

# *Actual Problems*

## Orientalisms and Documentaries,

*Articles from "The Free Thinker" Magazine 1992-2005*

collected by Christian Lanciai,

with contributions from

Rabbi Yohanan (Israel)  
Doctor Sandy (the Levant)  
John B. Westerberg (the Himalayas)  
Kim (India)  
The Raoul Wallenberg Society  
Edvard Milaszevski (Poland)  
John Bede (Ulster)  
Jaap Knevel (Holland)  
Helena Norberg-Hodge (Ladakh)  
The Loreto College in Darjeeling  
Carl O. Nordling (Stockholm/Borgå, Finland)  
Göran Michanek  
Laila Roth  
John Michell  
Mark Twain  
A.D.Wraight (London)  
The Marlowe Society (with other Marlovians)  
Anders Ekman (Bollnäs)  
Don Mahan (Massachusetts)  
Michel Peissel  
Christmas Humphries  
Doctor Sun  
Carl Gustaf Lilius (Hangö)  
Jamyang Norbu  
Rahayu Ratnaningsih (Indonesia)  
Terry McCarthy  
David Rennie (Daily Telegraph)  
Sri Shankar Menon (India)  
Michael Trend (Daily Telegraph)  
Human Rights Watch, Asia  
Dana Dillon (National Review)  
Epoch Times (Hongkong/New York)

with my greatest and sincerest thanks to my oldest and closest colleagues  
John Bede, John B. Westerberg, Doctor Sandy and Laila Roth,  
with everlasting affection and gratitude.

Copyright © Christian Lanciai 2005

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b><i>Music</i></b>   |    |
| Muriel Carlmark in Memoriam   | 5  |
| The Mysterious Origin of Richard Wagner                             | 6  |
| <b><i>Films</i></b>   |    |
| In the Name of the Father   | 8  |
| Four Weddings and a Funeral   | 9  |
| Priest  | 10 |
| Rob Roy   | 11 |
| JFK   | 11 |
| K2 - The Adventure  | 12 |
| Shakespeare in Calcutta   | 14 |
| Second Thoughts on "The English Patient"                            | 15 |
| <b><i>The Orient File</i></b>                                       |    |
| Pius XII and the Jewish Question in the Second World War            | 17 |
| <b><i>The Baruch Goldstein Case :</i></b>                           |    |
| Heard from Israel   | 17 |
| Talks in Jerusalem  | 18 |
| The Palestinian's Complaint   | 22 |
| The Strange Meeting at Ely  | 22 |
| The Cyprus Problem  | 24 |
| Studies in the Turkish Mentality, by <i>Doctor Sandy</i>            | 25 |
| The Kurdish War in Turkey, by <i>Doctor Sandy</i>                   | 26 |
| Religious Assessment by John  | 27 |
| Interesting Situation in Israel                                     | 30 |
| Doctor Sandy Concerning "The New Frontier"                          | 31 |
| What the Holy Quran does not say about Mahomet                      | 32 |
| The Problem Concerning Turkey, Armenia, Kurdistan, Iraq, Iran, etc. | 33 |
| The War in Afghanistan (1996)                                       | 34 |
| Eric Newby: A Short Walk in the Hindukush                           | 36 |
| Two Letters from an Old Doctor                                      | 36 |
| Moslem News   | 39 |
| Doctor Sandy's Lecture  | 40 |
| <b><i>The Raoul Wallenberg File.</i></b>                            |    |
| The Raoul Wallenberg Literature                                     | 45 |
| Raoul Wallenberg Today  | 45 |
| The Empire of Evil  | 46 |
| The Sikorsky Case   | 48 |
| Raoul Wallenberg and Tibet  | 49 |
| <b><i>The Jesus File</i></b>  |    |
| The Christmas Letter of John B. Westerberg (1996)                   | 51 |
| Apology for the Bible and Christianity                              | 55 |
| The Importance of Religious Criticism, by John Bede                 | 56 |
| The Jesus Debate, by John B. Westerberg                             | 60 |

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <b><i>Scientifical Problems and Speculations.</i></b>         |    |
| The Strange Case of Giordano Bruno                            | 64 |
| Concerning the Bomb   | 66 |
| Plutonic Problems   | 67 |
| Concerning Information Technique                              | 68 |
| Doctor Sandy on the Drug Situation                            | 68 |
| Concerning Drug Liberalization                                | 69 |
| The Strange Case of Jonathan Swift                            | 70 |
| John Westerberg Concerning UFO                                | 72 |
| The Consumption Society                                       | 75 |
| Concerning Einstein, <i>by Doctor Sandy</i>                   | 76 |
| One of the Most Exciting Books of Our Time ( <i>Podvoll</i> ) | 77 |

### ***Philosophy and Literature***

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| An Eternal Issue - <i>about the desert island</i>      | 78  |
| The Emperor Marcus Aurelius and the European Community | 87  |
| Talks with my Doctor                                   | 89  |
| An Interview with John B. Westerberg                   | 93  |
| Gore Vidal's Three Greatest Novels                     | 95  |
| The Most Important Authors of the 20th Century         | 97  |
| The Finest Author of the 20th Century                  | 100 |
| An Orientation in Contemporary Literature              | 102 |

### ***The Shakespeare Debate***

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Shakespeare's Identity Revealed?                            | 104 |
| Two Views on King Arthur                                    | 108 |
| King Arthur and Shakespeare - a Third View                  | 109 |
| The Shakespeare Debate with John Bede and Carl O. Nordling  | 112 |
| A Case for Christopher Marlowe                              | 113 |
| The Sun-Spots of the Poet                                   | 118 |
| The Revelation of the Sonnets                               | 122 |
| The Controversies of Timon, Pericles and Henry VIII         | 124 |
| The Method of Doctor Mendenhall                             | 126 |
| The Unfathomable Melancholy of Robert Burton                | 127 |
| The Contribution of David Rhys Williams                     | 129 |
| The William Shakeshafte Mystery                             | 131 |
| A Temporary Summary   | 133 |
| Ventilating the Theories, <i>by Laila Roth</i>              | 134 |
| Scrutinizing the Sonnets                                    | 135 |
| John Michell's Solution to the Problem                      | 137 |
| All We Know About William Shakespeare, <i>by Mark Twain</i> | 139 |
| The Secrets of Anthony Bacon                                | 142 |
| Comments on A.D.Wraight                                     | 148 |
| The Marlowe Case - Another Presentation                     | 150 |
| The Difficult Case of Sir Francis Bacon                     | 151 |
| Fact and Speculation in the Case of John Penry              | 153 |
| A Shakespeare Apology, <i>by John Bede</i>                  | 155 |
| Presenting a Baconian Problem                               | 156 |
| The Perfect Set-Up - a Summary of the (lack of) Evidence    | 157 |
| Melancholy  | 159 |
| The Mystery, <i>by Laila Roth</i>                           | 160 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| More Marlowe Theories  | 161 |
| The Gothenburg Shakespeare Symposium, May 2002                               | 164 |
| Comments to "Arden of Feversham"   | 170 |
| Main Traits of the Marlowe Theory  | 171 |
| Doubts about Bacon   | 174 |
| <br>   |     |
| <i>The Tibet File</i>  |     |
| A Short History of Tibet in Modern Times                                     | 178 |
| Tibetan Chapter, <i>after Michel Peissel</i>                                 | 180 |
| Documents from the Darjeeling Conference                                     | 182 |
| John's Letter  | 183 |
| The Darjeeling Conference : Aftermath  | 186 |
| Prelude and Aftermath  | 188 |
| Heroes of Tibet  | 189 |
| Later Heroes of Tibet  | 194 |
| Tibetan Letters ( <i>John Westerberg, Kim, Doctor Sandy, Doctor Sun</i> )    | 198 |
| The Panchen Lama   | 205 |
| The Tibetan Problem - a concise summary                                      | 207 |
| What Is To Be Done About China? - <i>by Doctor Sun</i>                       | 210 |
| Talks in Kathmandu   | 211 |
| It Happens in Lhasa  | 218 |
| Concerning Buddhism  | 218 |
| Letter from Calcutta   | 220 |
| Concerning Hinduism  | 221 |
| The Rules of the Buddhistic Order  | 223 |
| The Ten Precepts   | 224 |
| Peter Fleming and the Great Game   | 225 |
| The Murder of Panchen Lama   | 226 |
| A Political Reflection   | 227 |
| Problems in East Turkestan   | 227 |
| Whatever Happened in Mongolia?   | 228 |
| Heinrich Harrer's Return to Tibet  | 228 |
| Successful Pilgrimage to Kailash   | 229 |
| A Foreigner's View on Kashmir  | 230 |
| Voices from China  | 230 |
| Doctor Sun Concerning the Hongkong Issue                                     | 232 |
| The Tragedy of Tibet   | 233 |
| Concerning Genocide  | 235 |
| Violence or Non-Violence? - a Tibetan Question of Destiny                    | 235 |
| Comments to Karmapa  | 237 |
| Tibetan Seminar in Gothenburg, Sweden, May 6th 2000                          | 237 |
| Letter from Bihar  | 238 |
| The Leh Conference   | 239 |
| Tibetan Attitude Toward Death Not Mystical (Satori Foundation)               | 241 |
| A Note of Warning, by Doctor Sun   | 243 |
| The Situation  | 244 |
| A Bureaucrat's Diary, by S. Shankar Menon: <i>Road to Lhasa</i>              | 246 |
| Remember Lithang! - <i>by John B. Westerberg</i>                             | 247 |
| Forced Abortion and Forced Sterilization ( <i>Human Rights Watch, Asia</i> ) | 249 |
| Greetings from Darjeeling - <i>by John B. Westerberg</i>                     | 250 |
| Raoul Wallenberg and Tibet   | 251 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| The 27th Gothenburg Film festival - "The Cry of the Snow Lion" | 253 |
| The Himalayas Updated  | 254 |
| The Defence for China  | 259 |
| An Apology from China  | 261 |
| China's Zombie Countries Bringing Dictators Back to Life       | 262 |
| Anatomy of Political Communism                                 | 264 |

## *Music*

### Muriel Carlmark in Memoriam The Mysterious Origin of Richard Wagner

#### *Muriel Carlmark In Memoriam.*

There is a Swedish expression which was Muriel's favourite, and which best characterizes her entire being: "*full av skoj*", which means 'full of fun'. Few knew Muriel from her humouristic sides, but that was in fact her main character. She was a light human being who saw everything in rays of joy and harmony, and she was always enjoying herself.

This might be refuted by those who knew her fate and the struggle with which she carried it; but it was her unquenchably bright sides which helped her to endure the unendurable. Her irrepressible optimism in union with those trials she was subject to, which would have broken anyone else from the beginning, resulted in an incredible valour and toughness, which never gave up until even her apparently inexhaustible body had to obey the laws of nature.

She was born in 1910 while Leo Tolstoy was still alive and King Edward VII ruled in England, when Elgar and Vaughan-Williams were accomplishing their greatest achievements and when the whole world basked in the light of order, welfare and peace. She came from a richly endowed and highly cultivated family, the Dugdills of Brixton; her father could have become a concert pianist but instead ended up one of England's foremost ornithology experts; and also her brother followed the path of art becoming a photographer with poetry besides. She also went quite far in music and mastered pieces by Liszt and Rachmaninov before she was tempted out of England to marry a Swede from Åmål (pronounced *Awe-maule*).

Her life then became that of a house-wife with four children of her own, all musical with international outlooks, and her daughter married a Frenchman during a missionary journey in Peru together with Abbé Pierre, who is still alive and a definite candidate for the Nobel peace prize.

During her long life Muriel experienced both the world wars, and in London towards the end of the first one she outlived the first German bombings by air. She almost took it for a joke - "they were like paper aircrafts coming with flying dustbins which exploded full of rubbish and didn't even do any harm." As long as she lived she recalled vividly how she found protection against these bombings in the shelter of her neighbour's kitchen together with a German family, who couldn't understand what was going on. During the Second World War she was in Sweden and thus didn't have to endure how London was bombed for real.

She always remained quite English and could never really feel at home in Sweden or understand the Swedish society. She liked it best in Sweden when the family lived out at Marstrand by the sea, where it was closer to the outer archipelago of Gothenburg - the British Isles - than from Älvängen and Gothenburg.

A great and lovely smile and light has left us but still lingers on, with the glow of happier times from before the great world destruction of the two world wars, a glow which though always will remain as typically English as a cup of tea with muffins out on a sunny veranda in a neither too shadowy nor too sunny garden of incorruptible beauty with an entire universe outside it to discuss, a world which in spite of all the tragedies nevertheless to her always remained as incurably 'full of fun' as ever.

*February 2001.*

### *The Mysterious Origin of Richard Wagner*

When Goethe acquainted himself with the ancient German myths of the Nibelungen, he was overwhelmed by the enormous possibilities he saw of developing them literarily. At the same time he realized his own limits - he could never do it himself, since the subject was too theatrical and dangerously nationalistic - he was allergic to all forms of nationalism and exaggerations. But his vision of the subject as full of power and scenic possibilities was definite.

One of his friends was the very talented actor and painter, the writer and poet Ludwig Geyer (1779-1821). Friedrich Nietzsche later asserted that Ludwig Geyer had been a Jew, but he was the only one to make this assertion. There was no proof, but neither was professor Nietzsche refuted. It should be difficult to find any reason why the in those days still extremely wise and brilliant professor Nietzsche should have asserted this without reason.

Ludwig Geyer was a very close friend of Johanne Wagner's, the wife of Carl Friedrich Wagner (1770-1813), a police officer in the city of Leipzig. The ninth child of this family was Richard Wagner, who was born in May 1813. Six months later the father died of a typhoid epidemic in the city. The mother (1774-1848) then remarried Ludwig Geyer, who took good care of the family.

If Richard Wagner did not look like Ludwig Geyer, he even less resembled his father. You can hardly imagine a pear falling farther away from the apple tree than this hypersensitive extravagant artist and rebel Richard Wagner as the son of a very correct police official. It doesn't make sense. All the more Richard had in common with his stepfather Ludwig Geyer, the fantasy man with great gestures, the colleague and friend of Goethe, the ardent actor and the warm-hearted bohemian. Richard always acknowledged his vast debts to Ludwig Geyer, although he lost his stepfather already at the age of eight.

Was Ludwig Geyer then the natural father? There is much in favour of it. He was a very close friend of the family, so close, that he often went in as soon as Friedrich Wagner went out, which was often enough, since the wife frequently complained of her husband's unreliability. In summer 1813, before Richard had been baptized and when the husband was still very much alive, the mother went on her own to Ludwig Geyer at Teplitz to be with him during his theatre season there. For this reason Richard Wagner was not baptized until much later. The motive for the mother's journey to Ludwig Geyer has never been explained. The husband was then 43, the wife 39 and Ludwig Geyer only 34 and a most attractive man. Unfortunately we have no portrait of the father, which is queer indeed, since there are portraits of his brother and the rest of the family, as if all possible portraits of Friedrich Wagner had been destroyed by

Wagnerians to conceal the evident lack of kinship between Richard and his boring father - it could be a case of destroyed evidence. On the other hand, a blend between the complexions of the mother and Ludwig Geyer could very well result in a face like Richard Wagner's. Ludwig Geyer even presented his stepson in society at times as "Richard Geyer", and he seems to have taken a greater interest in this child than in Johanne Wagner's other children.

Richard Wagner could never be sure that Friedrich Wagner was his father, and when his own son grew up and got a face of his own, Richard had to confess that his son Siegfried looked like Ludwig Geyer.

So it seems probable that Richard was the natural son of Ludwig Geyer and that Ludwig Geyer at least to some extent was of Jewish origin. By chance Richard also happened to be born in the Jewish quarters of Leipzig. Another most influential Jewish person in Richard Wagner's life was the poet Heinrich Heine, who gave him the stories for both the Flying Dutchman and Tannhäuser.

The two most influential composers for the development of Wagner and his music were also both Jews: Giacomo Meyerbeer and Felix Mendelssohn. The Jewish complex in William Richard Wagner, which does not appear until he becomes famous and established, is easily explained logically and psychologically. He could never reach certainty about his origin. Since he probably wasn't his father's son, he was a bastard with doubtful Jewish ancestry. This psychologically fatal want of certainty had to result in a very peculiar relationship with things Jewish, which develops into open hostility when life later on offers him certainty in his career, since he had to regard everything Jewish as synonymous with all his previous lack of foothold in life.

To this liability was added his mother's reckless spoiling of him. He grew up as a perfect milksop, and his relationship with women were never normal. A psychologically upset and unstable boy is brought up in a motherly hothouse where he is allowed to cultivate all his grand airs - it is strange that he was not utterly ruined from the beginning or turned into a monster, which he in some ways definitely became.

It has been said by Jews about Jews that they are like ordinary human beings, only so much more. The same description would fit Richard Wagner perfectly but even more multiplied. His entire life consists only of exaggerations. He wrote ingenious music, but it never became more ingenious than in his smallest masterpiece "*The Flying Dutchman*". Instead of developing his musical mastery he is carried away by the idea of the 'universal work of art' and claims to be as much of a poet and an authority as a musician. The result is his music gets drowned in ostentatious effects and is ruined by miserably drivelling and exasperating texts. Everything Wagner wrote in letters is more or less absurd. He has no sense of logic and no human psychology, and he lives and works only for his self-indulgence in emotional exaggerations. "*Tristan*" is the one exception among his operas which is more music than preposterous effects. Parts of the "*Ring*" cycle have glorious moments of beauty especially in "*Die Walküre*"; and "*Siegfried*" in all its primitiveness must needs have an acknowledgement for opening up the gateway to modern music. ("Siegfried" made Leo Tolstoj so furious in 1896 that he became allergic to all things German for the rest of his life.) Not until in "*Parsifal*" the theatrical overstatements finally calm down in order to instead bring forth an almost ecclesiastical purity and peace - with a profoundly moving solemnity of unequalled grandeur, though - as the final overwhelming Wagnerian exaggeration.

(The great barytone Dietrich Fischer-Dieskau has written a most valuable book about the relationship between Wagner and professor Nietzsche. They were great friends until 1876 when the professor decided to disagree with Wagner for the rest of his life.)

# *Films*

In the Name of the Father  
Four Weddings and a Funeral  
Priest  
Rob Roy  
JFK  
K2 - The Adventure  
Shakespeare in Calcutta  
Second Thoughts on "The English Patient"

## *In the Name of the Father*

The true story of the case of Gerry Conlon and his family from Belfast is a hard story of a hard world, and the movie is hard all through. Gerry Conlon is a typical Irishman, a Belfast Catholic but something of a good-for-nothing, who earns his living by stealing scrap-iron. The story begins in Belfast in 1974 when everything is chaos because of the war against the IRA. Gerry gets caught in the middle between the British and the IRA, which is why he leaves Ireland for London to escape violence. He occasionally finds place in a hippie community together with his friend Paul Hill but has just been thrown out from there and is stranded with Paul Hill in the park when the Guildford bomb explodes killing lots of innocent people in a local pub after eight in the evening. The British authorities get furious, and extreme laws are carried through in a surge of hysteria, enabling the police to keep suspects in custody for a week. The hippie community is routed, and Gerry Conlon and Paul Hill are arrested together with the whole Conlon family. By means of torture four of them are compelled to sign a confession, which makes a trial possible. The whole Conlon family including the father, an aunt and two children are judged guilty of the Guildford massacre together with three other youngsters of the hippie community. Gerry is sentenced to 30 years' imprisonment although there is no binding evidence. The police has reasoned, that it is less important to get the real terrorists than to put an end to terrorism.

Many years later the real terrorist is caught and confesses his guilt in the Guildford massacre. Nothing happens in consequence of this since the police, who has sent eight innocent people to prison, keeps silent about it.

The ordeal of Gerry is fifteen inhuman years in the worst prisons of England for the worst of criminals. He shares cell with his father, who under the extreme circumstances involving several prison mutinies loses his health and dies. By then rumour has seeped out that the Conlons be innocent since the real terrorist never could keep his mouth shut. The scandal grows, the public becomes alert, demonstrations increase, and a female lawyer (Emma Thompson) decides to get at the bottom of things. After fifteen years she finds out that evidence has been withheld and that the alibis for the Conlons were known to the police but never made known to the court. It is publicly disclosed that the Conlons for 15 years quite deliberately were made into scapegoats for crimes they never committed. The worst scandal ever in English history of law is evident and maybe the worst scandal in the world since the Dreyfus affair, if it isn't even worse than

that, since here an innocent old father was even permitted to die in prison without any rehabilitation.

And what did the IRA do meanwhile? They just watched and continued with their terror bombs, said nothing and did nothing to prevent the injustice of having the Conlons and three additional youngsters serve 15 years of imprisonment and have their lives ruined. Eight innocent victims: four youths, two children, an aunt, and one father, who was bereft of his life.

The question rises: how many such cases are there who never get any rehabilitation at all?

### *Four Weddings and a Funeral*

The English couple from Polanski's horrible "Bitter Moon" appear again in this hilarious comedy about weddings successful, less successful and fatal, but here unfortunately Hugh Grant never gets the right one although she loves him. Instead he gets caught by an American girl who has already had 32 lovers before him while he only has screwed nine. You would have granted him a better lady, which Fiona or "Fifi" definitely is - but she never gets married.

The two first weddings are happily carried through, but the third one is accompanied by thunder and a case of sudden death, and the fourth is interrupted by a well-deserved knock-out and is never taken up again. Instead there are four extra weddings after the end.

The funeral is the worrying interlude. The one who dies never gets married, but after his death a very good friend steps forth who after the burial comforts himself with another of that kind. The question is touched but never debated, and it is never made clear whether these three were homosexuals or not. Many must assume them to be so.

Speaking about weddings, one of my old flames asked me the other day why I never settled down with a family and wife. I blamed my poverty, but the truth is also that in these frivolous times since the 60s I never found a woman whom I could trust. All my efforts to serious engagements ended in fraud and treason from the part of the lady, and the first example of this was the worst and the most damaging. If you can't do it with a clean breast, I was taught by experience, it is better to keep clean.

Looseness with round words and promiscuities like in this most recommendable wedding and funeral comedy could well be swallowed even if the mouthfuls became a bit thick occasionally, but in the field of love the ugliest impression ever made on me was by tendencies of homosexuality or lesbianism. In that aspect I would probably be regarded as a most out-dated oldish Victorian gentleman without double standards, but I can't be anything else unfortunately for perfectly natural reasons, since I can't accept something unnatural as something natural. It is not intolerance. It's just that no one has been able to convince me that anything unnatural could be natural. I simply can't believe in scientific theories excusing and explaining away homosexuality, since it doesn't make any natural sense.

The best films of the year according to the Free Thinker:

1992 : Tous les matins du monde (the French film about the Viola da Gamba players)

1993 : The Piano (Jane Campion)

1994 : The Secret Garden (Agnieszka Holland)

1995 : Kristian Lavransdotter (Liv Ullmann)

1996 : Farinelli

1997 : Shine

1998 : Ever After

1999 : Tea with Mussolini

2000 : Love's Labour's Lost

2001 : The House of Mirth

2002 : The Others

2003 : The Russian Ark (Alexander Sokurov)

2004 : Girl with a Pearl Earring

### *Priest*

"Priest" is simply made and shows simple people in humble circumstances in the slums of Liverpool in the depth of miseries of the great recession. The environment is depressing with parking lots and houses to be pulled down, depressing inhuman interiors of square concrete houses and dejected people among whom not a single one is going up. In this bleak scenery of delapidation an upsetting drama takes place in a Catholic vicarage.

The central problem is the obligation of silence under the sacrament of confession, just like in Hitchcock's film "I Confess", where a Catholic priest receives a murderer's confession and must keep his silence about it since that is his duty as a priest, even though he himself becomes a suspect of the murder committed. In that film things are sorted out but not here.

In this story of Liverpool a young inexperienced priest is told in confession by a small girl how she is being abused sexually by her father, and there is nothing he can do about it, since she has told him under the seal of holy confession. The father continues to abuse her, hears that she has told the priest about it, whereupon he threatens the priest if he doesn't keep his mouth shut. Of course this leads into a terrible dilemma for the priest. He can't suffer seeing the girl suffering and developing epileptic fits because of her father's ill-treatment of her, and at the same time he can't break his silence. The girl's mother suspects nothing, until one day by chance she takes her husband by surprise *in flagrancia* with the child. This is the most interesting scene in the film, since the priest at the same time suffers his severest doubts about his calling. When the mother learns that the priest knew about it she blames him for having done nothing to help the girl.

The question is: had in this extreme case the priest the right to break his obligation of silence? If he had done so the harm had been less for both the girl and the mother. This problem of doctors, advocates and priests concerning the obligation to observe secrecy sometimes becomes severe trials of conscience, and in such moments the doctor or priest or lawyer must also consult his own judgement. According to the Hippocratic oath, the prime concern is not to harm the patient: "What I have seen or heard practising my profession or outside it in connection with people which might be matters of intimacy too delicate to be communicated to others with any constructive result, I shall

keep secret and regard as never having been told." This implies that the doctor must judge by himself what he hears if it should be further communicated or not. If you stick to the chief Hippocratic purpose to keep the patient from harm you will find, that the mother did right in blaming the priest for not breaking his obligation to observe secrecy.

The priest's personal tragedy in the film is of secondary interest, while the film mainly depends on the character of father Matthew, an older and more experienced priest, who sleeps with the vicarage maid, who preaches walking around among the pews in his church, who doesn't fear speaking his mind under any circumstances and who even challenges his bishop, who gives him hell for his outspokenness. In the end all the threads of the story are united in a marvellous solution, where even the worst of crimes can be pardoned and forgotten under mutual shedding of tears.

A much more wholesome film, though much crueller, is then "Rob Roy" about the historical rogue Robert MacGregor of Scotland in the early 18th century, about whom even Walter Scott wrote one of his best novels. The phenomenon of Rob Roy is his personality as a paragon of supreme honesty, although he was a thief of cattle and an instigator of atrocities; but the honour and honesty of one single man who is right while the whole world attacking him is wrong is always one of the most fascinating of human themes. The film is excellently written almost like a Shakespearean drama with clearcut characters, a fine story and wonderful surroundings in the Scottish Highlands. It is a joy to see so much health and freedom, so much integrity and honest human initiative in this world, which still today, like in the days of Rob Roy and like always, is constantly suffocating in corruption, human filth and destruction, wickedness and selfish motives nowadays destroying even Dame Nature's own freedom. But as long as there still remains one single man to demonstrate a personal protest, there is still hope for the entire world.

### *A Sicilian's View*

He knew all about the Kennedy murders: the one who profited most was Richard Nixon. If the Kennedy brothers had been permitted to live on, Robert would have become president after John F, and then Edward, which would have finished Nixon's career. Instead, John F. and Robert were murdered, and then the arrangement of a perfect scandal was enough to terminate Edward's possibilities. My man on Sicily maintained that the democrats has always made America, developing her democracy, while the republicans always had sabotaged constructivity by developing military industries and insisting on gunfire freedom. That John F. Kennedy was murdered because he wanted to end the Vietnam war (according to Oliver Stone's realistically credible and convincing film) was if anything a motive which fitted perfectly into the policy of Richard Nixon and the republicans. Remember how Richard Nixon was the right hand of Joseph McCarthy in the witch hunts of the early 50s against left sympathizers like Dashiell Hammett, and let's never forget how the Nixon government sanctioned both the sacrifice of democratic Chile in 1973 (including the murder of president Allende), the sacrifice of East Timor in 1975 to the Indonesian military autocracy, and the sacrifice of the cause of Taiwan and the last freedom fighters in Tibet just to adulate the world's greatest totalitarian state communist China in order to make business possible with the cruellest regime in the world. If Richard Nixon hadn't been stopped by the Watergate scandal, who knows but that the Vietnam war commitment might have continued until 1989 at least.

He regretted very much the development of the world after 1945 while he wistfully praised the times before, when lack of food and constant wars had compelled people to work hard and do things right, which had rendered them happy. In those days, he told me, people sang everywhere, they were healthy, you moved mostly on foot although you had to travel tens of miles, and you were happy and content with only little. After the Marshall aid there was never more any real lack of things in Sicily, instead life became comfortable, and no one walked anywhere but went by car even if only a hundred meters, and people in general fell ill and became unhappy. The young ones do not sing any more but get themselves brainwashed instead by deafening rock music and go to discos to get themselves drugged and involved in further criminal activities.

At large he blamed everything on the rich. "It's always those who have money who cynically and ruthlessly invest it in exploitation of every possible unsound kind, socially using youth to further bad music and develop the use of drugs, globally by ruining the environment, politically by weapon industries and the support of violence, and economically by corruption. In the beginning of the 60s the world saw a most promising human development led by capable personalities like pope John XXIII, the secretary general of the UN Dag Hammarskjöld from Sweden, president John F. Kennedy and Martin Luther King. If their efforts for a better world had been permitted to continue, the cold war would have ended 20 years earlier. The reversion commenced by the murder of Dag Hammarskjöld by agents of economical interests in Africa, the pope didn't have much time and also another pope was quickly disposed of, the Kennedy brothers were murdered, and even Martin Luther King was murdered. Instead the American arms industry was given a giant leap forward by the prolonged Vietnam war together with all the weapon industries in the world, and the entire peace movement of the 60s was derailed. Thereby the end of the cold war was delayed by at least 15 years. Only Germany and Japan were wise enough to instead of supporting arms industries and atomic bombs invest in peace and peace industries. That's why they are today the strongest economical powers." He concluded categorically, that where the money is, you find evil, the initiative to war and dictatorship, and the beginning of all corruption and destruction; and there you will find that phenomenon called power, which never can be used except to bad ends.

### *K2 - the Adventure*

This film was shot in British Columbia and in Kashmir often in 20 degrees minus and on altitudes above 3000 meters. It told the story of two chums, who had been climbing mountains together for ten years, and who in Alaska met with an expedition who planned an assault on K2, Mount Godwin Austen in Kashmir, the world's second highest and most dangerous mountain. It's the weather which makes it so perilous, because it may shift in an instant from a bright day to a cold murderous blast of blinding snowstorms, which blows you off the mountain or freezes you to death in a second.

The expedition leader was a millionaire of about 60 years, who paid for everything and continued climbing impossible mountains although he really was too old for that already. His second mate was a young self-sufficient macho hero called Dallas. Number three was his girl and number four a Japanese veteran. To these were added our two chums, one of them a professor of quantum physics with an incredible capacity for always calculating the risks correctly and thereby how to avoid them, married and father of one child; and his pal, an invulnerable dreadnought, who could venture on anything and always be sure to come out all right.

The nature of K2, however, has the disadvantage of refusing half of its climbers to return alive. As our expedition embarked on the attempt in spite of rebellious porters and other unsurmountable difficulties, they met with another expedition on its way down after some evident catastrophes: one among them was mad, and another was dead. A few extra members of the party had been left behind dead up there somewhere in the vast deepfreeze. Our expedition continued, however, its two main characters, Dallas and Dreadnought, having an argument on the way and fighting it out with proper fisticuffs.

This was just the beginning. The old leader soon suffered from emphysema and could go no further, so he ordered Dallas and the Japanese gentleman to continue alone towards the top, while our two chums would remain as reserves: this was not according to the bargain or the program, so violent protests took place but were of no avail: the millionaire decided everything, because he had the money. In the morning the Jap returned from above alone and dying: he and Dallas had lost their tent as they had been taken by surprise by a snowstorm. Dallas was still up there somewhere, and the Jap had at least succeeded in returning alive. After telling so much of a story, however, he expired.

But the two chums decided to dare an attempt as the weather cleared next day. They happily reached the top, but the way down is always much more difficult than the way up, especially on such a mountain. The weather became worse again, soon they could see nothing, and the next moment they lost their footholds and met with disaster. The professor broke his leg in a fall of some fifty meters. He ordered his partner to leave him and save at least himself. The Dreadnought reluctantly agreed to this and not without the wildest protests.

In the meantime the old expedition leader decided to abandon the base camp since his life was in peril and since the weather up there was so bad that the four climbers had to be given up as lost.

But on the way down our dreadnought encountered the frozen body of Dallas. Here the story took its most interesting turn: Dallas had with him all the equipment, such as ropes, vitamins and adrenalin capsulas, which the chums had lost in their fall. Our Dreadnought decided to return with this equipment to his dying comrade. He found him all right, gave him adrenalin injections and put him on his one functioning foot, and with solemn carefulness they started to come down together, while the weather still was the worst imaginable and they didn't even know where they were.

Meanwhile the millionaire and the girl left the base camp by helicopter. The pilot insisted on going round the mountain just to have a last look if any survivor would come in sight for a last chance. Fortunately they thus found the two chums, who could be saved, while only two of the six in the expedition thus had perished.

The greatest losers in the expedition then had been Dallas (dead) and the millionaire, who never again would be allowed on any mountain. Already in the beginning, when Dallas proved so arrogant that it came to fisticuffs on the way up, it was certain that the expedition could not succeed. As an experienced traveller expressed it: If there is trouble between members in an expedition, the expedition should be cancelled immediately. Here the two leading heroes had an almost deadly row and still enforced the enterprise, in which two people died, one completely innocent of any fracas. Was it worth it?

The message of the film was maybe something like: money and power is necessary but never sufficient, while consideration and humanity outlasts death.

At the same time the film was an excellent lesson in sportmanship. Nothing is more important in demanding expeditions than the maintenance of good sportmanship. Intrigues, going behind the backs of others, withholding information, backbiting,

betrayal and overrunning - all such matters are purely destructive and the opposite of sportmanship. If such superfluities can not be avoided, it is better to cancel the expedition.

### *Shakespeare in Calcutta*

Calcutta has always been the centre of Indian quality films with such a man as Satyajit Ray for a dominating figure, while Bombay more has been the manufacturer of glittering soap operas. The small film "36 Chowringhee Lane" is a typical Calcutta production in its heart-rending realism and sharp expressive down-to-earth humanity and so true to life and conditions in Calcutta that it is almost overwhelming.

Miss Violet Stanhope is a small aged teacher in a girls' school, where she teaches Shakespeare to her girls. The play which she always uses is "Twelfth Night". She lives with a cat at home which she calls Sir Toby (Belch), and her entire world consists only of her tiny old beautiful apartment on Chowringhee Lane, the school and the girls, Shakespeare, and a dying brother in a hospital, whom she visits every thursday. The only other place she visits is the cemetery with the tombs of her relatives from the times of the second world war. Like her dying brother, she is English.

This small world of hers is kept up with a consistent humorous courage by the small lady, and the camera compliments her life with illustrating shots from the life of Calcutta - the poverty, the beggars, the slums, the rickshaw runners, the permanent congestion on Hooghly Bridge, (then still the only bridge across the river,) and the lost splendours from the times when Calcutta was the second city of the British Empire.

The monotony of her life is interrupted one day as she meets an old pupil who necessarily wants to introduce her fiancé to her old teacher. The old lady then insists on inviting them both to tea, and the young couple is charmed by the perfect coziness of her small but wonderful home. They get the idea that it would be the ideal meeting place for them as lovers. Through guile they succeed in persuading the old teacher to allow them to use her home while she is away at school - she is led to believe that the fiancé is a great writer who needs a place to work in peace and quiet for his great books. Miss Stanhope with her fine literary education can not resist this idea.

That's where the tragedy begins, which never fully becomes a tragedy, because nothing can perturb miss Stanhope. At school she is overrun by a younger teacher who takes over her Shakespeare class while miss Stanhope is reduced to teaching grammar. Her brother dies in hospital without her being present, since she is then lured out by the young couple to have some fun with them. Gradually she realizes that they have borrowed access to her apartment merely for their love meetings, but it doesn't matter - she still believes in the young couple as her friends, she continues to encourage them and help them, - and she is present at their wedding. For a wedding present she gives them her old funnel grammophone with records from the 40's of the old fast kind. She wants to invite them home to her on Christmas Day to please them with a real Christmas Pudding, but they decline the invitation, stating that they will not be at home during Christmas. That's how she gets the idea that she will give them her Christmas Pudding anyway, by going to their house and leaving it on their door-step, while they are away.

The Calcutta Christmas is illustrated with overwhelmingly objective pathos. You see all the beggars and homeless, who just lie about in the streets in heaps everywhere, the endless poverty and slum conditions, while a vulgar arrangement of "Silent Night" booms ironically in the air. And miss Stanhope arrives at the house of the young wedded couple to leave her Christmas Pudding. She is encountered by a house full of

lights and guests who are having a gay Christmas cocktail-party, and the guests are all young and rich and vulgarly noisy having drinks and luxuries galore. Not until then she understands.

She returns home with her Christmas Pudding undelivered, and she quotes Shakespeare. She recalls two of the most remarkable characters that Shakespeare ever invented - Malvolio and king Lear, the two greatest clowns of all - "Pray, do not mock me: I am a very foolish fond old man, fourscore and upward, not an hour more nor less; and, to deal plainly, I fear I am not in my perfect mind..."

And she returns to her old world of only memories - a young handsome lover who died in the second world war, her only relative the brother, who died completely gaga at the hospital, and what else besides Shakespeare?

What is it then she understood? Suddenly she realized, that no one cared any longer for an old English maid in Calcutta thirty years after Indian independence. She has fallen outside time. At the same time she has witnessed the contrast between the brave new world in India with the young rich generation only laughing at history and her cultural inheritance, unless they could use it for their own selfish satisfactions, and the world she still represents of high educational standards, morals and ideals. And the contrast is too striking.

The remarkable thing is that this film was made in India by Hindus. Both Bengali and English is spoken, and the two pathetic main parts - the old teacher and her dying brother - are also in reality an English brother and sister who have stayed on in India after 1947.

### *Second Thoughts on "The English Patient"*

This is a great love story and perhaps the best film of the year, made on a most interesting Dutch novel. Even if the story is not based on facts, it is spun around a most actual occurrence: the sensational "Cave of Swimmers" out in the Sahara desert beyond nowhere, which is lavishly decorated with prehistorical paintings depicting among other things people who are actually swimming. These prehistoric paintings is one of many proofs that the Sahara desert once was rich and fertile with endless resources of water and wild life.

The film and the novel describe the futility of world history in contrast to love, the classical love topic, which is the base of almost every great novel. The second world war with all its unhuman efforts and devastating political cataclysms disappears and becomes nothing in comparison with the tragic story of the lovers, who never can have each other and who rather die than accept it. The performances are outstanding, especially the always brilliant Kristin Scott Thomas and the reliable Willem Dafoe, who gets his thumbs cut off by a Gestapo officer, which makes him a combined drug addict and fanatic angel of revenge - without ever appearing as unsympathetic. The desert photography with its endless dune landscapes like a woman's body is breathtaking and has probably only been equalled and surpassed in "Lawrence of Arabia".

The most interesting aspect of this film, however, is its historical perspective. At the same time as eternal love is posed against the nonentity of the historical present the perspective of timelessness deepens by the mystery of all the prehistorical swimmers in a cave far out in the Sahara. We have already discussed the theories about how the asteroids came into being, the wayward position of Pluto in the solar system and Mars as once a living planet. The swimmers in Sahara confirm the desiccation of our planet. This serious phenomenon is most evident in Tibet. In western Tibet there were once flourishing kingdoms, which gradually were stricken by draughts, so that people had to

evacuate more and more areas. There is a very interesting theory about the kingdom of Gugge (pronounced 'Cookie') or its predecessors having once been maybe the oldest civilization on earth, from where people then migrated south (down the Indus valley resulting in the Harappa civilization) and west (down Syr-Darja and Amu-Darja, resulting in the spread of the Caucasian peoples). The oldest accounts in the Bible (Genesis 2:10-14) of the four rivers of Paradise (which could have been the four rivers Indus, Brahmaputra, Sutlej and Ganges, which all have their sources around Mount Kailas in western Tibet,) and of the deluge (with Noah introducing a new chapter in history by coming down from Mount Ararat to plant some wine,) could be remains in the form of legends from the old kingdom of Gugge or its predecessors.

If these theories could be scientifically proved by time it would import, that large areas of the continents once were covered by water, so that only very high lands (like Tibet and Ararat) were populated. And in that case, this would not have been longer ago than just before our known history as it found its beginning in Mesopotamia and Egypt around 7000 years ago.

According to our colleague John B. Westerberg in the Himalayas, this theoretical possibility is what makes the region of western Tibet most interesting: it could be the archaeologically most exciting area in the world.

## *The Orient File*

Pius XII and the Jewish Question in the Second World War  
*The Baruch Goldstein Case :*  
    Heard from Israel  
    Talks in Jerusalem  
    The Palestinian's Complaint  
    The Strange Meeting at Ely  
    The Cyprus Problem  
    Studies in the Turkish Mentality, by *Doctor Sandy*  
    The Kurdish War in Turkey, by *Doctor Sandy*  
    Religious Assessment by John  
    Interesting Situation in Israel  
    Doctor Sandy Concerning "The New Frontier"  
    What the Holy Quran does not say about Mahomet  
The Problem Concerning Turkey, Armenia, Kurdistan, Iraq, Iran, etc.  
    The War in Afghanistan (1996)  
    Eric Newby: A Short Walk in the Hindukush  
    Two Letters from an Old Doctor  
    Moslem News  
    Doctor Sandy's Lecture

## *Pius XII and the Jewish Question in the Second World War*

It's a question of cowardice. Although the pope very well knew about the Jews being annihilated in millions he never dared to condemn their murderers.

His one possible defence is that he chose the difficult path of total silence in order not to expose the church to any anger from the Germans - they did control Italy and Rome, and their capricious cruelty was capable of anything. They might have blown up the Church of St. Peter for him. He had no wish to make an extremely difficult situation even more difficult for a much larger number of people. He preferred protecting his church to imperilling it by breathing one word in favour of the Jews.

This is what sentences him and his church. If he had dared to side with the Jews with his world-wide Catholic church, the greatest and most influential of all Christian communities, he would have saved not only Christianity morally but also countless numbers of Jews. Instead he chose the opposite in his folly.

Since the days of Constantine the Great, the first Christian emperor in the 4th century, Christianity has claimed an absolute monopoly of religion by accusing the Jews for having crucified Christ and condemned them as heathens although they always believed in God, only because they never were formally baptized. This prejudice was not abandoned by the church until the days of pope John XXIII in 1959.

The parting line between Christianity and Jewry is the Christian notion that Christ was the son of God. The Jews prefer believing in God directly without by-roads. This is really the only thing separating these two faiths from each other. Although the Jews believed in God long before Christ was born, the Christians have always asserted that their faith is the only true one and always denied the Jewish faith any legitimacy in comparison. Of course this is pure stupidity and unpardonable ignorance, which according to the wisest heads of Hinduism and Buddhism is the only unpardonable sin.

People have often been curious about my own standing-point. Since I read the Bible the first time from beginning to end at the age of 21 I have preferred the Old Testament to the New one, since nearly everything in the New Testament was already written in the Old. I always had faith in Christ as a divine personality but carefully avoided taking sides to all the later constructed dogmas of the church. At the same time I agreed with St. Paul refuting Jewish formalism concerning circumcision and other such matters, which at least on our latitudes no longer are hygienically necessary formalities.

At the same time I willingly embraced the vast fields of knowledge of Hinduism and the humane constructivity of Buddhism. If I embrace all these different faiths - how then can I tell where I stand exactly? You need two feet to stand on for some security - one is not enough. I prefer standing on at least four.

*Heard from Israel*  
(February 1994)

Two Jews discussing.

"Don't let the Hebron massacre disturb your mind. It has nothing to do with anyone's religion or move towards peace since it was only executed for egoistical purpose by a mad American. He claimed to be a Jew, but no Jew could possibly call him Jewish since he violated the most sacred of all God's commandments: *Thou shalt not kill*. His design was not only to kill as many Arabs as possible but also to destroy the entire peace process. He was not only the enemy of all Arabs but also of all Jews, all Muslims and all

Christians and the mortal enemy of all people of a constructive mind. Those Jews who bless Benjamin Goldstein, extol his deed and honour his memory are not Jews but like Goldstein himself a disgrace to Israel.

On the other hand, those who hold forth this psychopathic example as an example typical of Israel, who use this example to curse Israel and to add fuel to the hatred of Israel are not in the least any better. The example of this American psychopath was unique as such and only prominent as an example of inhumanity and almost only comparable to the Charles Manson case, who was also an American.

Therefore, the less said and thought of this lonely psychopath, the better. Such loonies are only to be buried in memory as excrement smelling so foully to be humanly possible to be dealt with."

"No, brother, you can't explain it away. Baruch Goldstein was a Jew, born a Jew, educated a Jew and even a doctor, and he did what he did in the name of Israel and even on the eve of a joyous Jewish holiday. He had even planned it very carefully. It was a premeditated mass murder executed on purpose in the name of God. It can not be compared with the ritual murders of Charles Manson 25 years ago but rather with the suicidal attacks of Muslim fundamentalists. As Jews we can not free ourselves from the responsibility. We have to take it on our backs and carry it forever."

### *Talks in Jerusalem, part 3.*

On my second day in Jerusalem I entered by the New Gate and went directly to the Temple area. I had heard that the Chain Gate (the only entrance) was to be closed already at one o'clock, and my bus from Natanya was late. I reached the gate in the last minute and was instantly assaulted by the friendliest voluntary guide in the world, who was very disappointed when I didn't need his service. He wanted 20 shekels to show me the way to the ticket office and refused to leave me until he had obtained something. I got rid of him for 2 shekels - a bribe just to dispose of an embarrassing and depressing problem.

The Dome of the Rock, the oldest sacred monument in the history of Islam, now became the first mosque in my life which I entered. It is well worth a visit. You can well understand the enthusiasm of the emperor Frederick II of Hohenstaufen as he during his peaceful crusade to Jerusalem in 1228 was so impressed by the fantastic architecture of this sacred building that he later built his own most important castle (Castel del Monte between Aquila and Pescara in Abruzzi) in the same octagon form. As you wander about in this marvellous construction and study its wonderful cupola from the inside you are seized with a kind of vertigo and bewildering dislocation of the perspective, which makes you think something is wrong with your eyes, but there isn't. The Dome of the Rock was simply designed that way by its incredibly clever architects.

From there I went out through the Damascus Gate and down back across Kidron to Gethsemane. Unfortunately the Russian church of St. Mary Magdalene was closed and inaccessible, which from the outside is the most beautiful church in Jerusalem. After having revisited the garden of Gethsemane and the ecumenical garden of prayers of pope Paul VI almost at the top of the hill I went back down to Kidron and followed it to the City of David to ascend Mount Sion and enter by the Gate of Sion. Next I went to make my second visit to Rabbi Yohanan.

He took me through Cardo to the Wailing Wall, where we seated ourselves on the long stone bench beneath the flagstaffs furthest from the Wall. He was in his very best teaching mood, and it was obvious how carefully he had considered the things he wanted to tell me.

"Moses was probably the only real prophet who ever existed. Elijah was of course number two, but then there were not many others. But even such a grand old man as Moses had his foibles. He was not easy to deal with when he got angry, in his fits he was about as mad as your saint Savonarola, who was burnt at the stake for a greater lack of sins; and he was probably much worse and more difficult than your Giordano Bruno. Our astrologers think he might have been born in the sign of Capricorn, since it's noticeable how he constantly wanted to climb mountains, both real ones and greater mountains of human effort. He was so enthusiastic about climbing Mount Sinai that he brought his whole people to the mountain, and as an old and dying man he insisted on getting up the Mount Nebo. But mind you: no ascension! He may have had fits of bad temper now and then, but he was not vain, but always strove honestly for the welfare of his people. And he was the first one to start compromising with his own Law, which art and practice has continued ever since. The Law of Moses has never been followed exactly, but it has always been compromised with. Moses himself probably only brought the commandments and then tried to apply them practically by taking their consequences in each individual case. The great bulk of the Law was probably collected after his time and then consisted of a collection and concentration of all those individual judgements and decisions he had made that could be remembered. He was really the first judge, and the final edition of the Torah might have been completed during the times of Samuel, the last great judge, since during the reign of king David the Law is already well known and referred to.

Take a look at these black-coat Jews with their long ornate whiskers. I can well understand that *gojim* find them ridiculous. These are today the Jews who come closest to the ideal pursuit of the Law of Moses, but just the way they do their hair is a compromise. The Law says, that no razor is to touch the head of a Nazir as long as he remains holy as such, which means he may not cut his hair nor his beard. But these holiest of Jews cut all their hair except the whiskers, which they grow just to show something to prove that they haven't compromised everything away."

"What about the other prophets then, like Jesus and Mahomet? Are they completely worthless from a Jewish point of view?"

"Of course not. Jesus was probably the most learned young Jew of his age, he must have known the entire Law, Prophets and Scriptures by heart, he was probably something of what we call an infant prodigy, but special circumstances made something unsound rise in his mind. He got the idea that he was the real Messiah, and he acted that part admirably well all the way to the bitter end but got the hell out of it and died too soon as a result of it. But his performance was unforgettable, which resulted in the most powerful religion that ever existed, because all people with high regard for themselves, who wanted to be superior to everyone else, like kings and emperors, were inspired by the greatness of Christ's example and became Christians. He probably came closest to the Messianic ideal of all candidates ever, but that doesn't mean he was the only possible Messiah, no matter how much common sense he preached, no matter how much good he did, no matter how many patients he cured and how many he resurrected from the dead apart from his playing the part of the Messiah. Of course, many of your readers will object to my words if you quote them, so please, don't define my person too clearly but keep my name unknown. But the same thing that I am telling you, every rabbi in Israel and in the world would tell you also."

"And what about Mahomet?"

"That's the real problem. You see, of all religions only Islam takes itself dead seriously. You can not have a sense of humour in Islam, it has never been possible, and whenever someone has tried to crack an apposite joke about the slightest triviality in Islam, the bud of self-irony has been crushed and banned and never been permitted to

blossom. In Islam, good humour, self-irony and self-criticism only exist as underground activities. That's why Islam has become the most imprisoned and bleak and morbid of all religions.

The less said about Mahomet himself, the better. I sincerely hope you don't have any Moslem readers of the only proper faith. He was an epileptic who used his illness for his own benefit by taking his epileptic hallucinations seriously. His epileptic ecstasy he called prophetic visions and revelations by the angel Gabriel. The Arabs at that time were the most primitive people in the world, and they were enough superstitious to believe in such a scary prophet. He didn't write anything down himself though, just like Jesus, but all his holy writ was taken down from hearsay long after his death, some even say in the Aramaic tongue by Jews. All he did was to copy the Torah, and he translated the Genesis into the Arabian mentality. For us, the Quran version of *B'reshit* is like a Donald Duck version of a great classic. But the Arabs liked it. And then he also fancied the absurd story of the Ascension. He found it a good idea, so he went up to heaven too, but he had to do it even better than Jesus, so he started off from the very rock of Moriah, the most sacred rock of Jerusalem, where Abraham had considered sacrificing Isaac, the holiest spot for all our three religions.

Of course, you can't just explain it all away like that, and also the prophet Elijah went up to heaven - but in an entirely different way. Elijah was picked up by something, while Jesus and Mahomet sailed up by themselves. Now there is in your theology a famous Christian phenomenon called levitation. Your Saint Thomas Aquinas is supposed to have levitated now and then and in the presence of witnesses, and the Ascension of Christ could be an expansion of the remarkable incident where he was seen by the apostles together with Moses and Elijah. In that moment he also appeared in a somewhat elevated situation. It is well known, that people subject to an extraordinary inspiration can be carried away to such an extreme degree of ecstasy by their emotions that it becomes noticeable to other people who are terrified by the fact that the inspired person becomes someone else, like an illumined stranger. The episode on the mountain with Christ appearing like this was probably such an occasion and why not to an excessive degree, so that the memory thereof became so unforgettable that it gradually developed into the Ascension, which Mahomet found such an irresistible idea, so he found it convenient to be placed in the same position and, if possible, in an even better one.

But most interesting and important about Islam is its origin as a challenge against Christianity, which at that time was suffocating the world in dogmas and intolerance. Still today, Islam is the greatest Christian challenge, and between ourselves I think it is quite appropriate that the Dome of the Rock over there in the middle of the Temple area remains Islamic giving both Christianity and all self-righteous over-learned all too orthodox Jews sore eyes. Also the nicest parts of Jerusalem are all Moslem, where life is at its most natural, while unfortunately the rest of the city no longer is dominated by poor pilgrims but rather by rich dollar tourists, who gradually are becoming the only welcome people here. Still, the state of Israel is not just an extra American state or colony. Only our economy is American. The identity of the Jew was rediscovered and resurrected in Germany in the 18th century, and Israel is still ruled and dominated by those German Jews, *ashkenasim*. Our culture is European. Only our economy is Jewish-American. But we shouldn't have turned Jerusalem into our capital. That was an error. We should have allowed it to remain a wholly international religious city reserved for poor pilgrims and sacred graves. Tel-Aviv is a much more positive, happy and extrovert city and much more suitable for a capital and centre of secular politics. The politicians should have left the sanctity of Jerusalem in peace, for there is no better witness in the world of the consequences of political power than our sacred Jerusalem.

Many times Jerusalem has been destroyed, and here you see all that remains of the first, greatest and holiest Temple in the world, which after its restructurization was only even more utterly destroyed. This is the true God: the Wailing Wall, the crucifixion and all the graves of Jerusalem. God is history, which always will make all empires and political dreams of greatness crumble and fall to dust. Our God is the God of Job, who caused Job to lose all his children and all his property although Job had done nothing to deserve it. This is the only God we are able to present: the brutal and ruthless historical truth about the destruction of all empires and the death of six million innocent Jews for nothing. This is not the God of Moses, your Jesus or Mahomet, but it is the God that always exists no matter how you believe in him or not, always unfathomable, undefinable, relentless and overwhelming in his total power and control of history, which humankind never has been able to control."

"Do you mean to say that Islam has no future?"

"I feel sorry for Islam. Look at all these beggars in the streets of Jerusalem. They are all Muslims. Look at all these boys of the Intifada throwing stones at us, who have upset the whole world and almost turned the United States against us. They are only children, but they hate us, because they feel so painfully inferior to us. The Arabs and the Bedouins can not compete with us, because they are not that adjustable. We easily learn all the languages of the world, and we print and read five alphabets on our public signposts, but the Arabs only know their Quran and their Arabic. Their five service duties every day make it impossible for them to relax from the strains of their religion. They are constantly being brainwashed and made dependent like serfs. They have my sincerest and greatest compassion, I worry about them quite a lot, because unless we care for them when misfortune falls upon them, no one else will either. Islam has an increasingly bad reputation all over the world among the Hindus and Buddhists of Asia as well as among the Christians of Europe and America. And in Africa the Moslems are still trading with slaves. Enough. There was something you wanted to ask."

"Time is passing, and it will soon be dark. Isn't it about time that we come to the point?"

"What point?"

"Has anybody else come here to find you except me? Has any of the others written any message?" And I reminded him of the important theological question which our friend John had tried to make a theme for a conference.

"Best things last," he said. "Some letters really did arrive. You can see them, if you like. You can take them with you. I actually thought of it before leaving home."

And he offered me a package of letters. I hesitated, but he insisted benevolently. "Take them and read them! You may do whatever you like with them. I don't want them."

They were all there, almost everyone, - our Christian brethren from Egypt, our Muslim brothers from Iran and Bosnia, the Armenian and even the couple that got away. "None of them has complained about God," rabbi Yohanan said, "but they are all complaining anyway. Read!"

The perusal of the excuses gave me a shock. They were all about the same. Our brother from Egypt excused himself, saying that he would much have liked to come if only John had been there but that he couldn't trust a Jew. The Assyrian wrote that he would have enjoyed meeting John but was not very interested in meeting the Rabbi. The Gipsy from Bosnia stated bluntly that he could trust John with an ecumenical chairmanship but not a Jewish rabbi. Even the Iranian excused himself, stating that he would gladly have come to meet his friend John but didn't know the Rabbi. Only our Armenian friend expressed himself decently and correctly without wounding anyone's feelings, but also he excused himself although respectfully. But all the others were

negative and condescending towards a Jewish hostship. They all consciously or unconsciously insulted rabbi Yohanan and Jewry.

"You see what I mean," the rabbi told me with a smile, "it's still the Jews who get most of the hell out of having founded all monotheistic religion."

And this was in the good old days before the massacre at Hebron.

February 1994

### *The Palestinian's Complaint*

Baruch Goldstein, you didn't murder any Moslems.  
You only killed your own brothers and sisters and children.  
Those were your closest friends, whom you cut down  
with careful premeditation and without any concern.  
You didn't help or fight for Israel;  
you shot her down, your own mother, from behind,  
having planned it very carefully and with your fullest intention.  
Arabs do not do like that, nor any people.  
You proved worse than any traitor and worse than any swine.  
Your most cowardly massacre on people praying in peace by a sacred grave  
makes you a rapist of the inmost sanctity and soul of Israel,  
and thereby to a killer worse than any holocaust-executioner in history.  
Once again you have only caused your own people to bleed to death,  
you poor demented American assassin and inhuman suicide.

### *The Strange Meeting at Ely*

from "*The Miraculous Voyage to Cambridge*"

I knew that rabbi Yohanan was dead. John had reported that to me in April, but the circumstances had not been very clear. What decided his death was probably the Baruch Goldstein massacre in Hebron, even if this incident had broken him down very slowly. It had struck rabbi Yohanan to his heart. "Do we not have enough Jewish tragedies already in our most sad history?" he had exclaimed after the massacre and then left Jerusalem to return to his home by the Kinneret lake. There he had died in March only just about 70 years old.

The Baruch Goldstein case has since then proved to be not quite simple. Investigations after the catastrophe showed that the Arabs themselves had hidden guns and rifles in the tomb of the Patriarchs. This opens up the inevitable possibility, that if doctor Goldstein hadn't made his massacre on the Arabs, the Arabs might have performed it on the Jews. It's just a possibility and no certainty. Doctor Goldstein might have learned something about the hidden depot in the mosque and therefore taken the initiative to anticipate a disaster in his own way by at the same time taking revenge for those 30 Israelis who had been killed by Arabs since the peace treaty in September and the even greater number of Jews who had been massacred by Arabs at Hebron in the 1920s.

The death of rabbi Yohanan put my talks with him in Jerusalem only two months earlier in a most remarkable light. John wrote to me in April, that "as no one knew he was to die so soon, my sojourn with him led to a kind of documentation of his testament", which no one could guess at the time.

It is quite clear that the Hebron massacre broke his heart. "Why do we use violence when we are only good for love?" was his personal protest.

My man at Ely explained the case of rabbi Yohanan thus: "He was a quite small and inconsiderable man who performed his miracles in silence and obscurity. He did not want to be noticed or that anyone should know what he was really at, in order to be able to continue his work in peace. He was in fact the driving force behind the ecumenical conference in Egypt early in 1992, although our man John Westerberg organized and led the whole thing. That conference was in fact the seal on the doom of Islam. No one knew better than rabbi Yohanan that the Moslem fundamentalism is only the self-destructive weapon of Islam against itself, and that nothing else actually threatens Islam. His aim was to have these subconscious fanatical mechanisms ecumenically discussed and defined in the course of the Egyptian conference, which, although it didn't fall out entirely well, all the same was a great effort and considerable initiative."

After these words he gave me rabbi Yohanan's last letter. It had been found after his death with the words "*Aux Mains*" under my name. Thus could one of his last wishes be entirely fulfilled according to the letter.

This letter is so remarkable in its wordings that I can't keep it secret. Here it is:

"My dear son, One last wish to you and your friends. I have worried all my life about the destiny of Jewry, and I am today more worried than ever. Our chief double problem is the inevitability of assimilation and the inevitability of orthodoxy making a fool of itself by means of fanaticism. The tragedy of our orthodox faith is its own blind alley - by being perfect we eliminate all other human ways of being more human and tolerant than perfect. This kind of Jewish orthodoxy has always ultimately systematically become the machination and vicious circle of its own downfall, to which it inevitably leads. The tragedy about it is that Jewish orthodoxy is the heart of Jewish religion. We are the tragic schizophrenic leaders of Jewry throughout history towards universality.

This tragedy calls for help, constantly and urgently. It is only human that *gojim* hate us because we consider ourselves the only truly holy people. Our character is a constant challenge to all human envy. But not all are envious about us. To our most respected friends belong people like you and John and Kim, who understand Jewry without being Jews. You and your kind are the best friends of Israel in history. We need you in the world as our advocates and defenders. If you did not understand us and defend us, no one would. You are our hope, and this hope is very strong, because we know that you are trustworthy, because of your universal tolerance and understanding of all religions. If any new world religion would rise again in the hearts of men, it would be a religion comprising all religions, like yours.

These words were never spoken by me to you in Jerusalem, which is why I write them down in afterthought, hoping that you will receive them at least posthumously.

Your old friend, Rabbi Yohanan."

A bit shaken I regarded my confidential man in Ely. He smiled for the first time. "That's all," he said very simply and rose from his seat. It was obviously all and enough for the entire voyage. He left the place before me. When I came out he was already gone. That was quite all right.

For me it was just to roll on further down to Cambridge. But even if I shall never see Ely again, this occasion will for ever live in my memory connected with Ely and its wondrous cathedral in looming majesty and mysterious sanctity.

## *The Cyprus Problem*

When the British took over Cyprus from Turkey, it was their expressed purpose to let Greece have Cyprus in due time, since the population of the island was 80% Greek. They would just develop the island; but during the first world war it proved of so great a strategic significance in the war against Turkey and in the Orient, that instead of allowing it to become Greek, the British made it a crown colony, which it remained until 1960. Only by violence and five years of civil war the Cypriots managed to convince the British of their obligation to leave.

But Englishmen don't give way so easily. They tried to convince the Cypriots about the propriety of the British to remain by giving the Turks dangerous illusions of a future on the island and by using these against the Greek Cypriots. The result of these British manoeuvres became a government of independent Cyprus with 30% Turkish ministers (although the Turkish population was only 18%) and a permanent Turkish vice-president with a right of veto. These privileges to the Turks paved the way for the tragedy. They gratefully received the offered fingers in their jaws and never let them go. The Greeks thereby entered the tragic position of constantly having to battle against a pretentious Turkish minority which was impossible to satisfy. When the military dictatorship of Athens committed their last and greatest political mistake by annexing Cyprus to Greece, Turkey used this as a justification for occupying nearly half of the island by military force. Only a few days later the Greek military government was ousted while the Turkish military forces on Cyprus stayed on - and expanded the occupation. In August the occupation also comprised the second greatest town of Famagusta, which inhabitants had to run for their lives. Since then Famagusta is a ghost town fenced in with barbed wire where no one is allowed except Turkish military.

So much for the British on Cyprus, perhaps the only colony in the British Empire which they managed to destroy to a great extent by political mistakes. The Turkish occupation has been going on for twenty years by now, and the Turkish authorities are constantly evacuating Turks from the mainland to the island in order to increase the Turkish population and legitimize their occupation, while the Greeks to save their lives have to leave their homes in the Turkish zone, where everything Greek and cultural is being plundered and systematically exterminated. The art markets of the world have been invaded with art objects from Cyprus which the Turks have taken from the Greeks or from monasteries and churches that have been vandalized into ruins.

The British still occupy two great military bases on the island, of which the greatest is Episkopoi on the southern peninsula. They are perhaps 30,000, and sometimes their activities increase intensively, as in the Gulf War in January 1991 and also when the Americans bombed Libya in April 1986 with benevolent compliments from Mrs Thatcher. The entire Commonwealth supports the Greek Cypriots against the Turkish occupation. But if Turkish violence ceases and leaves Cyprus, the Greeks will hardly continue to support British presence on Cyprus, at least not as long as Cyprus is not yet a member of the European Community. Most parties consider it a good idea, though, to enter Cyprus into the EC, which probably also would make way for a future Israeli membership - both nations are already European.

## *Studies in the Turkish Mentality*

by *doctor Sandy*.

The Turk has always suffered oppression. He has never been free, able to speak his mind, been allowed to live without fear or even tasted the small freedom of not being constantly ordered about. The Turk's life has never been his own. His masters have owned him body and soul since the middle ages, and he has never been able to turn his life into something creative.

In that sense he is a hopeless peasant. The only thing in life he knows to be sure of is obeying orders. When his masters order him to report on his friends, he has no choice but to do so. When he is ordered to bomb Kurdish civilians, eradicate and plunder their villages, shoot every person to death who tries to escape even if they are women and children, and to let his wife be used by soldiers while he is away, he has no choice but to comply, although he knows it well to be wrong, all the victims to be innocent and that his colleagues using his wife are the worst of barbarians although they call themselves his friends and colleagues. If he protests his life is ruined and worth nothing.

The Turks coming to Cyprus from the mainland are in this dilemma. They don't want to leave their Anatolian homes and move to Cyprus, but if they don't they will be ruined, their wives and sons taken, they will be considered dangerous enemies to the state and treated as such, and their lives will be worthless. They know it to be wrong to move with their families into evacuated homes that belonged to expelled Greeks in Kyreneia or Famagusta, but they have no choice. Most Turks coming to Cyprus have been tricked into the island. They are offered vacation jobs, and when the season is over and they want to return to their homes in Turkey they are not allowed to. They have been trapped, and they are exiled for life from Turkey. What shall they do? Their only possibility of surviving is to remain on Cyprus as loyal subjects to Turkish imperialistic egoism and megalomania.

But such a government has to commit mistakes. The mistakes of the Turkish government are constantly multiplying. Their most recent blatant mistake was to turn Theofilos Georgiades into a martyr by shooting him. This cold-blooded murder hit simultaneously the heart of the Cyprian cause, the Kurdish cause and the Greek cause and turned the three into one. Theofilos was an educated highly cultivated man of great qualities, heading a family of three children, speaking Turkish and Kurdish fluently, heartily engaged in the cause of Human Rights both on Cyprus and in Kurdistan and playing a completely honest game with all his cards on the table. He was shot down in broad daylight by order of the Turkish government, and the assassin got away. It is easy for Turks to hide, strike and get away on Cyprus. But morally this murder was a suicide.

The Turkish aggression is very much like the Serbian aggression. Both parties excel in ethnic wars against every people except their own. Both parties practically brag about their imperialism, they are aware of their totalitarianism and are proud of it, they don't try to hide any of their crimes against human rights but rather find some macabre pleasure in practising them. But such governments can never last for long.

Atrocities are never economical. The Serbian inflation has been the thermometer of the national disgrace. The same is happening in Turkey. From every 100 liras 40 go to the civil wars against Kurds, Cyprus, communists and a number of other groups who find Turkish conditions intolerable. Tourism is more and more evading the country, violence is never good for tourism and public relations, and also Nato friends and colleagues are lifting their eyebrows more and more on Turkey, questioning her open

follies. Turkish politics are gradually developing into a vicious circle that can't disentangle itself out of its imperialistic mistakes of intolerance and oppression. Turkey is a sick patient who is getting worse, and the temperature is constantly rising.

The first victim, though, is the Turk himself, who may not rule his own life, who is never relieved from his fears, who is ordered about by the constant nightmares of his life, authoritative tyrants or bureaucrats, who force him to execute their wrongs, and who doesn't see any way out of the hopeless curriculum of steadily worsening conditions of violence, oppression and fear.

(June 1994)

### *The Kurdish War in Turkey,*

*by doctor Sandy.*

This report is confidential containing only my personal observations and deductions.

On the dark side, the war is approaching catastrophic proportions, the Turks well on their way of performing their second genocide this century. The story is sordid and stale, every day the same, villages destroyed for no purpose, babies, women and old people killed for being "revolutionaries and accomplices" without trial, the government silencing the whole thing up, and the country of Kurdistan turning into a desert by the hand of man.

The more interesting side can't be seen. There is no one controlling it, but the more you discover of it, the more interesting it becomes in its gigantic complexity.

Everything is going down in Turkey because of the war, the economy, the morale, the organization, everything. As long as a woman heads the country there will certainly be no improvement in either of these three ground pillars for every functioning nation. On the other hand, if a man takes over, things will certainly become even worse, because the military is the hooligan in the bargain, and the entire military force leading the whole country to ruin consists only of stupid men.

The politically interesting situation is that Turkey is isolating itself losing friends more and more rapidly everywhere. All its neighbours are enemies today: Greece, Bulgaria, Romania, Cyprus, Georgia, Armenia, Ukraine, Russia. Only Azerbadjan is a reliable ally, Syria is something of a friend, Iran is an ally but only against the Kurds - an ally in a genocide is hardly a friend to be trusted in the long run, and especially not fundamentalistic Iran, the fundamentalists of Turkey being the chief undermining factor of political Turkey. Other friends are only to be found further east, the former Soviet Muslim republics, but they are not interested as allies in the genocide. The worst possible friend to have today is Saddam Hussein of Iraq, and he might actually be Turkey's best friend today, at least as a close colleague in the Kurdish genocide.

Within Nato there are constantly more voices heard demanding the exclusion of Turkey for moral reasons. Turkey continues in Nato only for military reasons, and gradually the military back-up by Nato is becoming the only thing keeping Turkey together in the continued self-destructive pursuit of genocide.

If Nato lets Turkey go, it will probably collapse with great political turmoil and possibly the fundamentalists taking over with chaos and oppression for some decades to follow like in Iran. Of course, no one is interested in this. Instead, Nato continues to support Turkey with a constantly more alarming genocide at their hands. The situation is unbearable, Turkey is dwindling down into an abyss of national disaster and ruin,

and its only means of protection is to blindfold itself by suppressing journalists' reports. It is forbidden to tell the truth, because no one wants to be made responsible for it.

From my point of view, a general collapse of the country in one way or another is inevitable. This is the only bright ray of sunshine for the Kurds. A sordid ordeal indeed, if the only bright side of it is its own destruction.

### *Religious Assessment by John*

(We put to him the question, concerning an article by him against Islam: Would he still maintain his objections against Islam in the face of the ethnic cleansings by the orthodox Serbs in Bosnia? He is himself a well educated Christian orthodox theologian. An elaborate answer was expected. Here it is:)

"My dear friend, Your query compels me to some painstaking elaboration. I hope at least some of your readers might cope with it.

My distance from Islam has only been more marked with the years. Islam today is the religion with the greatest double standards with on one hand a generous, attractive and reasonable universalism and on the other hand the most extreme terrorism and fanaticism which is seen in the world today. Good Muslims can not understand the fear and prejudice of others against Islam while at the same time they close their eyes to its dark sides; and the greatest danger of Islam today is that all these good and somewhat naïve Muslims, who constitute a majority, are being driven over by the fanatics and fundamentalists.

The situation in ex-Yugoslavia, though, concerns religion least of all. There is a very old hatred against an ancient Turkish-Muslim oppression at the bottom of the conflict, but this originally logic hatred is not what the conflict is about. From the beginning of the civil war, the Orthodox Church of Serbia definitely denounced the Milosevic regime and its manoeuvres. The Church has never supported the Serbian ethnic cleansings or any war in or against Bosnia, not even morally.

The conflict is extremely complicated since Croats, Bosnians and Serbs really are one and the same people with one and the same language. The differences between them are partly religious, since Croats are Catholics, Serbs are orthodox and Bosnians Muslims; but more prevailing than the religious discrepancies is the heavy historical legacy, which in my view is the villain in the drama. Croats and Serbs have always been fighting each other, although they are one and the same people, only because of a bitter historical inheritance. A wall was erected between them from the beginning by the Church, which prescribed the Croats to become Catholics with a Latin alphabet and the Serbs to become orthodox with a Cyrillic alphabet. In almost every war they happened to land on different sides against each other. The process hardly improved by the Croats developing into good organizers and business men, leaders in peace and war, and the Serbs never getting away from the turf but remaining an uneducated ignorant stock of peasants. The difference between them that never existed in language, culture or religion formed during the centuries into a definite difference in mentality.

It became the task of a Croat to organize and keep modern Yugoslavia together, which at the death of this hero, the leader Tito, lapsed into total dissolution from want of an equally competent Croat to take over.

The lack of education and contact with other peoples has turned the Serbs into a hard and stupid people. By that civil war, which only they have forced upon the country, they have made themselves deserving of a thorough chastisement; being so stupid and hard they need a good thrashing, and that is probably also the opinion of

their own Orthodox Church. So much about the Orthodox Church in the civil war of Yugoslavia and my own stand against Islam.

That this religion is on its way out appears to me as self-evident. Only the most stupid, the most oppressed and most uneducated embrace Islam and generally with much fear and superstition. They all seem bound to become losers. Islam is sinking down to some status of the great world religion of pariahs.

But also Christianity is in danger. Jewry manages as it always has managed by primarily safeguarding its own religious core at the cost of expansion and dissemination. Among the Christian churches the Orthodox manages the best, also by consistently turning away from the world to instead carefully watch its own retrospective stability, which has been strongly consolidated during 70 years of communist oppression and persecution; while both the Catholic and the Protestant churches are in a crisis of identity in a modern world which they imagine it is important to follow. This might be their great mistake.

Searching desperately for means of renewal without knowing where, they search in blindness. The Protestant Church is more flexible and therefore has greater chances of success, while the Catholic Church is stuck in old prejudice, which unfortunately seems impossible to break away from.

The only solution as I see it is to commonly strive for the original Church, which existed before Constantine the Great turned it into a state religion, before the massive Catholic dogmatic beton bunker was constructed as a devastating anti-Christian anti-cathedral with heresies and inquisitions in unendingly deplorable towropes, before the popes became infallible and before the Catholic and the Orthodox Churches separated. As I see it, the Christian Church can only survive if it find itself again as it thrived before the year 325.

Of course you can't just abolish everything that happened after the year 325 including the activities of Augustine and Martin Luther. But what you should do is to reassess all the authorities after 325, investigate them critically and cease to consider anyone as infallible just because he or she represented the Church. The principle of infallibility is the worst trap that any man can fall into.

Many monotheistic fanatics have wandered into this trap with flying colours dragging uncountable innocents with them unto death and perdition. This is the peril of monotheism: it can be abused. Without mentioning any names that could generate protests ( - so I say nothing about Moses, Jesus or Mahomet - ) you can from our own times pick doubtful characters of that kind like David Koresh, Charles Manson and even Adolf Hitler, who earnestly believed himself to be an instrument of God.

There are such traps and risks also in Hinduism but curiously enough not in Buddhism. During 2500 years, Buddhism has never succeeded in bringing forth any fanatic leader, as far as I know, who in the name of his religion has dragged others into perdition. On the contrary, there are many examples in the history of Buddhism of fanatical leaders who have dragged others into perdition and misery by persecuting Buddhism.

Buddhism and Hinduism walk together and have never persecuted each other, like for instance Christianity and Islam have persecuted each other and Jewry. Both Buddhism and Hinduism have been severely persecuted by Islam, though, which tried to extirpate both religions from India 500 years ago. It only succeeded in destroying an enormous amount of monuments, temples and monasteries from Pakistan all the way down to Indonesia and Java.

In addition to this you also have to acknowledge Hinduism for being an incredibly dynamic and expansive religion, which during so many thousand years (at least three,

probably more,) has succeeded in maintaining an originality and multiplicity which no other religion ever could vie with.

For its sobriety and tolerance, lack of abuse, its basic constructiveness and humility, and its human and universal common sense in connection with a faculty for self-denial and self-sacrifice, which is only equalled by Christianity, which has not succeeded equally well in keeping clean from abuses, Buddhism must objectively be regarded as the world's most interesting religion.

I mentioned previously that the only salvation for Christianity is to rediscover its true identity as it was manifest before 325. At that time there were many Christian books which in 325 and later on were completely suppressed. Many were lost in the process. One of the most ruthlessly suppressed was the great orthodox apostolic father Origen, who made magnificent efforts to unite Christianity with the ancient philosophical schools of Greece, so that these would survive within Christian frames. Origen was for example completely open to the idea of reincarnation (the Pythagorean school), and he was far from being alone. For such tolerance, universalism and mental open-mindedness, the establishment of Christianity as an established dogmatic state religion was a catastrophe as disastrous as the invasion of the barbarians was to the civilization of classical antiquity.

During the first half of the 20th century, Jewry became the most important religious issue in the world above all through the terrible martyrdom which that religion suffered in the second world war. In the same manner I think Buddhism today is becoming the world's most serious religious issue through the remarkable martyrdom of Tibetan Buddhism under the hands of a Chinese atheistic establishment of force. The Jews were reconditioned after the war and had their state of Israel, which almost the whole world has supported ever since. The Tibetans were robbed of their own country in 1950, and no one did anything about it, although Tibet appealed to the UN. Not until in 1959, when Dalai Lama was compelled to leave his country, the world started to pay some attention to Tibet, but still nothing was made. The only important initiative to do something about it was the International Jurists Commission's enquiries and reports in 1960 about what really happened. The only other actions was the generosity of the Indian government to support Tibetan refugees and a vague American support to the Tibetan resistance movement among a handful of warriors of Kham. Nothing else was done; and those very few travellers who China allowed to visit Tibet were all naïve obedient lackeys, who were used by China to propagate to the world the one-sided Chinese view of things. Thereby China was given free hands to launch the unspeakably cruel cultural revolution in Tibet with the destruction of 98,5% of all the religious monuments and institutions of Tibet and 85% of all Tibetan original literature as a result, apart from the genocide of 1,2 million Tibetans or a fifth of the population. From 1959 until 1979 the world left the Tibetans to languish or die in their own country under the occupation of an alien nation of murderers. And those very few who knew something about it and who could give the world some information were not allowed to appear, were not believed or were silenced.

The long space of time (20 years, really 30 or even 45) makes the sufferings of the Tibetans from one aspect even more remarkable than those of the Jews 1933-45, which only lasted for twelve years, or at least equally remarkable. More Jews were murdered, but they were also a greater people with some prominence in the entire world. The Tibetans were only a small people living only in Tibet, who only wanted to stay there in their own country and live there in peace.

From a theological point of view, the Tibetan situation thereby is the most interesting situation for any people in the world today. In some way I believe the Tibetans have the future and destiny of the world in their hands. According to my

experience, they have thought deeper and further than any other people; and as an example of what they really occupy themselves with, I can recount a discussion which at the moment is very much in vogue among high lamas.

You could say that it is intimately connected with the theory of relativity of Einstein's, which also speculates in the manipulation and change of laws for the fourth dimension of time. A few lamas I am acquainted with, who are deeply engaged in the world's affairs and feel some responsibility for its destiny, are completely united in their conviction, that it is absolutely possible, solely with the power of thought (which is neither limited by time or space or distance), to correct historical mistakes, by practically journeying back in time, visit the exact spots in space and time of critical events (for instance the Sarajevo murders in 1914 or the releasing of the bomb over Hiroshima in 1945,) change the historical course for a better one (by for example letting the Hiroshima plane crash into the ocean) and then return to the present time as if nothing had happened. The world would look decisively different, history would be written in a different way, the whole historical course would be something else, but all this would be natural and accepted both to oneself and to all other people living, who would have experienced something completely different from the Sarajevo murders, the Hiroshima and Nagasaki blasts or the Kennedy assassinations.

Of course, this would categorically be refuted by all realists as wishful thinking and science fiction, but to certain Tibetans it is absolutely possible and perfectly realistic.

That was now a general survey of the religious situation in the world of August 1995 fifty years after the termination of the second world war from a Tibetan point of view in the Himalayas. I hope you and your readers don't mind."

(The famous physicist Stephen Hawking of Cambridge had a comment on the possibility of "journeying in time" in September, in which he completely agreed with the Tibetan lamas about the realistic possibility of the phenomenon.)

### *Interesting Situation in Israel*

That Benjamin Netanyahu won the elections surprised everyone. For many people this surprise was not pleasant, though. Many Israelis felt like immediately abandoning their country, and Jitzhak Rabin's widow mourned bitterly that the murder on her husband hadn't been better utilized as propaganda in the elections.

The result of the elections was surprising most of all since the policy of Shimon Peres had been successful. He had mastered all the greatest difficulties, and his peace policy seemed to the whole world to be the right one. Few bargained for his loss in the elections.

The results are symptomatic for Israel, however. During the most embarrassing years of the Intifadah, Israel was governed by a right wing coalition which only worsened the situation and which turned the world opinion against Israel. It took years before the message of the Intifadah went home with the government, which finally compelled Israel to enter on a different direction towards peace and reconciliation. The peace process started off and soon went too far, according to many Israelis: too much land was given away for nothing but empty words and promises that were not kept, and the critical voices against a government which without insurances and any self-criticism gave away lands that Israelis had sacrificed blood, sweat, tears and their lives for culminated with the murder on prime minister Rabin. All the same the government remained insensitive to this massive criticism.

At this moment the peace policy of Shimon Peres seemed to carry success. The world believed in him, and David Frost interviewed him in a universal broadcast to immense advantage for Shimon Peres, who inspired respect and confidence with warmth and humanity. The peace process had claimed its victims and martyrs but survived and proved morally superior to all alternatives. At this point Peres loses the elections.

Thereby the just criticism against the exaggerated liberalism of Rabin and Peres went home a few years too late. Such a radical turn in politics had been justified two years ago but could hardly be said to be justified now, when Rabin had been martyred for peace and when Peres had gained the whole world's credit. The most radical reaction came from the Arabs. 21 Arab countries assembled in a top conference, which resulted in a unanimous ultimatum against Israel: "Return all occupied territories including the rest of the West Bank, the Golan heights and the east part of Jerusalem without conditions and at once, or else..." You could hardly believe your ears when this message from 21 Arab countries to Israel was broadcast on the radio. Such an ultimatum had not been heard in history since the very harsh ultimatum of Austria against Serbia in 1914 had launched the first world war.

Still there is hope for Israel. At least there is greater hope for Israel than for such countries that publicly can announce such a blatant proof of that they have no good will at all.

*Doctor Sandy concerning "The New Frontier"*

- a letter from Istanbul.

"I am very sorry to hear that you will not come down to me this year. But hold out, my dear friend! - Your old doctor will probably live at least one more year.

Answering your query concerning the Oriental mess, I would prefer a rather careful standing-point, since I know that you are not an atheist, and since my natural atheism during the years only has been confirmed. Without entering into this, without defending my atheism and without accusing any monotheistical religion, I would like to hint at a point or two which simply is too obvious to be ignored.

My probably greatest objection against monotheism is that it has the most infallible fallibility of always leading to partiality and biased conclusions. In spite of my atheism I can stand up to defending Jewish monotheism for the simple reason that it is based on a good book. Not everything is up to par in this good book, but that which is good enough is for me an enough reasonable defence for jewry to outlast time.

The Quran is a different thing however. Its aggressiveness is almost admirable for its sustained continuity, indefatigably preaching the enforcement of religious laws preferably by violence and excluding the female part of human life, (love, tenderness, consideration, sensitivity,) as if such disturbances in a monotheistically perfect world must needs be banished. To this comes the established intolerance in practical life and double standards often to the extreme. Islam preaches tolerance but is practically the most intolerant of all religions.

My greatest objection against Islam, however, is that it is naturally anti-democratic. Turkey could only turn itself into a democracy by cleansing the state from Islam. It could not be done away with completely, and that's why Turkish democracy never succeeded completely. Islam can only be sustained by totalitarianism. When a Moslem country goes democratic, its Moslem system goes out of order. Islam and democracy are incompatible. Strange enough, that is not the case with any other religion: they all mix well with democracy. Only communism suffers from the same problem

That's why as a casual and practical pragmatist my only possible diagnosis on Islam has to be, that the Moslem world will never taste freedom until it is freed from Islam. If Islam can find it satisfactory to exist outside politics, which was Kemal Atatürk's definite desire, Islam would survive, especially if it concentrated on developing such constructive forms as Sufi, Ahmadiyah, Bahai and whirling dervishes; but politically Islam has no future. Without admitting it, it is well aware of the fact, which it tries to hide by applying such desperate measures as the enforced backwardness of Algeria and the latest terror the Talibans in some kind of a strange bolting self-destructiveness, like the swine running into the sea of Galilee.

It is interesting to analyze the political changes of the world since 1989, but it really hasn't changed at all. Only the frontiers have changed. During the cold war the frontier went right across Europe. Almost all of Asia sided with the Soviet Union and the Warsaw Pact against the free world west of the iron curtain, while only a few islands remained out in the dark: Hongkong, Israel, Kuwait, Singapore and Indonesia. This darkness has greatly been reduced by the Soviet Union changing side and becoming white with the whole of eastern Europe - it is almost unavoidable now that Russia joins NATO to insure itself against the growing threats from Moslem Asia and China. While only ten years ago the Russians were the villains in Afghanistan, they are now on the right side against the Taliban terrorists. The nations which today are found on the "wrong" side, and thereby continue to make a frontier, are really only Iran, Iraq, Syria, Sudan, Libya, China, Burma, North Korea and Cuba. Foul players but not lost in the dark are the dictatorship of Indonesia, the double-crossing Pakistan and civil war Turkey. But the frontier in Turkey is a separate front outside the great game. Paradoxically the terrorist Ghaddafi is right when he tries to persuade Turkey to let the Kurds have their own state. But the Kurds do not belong in the bad lot of Sudan-Iraq-Iran & CO.

The cold war is over, but instead we have a new frontier against China and Islam. The cold war lasted for 40 years. I don't think the new battle will take as long, especially since the Russians now are on our side."

This diagnosis of doctor Sandy's has caused some reactions, but the general view among professionals seems to be, that "the worst thing about doctor's Sandy's diagnosis is, that he is perfectly right". Living as a guest in a Moslem country, (now and then also residing in Greece, Cyprus, Hungary and other exotic countries,) he expresses his ideas only in private letters and never in the press. For security reasons, he is unknown to the world and leads a private life incognito.

### *What the Holy Quran does not say about Mahomet*

There are two stories about the Prophet which have been told and spread ever since his death but which no faithful Muslim ever mentions a word of. The first tells the story about how it befell when he forbade the use of strong drinks. He had had some carousal with some pals in such a swell party, that none of the participants could remember anything afterwards. Apparently the drinking bout had not been entirely successful, though, as the gay guys with hang-overs woke up the day after and found one of the party stone dead cut to pieces by a scimitar. The pals were terrified and most of all the Prophet. No one could explain what had happened. As they looked things over it proved no better, than that it happened to be the very Prophet's own scimitar that was bloody, and not only his scimitar, but even his clothes and his very own hands. The Prophet was mortified by such a dreadful situation. He promised to never again taste

any strong liquor, and to make an example he ordered all his followers to obey this most sacred commandment. Since that party Muslims are not allowed to drink any alcohol, as a consequence of the Prophet having had one glass too much.

The second story is about the Prophet's unhappy death. He was only some sixty years when he began to suffer from gaga and start chasing the fair young daughters of the faithful. There was one girl in particular whom he just couldn't stop pursuing, which was a most improper thing for such a holy Prophet to do. So her family decided to make an end on the disgrace for the good of all, for the sake of the Prophet's own reputation and for the sake of the whole of Islam and its glorious future. So they framed him and used the girl for a bait one night as it was dark, so that, as he chased her, he was trapped to fall down into a deep well. They pretended not to have noticed it and let him languish to death safely in the bottom of the well. Of course, such a sorry end to the Prophet was an impossibility to Islam, so the thing was hushed down completely. Instead the official version of the Prophet's death is, that he was carried off from the rock of Jerusalem by angels - or was it white horses? - and brought directly home to heaven. Whatever version is more credible appears from the fact, that the later version obviously could have been made up from the motive, that the truth needed some face-lifting - for the sake of Islam.

Because of such stories, which have been current in those parts of the world ever since the Prophet's own lifetime, innocent people like Salman Rushdie are banned and proscribed, and all faithful Moslems are encouraged to murder him in the most sacred name of Allah. The Prophet himself forbade the telling of stories and myths but seems to have had no objection against stories and myths about himself.

### *The Problem Concerning Turkey, Armenia, Kurdistan, Iraq, Iran etc. - in Brief*

This article was written 28.3.1992 and has never been published here before, since *the Free Thinker* then did not yet exist. However, the article is still valid, why it is publishable in this context.

"Starting in Iran, the worst seems to be over. President Rafsanjani has managed a difficult position for two years, and his becoming a president at all must be regarded as lucky considering the darker profiles of the other candidates. He is flexible, is able to listen and can adapt to changing circumstances, which none of the others can do. Against him stand the more militant and one-sided Shia Muslims, Hizbollah the dreaded servants of Khomeini, and the Mujaheddin NLA (operating in western Iran) organizing strikes, demonstrations and riots in the country. The NLA are militant leftists, they worship the memory of the 70,000 martyred victims of Khomeini and have lost some importance after the death of Khomeini. They made a bad show by siding with Saddam Hussein against Iran in the eight years war. Their leaders are a romantic couple who are recognized by their crimson scarfs and turbans. It would be vital for them to reach some agreement with Rafsanjani to survive and to get the Hizbollah under control. The revolutionary aggressions of Iran today are limited to barking against Israel and the stubborn maintenance of a most stupid death sentence against the harmless philosopher Salman Rushdie.

More worrying is the situation in Iraq, which will not improve as long as Saddam Hussein remains in power. The Kuwait crisis stroke hard against everyone except the guilty, and the hardest hit were the Kurds, the Shia Muslims of the south and the 13 percent Assyrian Christians. The Assyrian Christians in Iraq, Syria, Turkey, Iran, Lebanon and other places in the area are about 5 million and have a hard time

everywhere. If any, they are to be counted with in building a future in this politically collapsing area.

Naturally the Kurds are entitled to their own state. The sooner it is constituted (at the cost of Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Syria,) the better. As long as they are forbidden a state of their own, the civil wars will continue. They are not, however, entirely innocent of their own situation.

In the beginning of the century a strange political ethnic cleansing took place in the area (mostly in the years 1895-1908) which must be considered as the chief source of all the troubles. Two million Armenians (Christians) were systematically massacred by the Turks. The world just watched it and did nothing. There is only one parallel in history: the holocaust against 6 million Jews in the second world war. Everyone knows about that. The Jews now have their own state, the Germans have confessed their crimes, many of the guilty have been punished, and Israel still today receives large amounts of money for indemnity. Of course, nothing of this will in the least compensate the brutal slaughter of 6 million Jews. But nothing has been done to indemnify the slaughter of 2 million Armenians. Not a penny has been paid for indemnity, not one Turk has officially confessed any part of any crime in this, there are only 100,000 Armenians left in Turkey today, and many of them have been forced to become Muslims.

The Kurds took part in the massacres. In the name of Allah the Turks and the Kurds went together extirpating the Armenians, the Kurds being promised the lands of the Armenians as a reward. Today the Kurds have the same problem with the Turks as the Armenians had a hundred years ago, and the Turks have even greater problems with the martial Kurds. As long as the Turks continue battling this problem Turkey will never be accepted in the EC. While the Turks seem as reluctant to let the Kurds have their own state as in his days the great Pharaoh was reluctant to let the children of Israel go, the problem seems too difficult for a solution, especially since 2 million innocent Armenians are waiting for a compensation which they never can get, since they were all brutally murdered. In comparison with this, the sacrifice of 70,000 martyrs to Khomeini appears as something of a modest parenthesis.

The best thing we Europeans can do to solve our immigrant problems is to arrange matters so that people can live in peace and security in these their own war-torn home countries from which they come."

Since these words were written in March 1992, things have grown worse for the Kurds and for the Shia Muslims in southern Iraq by 1) the failure of the USA in the Gulf War to depose Saddam Hussein, which they thought they could arrange by simply telling the Kurds to do away with him, which only resulted in the increased oppression of the Kurds by Saddam Hussein, and 2) the mad project of Saddam Hussein to drain the marshes of the southern Shia Muslims by digging a monstrous canal through the marshlands, which turned these into a desert in a full scale environmental disaster, as if all Saddam's environmental disasters in the Gulf War in the Persian Gulf had not been enough. The USA thought Saddam's remaining in office would add to the stability in the area, while *the Free Thinker* considers this measure a most fatal error.

### *The War in Afghanistan*

"There has been a war going on in Afghanistan for 17 years. There is no sign of any peace there. I have always been interested in Afghanistan since my grandfather was an Afghan and my father used to travel to Afghanistan to see his cousins. But it's twenty years since we last heard anything about my father's relatives because of the war.

Some facts of Afghanistan:

The last king was Mohammed Zahir Shah, and he still lives in Italy. Monarchy fell in Afghanistan in 1973 when the Shah's son-in-law Mohammed Davod organized a coup while the Shah was abroad. Afghanistan was then made a republic. The communists seized power in 1978 in another coup, and the new leader was Nor Mohammed Taraki. Since the Afghans are Muslims, they could not accept the communists in Afghanistan, and as the communists were threatened with defeat they asked the Soviet Union for help. The Russians occupied Afghanistan in 1979, and since then there has been war. Nearly two million Afghans have died and five million have fled to the neighbouring countries. The whole country is ruined. The Russians left Afghanistan after ten years of war in 1989. But there are millions of mines left in Afghanistan which kill innocent civilians every day. After the Russians returned to the Soviet Union, the communists remained in office until 1992. During their time many leaders followed each other and killed each other or were killed by the people or by Russians. After Nor Mohammed Taraki there was Mohammed Hafizollah Amin and after him Babrak Karmel and then Najibullah until 1992.

The communists were overthrown in 1992 by the Muslims, and Najibullah found protection at the UN headquarters of Kabul. There are many different Islamic groups in Afghanistan who fought together against the Russians, but they couldn't agree in peace, so there were new wars between them after 1992. More than 100,000 have died since then in the fighting. A few great names are the former president Rabbani and the general Ahmad Shah Masoud, who is also called the Panjshir Lion: he was a legendary warrior against the Russians. Golabodin Hektmarjar and general Dostam are other important war leaders. They almost overdid it in the war against the Russians and the communists. The Taliban, who were formed only two years ago, conquered Kabul in the end of September, and a new civil war has begun as a preliminary result. Kabul is the only capital in the world which has been completely destroyed. It's incredible how the destruction of Kabul has been going on from the fall of the communists in 1992 until 1996. The Taliban executed doctor Najibullah, the former president of the communists, without a trial three weeks ago. At the moment the war is carried on between the forces of Masoud and those absolutely fundamentalistic Taliban. Is 17 years of war not enough? The Afghans wonder how long they have to keep waiting for peace.

Most Afghans miss the monarchy and the former king Zahir Shah, but he has declined to return to Afghanistan. He survived a knife assault a few years ago and lives in Italy since 1973 and is almost 80 years old. We feel very much sorry for the Afghans and Afghanistan when we think of the happy golden days during the reign of Zahir Shah. Alas, times have changed.

Here is an old song from the days when the British were defeated in Afghanistan:

Children of imperialism, listen to me!  
Take it easy, and play no more with fire,  
for I was an Afghan, and I made the British run away.  
I thundered against them like lightning,  
and with my bare hands I crushed them.  
So, get lost, you miserable British, for you can't escape us.  
This is the land of the Afghans, and you can't kid us any more."

- with greetings from our Afghan correspondent.

### *Eric Newby : A Short Walk in the Hindukush*

This is a marvellously entertaining travel story glittering with good humour from beginning to end. The two Englishmen Eric Newby and Hugh Carless abandon themselves in an effort to climb one of the highest peaks in Afghanistan without any experience at all from mountaineering, so they practice at first on a few hills in Wales. Now the Afghan Himalayas happen to be most atrocious and hostile mountains which hardly have been climbed at all - rather have they always claimed victims - and dreadful weather combined with savage local barbarians did not make things easier. You get a vivid insight into the unfathomable mysteries and absurd conditions of an alien world, where the people of Nuristan maybe were the last people in Asia to be islamized by the sword in 1895. Before that, the people of this country, which previously was called Kafiristan, were among the world's wildest savages with a polytheistic mythology of their own, and their main professions were as goatherds and robbers. This was the area where Alexander the Great in his time had the greatest difficulties on his quest for India, where he found the hardest resistance from the most qualified fighters he ever knew. Many of them have still today blue eyes and blond hair, but all the varieties of the human race are to be found among these hills, like in Pakistan and northern India. The one thing which Eric Newby neglects in his hilarious chronicle is to mention Rudyard Kipling, whose maybe most fantastic short story "*The Man who Wanted to be a King*" is a story about this very country of Kafiristan, nowadays Nuristan.

The mountaineering then only resulted in disasters. Twice the stalwart British attacked the forbidding summit of Mir Samir at almost 20,000 feet and had to turn back only a few hundred meters from the top on both occasions. They laboured in this enterprise for two weeks until dysentery and diarrheas and other Himalayic symptoms of overstraining forced them off the mountain; and retreating for good they had no better luck than to find a witness to their total defeat in Wilfred Thesiger, who was on his way up alone.

The book deserves to be read carefully, because there are wonderful details everywhere, the conversation is reliably spiritual all the way, and it is great fun to partake in all the disasters and hilarious catastrophes of the intrepid couple. One has to be grateful for their safe return, so that they could tell the story of their defeat, since this part of the world is famous for all the visitors who just vanished without even a story to tell.

#### *Two letters from an old doctor.*

(We have only his permission to publish them anonymously.)

"Pray excuse an old man's dotage. Since you already know that I am getting old, at least I need not be afraid of making a bad impression of myself in front of you, since you are such a paragon of tolerance. On the contrary, I am myself getting the worse by the years. The more I outgrow my own justification for remaining in this world, the more critical I become against it and against humankind. My last trip down to Syria, Jordan and Israel has not cured me of my like a cancer steadily increasing scepticism. As you already know, I witnessed the bomb havoc at the greenmarket in Jerusalem on the 30th of July. I saw the blood everywhere, the limbs lying around, the chaos of war like in the blitz of London in 1940, the total hysteria of violent despair at the unjustness of the meaningless assault. I am sorry, but as a doctor I must penetrate into the source of the evil and blame the idea of God.

Not that I am an atheist, but you already know how I can't accept the preposterous absurdity of Islam claiming the Muslims' right to be God's own people in almost the same way as Israel. The children of Israel deserved that light, Moses bequeathed it to them through endless hardships, and the history of Israel, with the downfall of the realm and millennia of persecutions, has confirmed that right. Nothing can take that right away from Israel. But Islam has never deserved that right of divine privilege in the same way.

So you can say I am an atheist concerning Islam but a believer concerning Jewry. I have to be an atheist concerning Islam, because everything that goes on theologically in Islam speaks against the absurd atrocity of that so called religion. Did you know, for instance, that there was a secret Islamic conference at Lahore in 1980, in which leaders of the Muslim faith decided, that the whole Muslim world should be Islamized by the year 2000, that is, that all people of other faiths in Muslim countries should be Islamized or extirpated. You can call it a Muslim equivalent to the Nazi conference at Wannsee in January 1942, which decided the extirpation of all Jews in all Nazi occupied countries. It is exactly the same mentality.

In brief, Islam is asking for trouble and heading for immersion in very difficult problems. Turkey is maybe leading the way out of this dilemma in its decisive stand against Muslim fundamentalism. Let's hope so. There is always a way out from every sickness, and the only way out of that mental derangement and hysterical aberration called Islam is to take a firm stand against the whole religion and denounce Allah as an equally mentally unsound idea as the movements of Jim Jones, David Koresh and others who mistook their own self-love for the idea of God and lost their reason in the bargain.

As a doctor I can see very much reason and constructiveness in the Jewish, the Christian and the Buddhist faith but none whatsoever in Islam, which I can only regard as a very serious if not fatal illness, like a brain tumour. That's my diagnosis concerning the Muslim idea of God, and I am afraid that everything that goes on in the Muslim world is just obvious symptoms confirming it, from the terror of the Talibans to the massacres in Algeria and the bombs in Jerusalem.

Also I have no faith whatsoever in Mr Arafat. He got a certain air of positive credibility during the days of Simon Peres and Isaac Rabin, but before they gave him that status he was just a wicked terrorist and a crook, no matter how much Mr Olof Palme and Mr Bruno Kreisky embraced him, and his few positive traits from the dealings with Mr Peres and Mr Rabin are now gradually falling off him like old dirty clothes, again exposing him as the pathetic fraud and miserable crook he is and always has been to the backbone, if he has any, which I doubt."

"My dear friend, Your request is of course not easy to grant, but above all it's of course the least enjoyable task imaginable for a doctor to diagnosticize the patient of all humanity, since it has never been sicker.

The only positive thing about the Kyoto conference was that at least it was an effort. At the best, it was even a beginning, as the Americans put it, putting a smiling attitude on everything to conceal the facts. The fact is that nothing really was done. The effects of global warming have to be stopped *now*, because being a runaway train constantly accelerating, it will be increasingly difficult to stop it later.

The main sickness of humanity comes from the simple fact, that a hundred years ago we were 1500 million people, while we today are 6000 million. In only a hundred years humanity has increased in number by 400%. A hundred years ago humanity was in control of itself, the great European monarchies ran the world with decent stability and knew what was going on, but that control went out of hand in 1914. Stability, order

and world control vanished and were swamped in the population explosion, resulting in populist autocracies in many parts of the world (Germany, the Soviet Union and China above all) which only made matters worse. Common sense was driven over by the animal instincts of the lower masses of the human race, the morals and norms of the previously Christian society were simply abolished, and as the most irresponsible leaders of the population explosion, running the merry-go-round of the world at a constantly increasing speed towards hell, emerged the Catholic Church, refusing to interfere with the population growth, and Islam pushing it even harder.

In my opinion, only bachelors and virgins are responsible people in the world today. No responsible person being aware of the general condition of the world can give birth to children with a good conscience. And the rest being occupied with their family problems, only bachelors and virgins, I believe, can do something about the dreadful condition of the world.

Of course nature must react. You can't destroy forests all over the world at a constantly increasing pace without the natural consequences of growing deserts, dying species and changes of climate. Man is always wrong and nature is always right, and nature will always have it her way. If man does not adapt himself to the ways of nature, man must needs perish.

The Ebola epidemic in Africa was only a warning. Worse will come and is starting already. In India the population has increased 300% in 40 years, but the Aids statistics have increased 500% in only 5 years. Malaria and tuberculosis are coming back strong all over the world. And then we have the giant urbanizations turning their poison traps against themselves, becoming death traps for tens of millions of people in cities like São Paulo, Mexico City, Delhi, Calcutta, Cairo and Istanbul.

In Turkey the population count was successfully carried through and showed a shocking figure of more than 60 million people to only 15 a hundred years ago. This is curiously enough an exact mirror of the real condition of humanity: Turkey is keeping an exact pace with the self-destructive explosion of humanity.

In our western countries there is not much to worry about, though. We have the knowledge and the experience and the technology to use them. We don't multiply our populations any more. Our democratic stability in EC, US and Canada, Australia and Japan and perhaps even Eastern Europe makes it even unnecessary to worry about our money. All the blows will be taken by the third world.

Whatever you do, don't make any investments in Africa, Latin America or even in Asia. Nothing is under any control in these parts of the world. Here the population explosion is constantly at its epidemic height, and where there is no control of the population explosion, there can be no economy. So forget about South America (except perhaps Argentina and Chile) and Africa (except perhaps South Africa). There is not much hope for these sinking ships.

China and India represent one third of the world population. Both are interesting from an economic point of view. China is the only country in the third world which has managed to control the population growth. Outwardly it shines and boasts of stability, which attracts much investment. The unaccountability of China is that it remains an autocracy. You can never trust dictators, because they always will fall.

In India there is no birth control, but on the other hand its economy is surprisingly stable, which is due to its stability as a democracy. Indians have always been master business men. The richness of India has been constantly swamped by its exploding population growth, but it constantly remains a gold mine all the same. There are no brighter minds and brains than in India.

So Asia remains interesting from an economic point of view. There are possibilities. Just forget all about the Moslem countries (including Indonesia), and be careful about

China. The economic plunge of Hongkong after the Chinese take-over is a sign as clear as any."

### *Moslem News.*

1) *The Mysterious Death of Princess Diana.* It has appeared afterwards, that the driver, who drove the Princess and her fiancé to their deaths and lost his life with them, a few days earlier had mysterious deposits on his bank accounts consisting of millions of francs. No one has been able to explain from where this money has arrived. Consequently there are speculations. Could anyone rich enough to have been able to furnish the driver with considerable millions have desired the deaths of the famous couple and paid the driver to arrange matters accordingly? The answer is yes.

Both the house of Windsor and the family of the cavalier would have had reasons to desire that the wedding never took place. It would not have been very suitable for the heir to the British crown to have Moslem half-brothers and -sisters. But above all, the family of the Moslem fiancé were busy with arms sales in the billionaire category, which would have given them a world of motives to block the possibility of getting a leading celebrity into the family who was making her chief aim to stop the sales of arms and lucrative landmines.

Who would then have had the greatest motive to stop the wedding? The weapon dealers family, without doubt. So the death of Princess Diana could have been arranged by the family of the future husband? As long as question marks remain around the accident, like for instance the mystery of the vanished car, this suspicion can not be disposed of.

The criminal implications of the case are highly aggravated though by the results of the October investigation reports. There are witnesses to the fact that the driver of princess Diana's car was blinded from in front by one of the paparazzi using a special device to blind the driver on purpose. This suggests a perfect set-up. The driver was forced into excessive speed by the frenetic paparazzi chasing him, and one of them, disguised as one of them, used this to put the driver out of control in the very strategic tunnel for numerous car disasters. It was the perfect homicide, and it is impossible, according to the October report, to implicate anyone for it.

2) *Algeria.* There is no longer any doubt about that many massacres in Algeria are planned and executed by the rulers of the country in order to control the subjects by means of violence and terror. The rulers of the country are militaries, who establish and depose ministers as they wish. The massacre executors are disguised soldiers, who are masked with phoney beards and loaded with drugs, so that they can perform their missions without any scruples. The enormity of the crimes then binds them to the generals with loyalty and silence. Nothing is more revealing of the established government than the fact, that they label all investigators in the crimes as traitors to the nation. The situation is a typical vicious circle of power abuse: from fear of losing power the rulers constantly commit worse crimes to keep it.

3) *The Most Destructive Man in the World.* To allow Saddam Hussein to remain as dictator of Iraq after the Kuwait crisis was equal to if the allies after the second world war had allowed Adolf Hitler to remain dictator of Germany. General Schwarzkopf wanted to continue to Bagdad to complete his work in 1991, but the USA would not allow him with the motivation that they feared the danger of instability in the area and above all the menace of Iran. From fear of taking a political risk they allowed the greatest mass

murderer in present history to remain as supreme dictator in one of the most important states of the Middle East. President Bush told the Kurds and the Shia Muslims to by all means do what they could to do away with the tyrant, but the result of the US allowing Saddam to continue as dictator was that he also was free to continue his genocides especially among the Shia Muslims in the south and transform the wet lands of the Marsh Arabs into a desert in the worst deliberate environmental destruction in history premeditatedly committed by a responsible regime.

Still, war is only the worst and the last solution, which the various Christmas bombings prove. The best thing would be if at last one of the many efforts to kill off Saddam Hussein privately would succeed.

4) *Yassir Arafat*. "Yassir Arafat came to Gaza in July 1994 with a league of men not carrying ploughbills and spades but guns and bazookas. He created ten security services and an armed police force of more than 40,000 men, which is more policemen per capita than in any other country in the world. This police force mainly consisted of local Palestinians, but most officers have experience from outside the West Bank and Gaza, above all from the civil war in Lebanon. Many have at times been stationed in countries like Iraq and Algeria. The Oslo agreement allows a security force of not more than 20,000 men. The United States, which during the years have helped many dictators to survive, is now also backing one in Palestine."

*- a retired counsellor of Yassir Arafat's.*

5) *Bethlehem*. 25 years ago most inhabitants of Bethlehem were Christians. Seven years ago they still made up half of the population, but today they are barely 15%. After Israel retired and Arafat moved in, mosques are growing out of the grounds like mushrooms after rainfall, while the Christian churches one by one are closed down, since many Christians emigrate to Canada, Australia or the US, which has more security and a safer future to offer than the PLO.

### *Doctor Sandy's Lecture.*

Doctor Sandy blamed the East Timor situation entirely on America.

"It was the US foreign secretary Henry Kissinger who gave Indonesia leave to occupy and suppress East Timor. Whether the brain behind it all was Kissinger himself or President Nixon I can't tell, but it certainly was American and all in line with American foreign policy after the war."

Evidently this was one of his great favourite topics, for now he entered on a lengthy lecture.

"It was all the fault of that Foster Dulles," he began.

"Who was Foster Dulles?"

"The leading American diplomat after the war. He was all effort to eliminate the European colonial empires, so that the US could start ordering the world about alone.

What really happened after the war was, that Europe lay in ruins, and the only real victor, England, had completely overstrained herself in that victory. There was nothing left of us. We were down on our knees. In that moment the US decides to give Marshall aid to all Europe except England. Germany above all got all the support in the world on that condition only, that the communist party should be forbidden. It's a matter of discussion whether that was a democratic condition. But Germany got 100% back-up from America to rise again while England got nothing and not even Marshall aid.

De Gaulle reacted strongly against the American way of manipulating Europe in their own way. Italy got all the help in the world from America just because there was a strong communist party there. But France was still a colonial power, and America demonstrated all too clearly that France should let go of her colonies for the sake of NATO. That's why de Gaulle hated America almost as much as England.

Secretly but actively the US supported the national independence movements of India and Indonesia. In Indochina the US realized soon enough that they had made a mistake by supporting Ho Chi Minh and his rebels to establish communism in North Vietnam, a mistake which later on led the US to commit further mistakes.

But through the uncompromisingly negative policy against the European colonial powers these were forced into bankruptcy and liquidation, first of all the Netherlands, England, France, Belgium, Spain, Italy and finally even Portugal. The US starved the British Empire to death, and France was forced into the same abyss. When de Gaulle was compelled to give Algeria independence it was his life's tragedy, because it was the ruin of everything he had lived for and sacrificed all his French idealism for. But the most tragic sacrifice was Algeria herself, which we see results of still today.

So all these hundreds of states all over the world were suddenly independent and democratic without ever having had any experience of independence or democracy. Most of them were immediately taken over by ruthless militaries who exploited and suppressed them twice as hard as France and Britain had done. Others degenerated and disintegrated into complete chronic anarchy, like the Congo. Others turned into hopeless terrorist states torn asunder by eternal civil wars like Sudan, Iraq and Sierra Leone. In India one million people were killed for nothing in the Punjab crisis as a direct result of independence, when Hindus were to move from Pakistan and Muslims into Pakistan, an artificial construction of Muslim policy, which never existed earlier as a state. Look at the civil wars in Ceylon. See what became of Indochina after the French leave. Look at Indonesia today, the greatest Muslim nation in the world, completely ruined and heading straight towards anarchy, terrorist militia exploding like mushrooms after tropical showers and with the priceless tropical rain forests devastated and burned to cinders by mismanagement and corruption.

In all these modern states without any history and experience, put the question to those who have some education and maturity, who feel responsible and are competent, and each one will say that life was better from all aspects in the colonial days. There was less corruption, less anarchy, less war and violence, there was law and order and working communications and better education possibilities. Ask in Indonesia about the Dutch, and you will be answered with eyes full of tears out of nostalgia. Ask in Kenya about the times before the Mau-Mau, ask in Malaysia about the times before the communist guerrillas, which were armed by the US; ask in Libya about the Italian days, ask the Angola which bled to death under the treatment of Cuban arms, and the now poorest country in the world, Mozambique, about how the Portuguese ran their business, the first and last and most exemplary colonial power; and ask any remaining colony in the world, for instance Macao or Bermuda, if they would like to get independent from the mother country, and you will get a firm answer of 'No!' All the same Macao will be taken over by China later on this year, that very China, which the US always helped to suppress all their neighbours, especially Tibet, probably the worst example in the world of how the end of colonialism brought about much more evil than did ever colonialism. You know yourself, that the British departure from India directly gave the communists of China the opportunity to capture and extinguish Tibet as a nation, which the US gave China free hands in. But the history of Tibet goes back more than a thousand years before the American history begins.

In brief, the American enforced liquidation of the European colonial powers bears the same mark of that short-sighted and destructive irresponsibility which also unnecessarily bombed Hiroshima and Nagasaki. It's irresponsibility and short-sightedness - nothing else. But England was the mother of the US, and most American families have their origin in old Europe. The part played by the US in the destruction of the British Empire is that of a most spoiled and ungrateful son - a regular mother-fucker.

And what's been done can't be undone. The most important thing to be done now is the complete dismantling of all nuclear weapons and the establishment of perfect control of all use of nuclear power for a total elimination of all possible abuse. America dropped the bombs on Hiroshima and Nagasaki for no constructive reason at all and bears the highest responsibility."

## *The Raoul Wallenberg File.*

followed by

The Raoul Wallenberg Literature

Raoul Wallenberg Today

The Empire of Evil

The Sikorsky Case

Raoul Wallenberg and Tibet

"Dear Editor, You write that Raoul Wallenberg disappeared in the Lyublyanka prison in Moscow 'exactly 50 years ago, probably shot by the order of comrade Stalin, Beria or some other comrade'. This is a gross misconception. Raoul Wallenberg's fate was far crueller than that.

Your information is correct as far as there was a memorandum from foreign secretary Andrei Gromyko in 1957 as a result of persistent Swedish enquiries into the case of Raoul Wallenberg, which memorandum stated that Raoul Wallenberg died in the Lyublyanka prison on July 17th 1947 from heart failure and that he instantly was cremated without any autopsy, according to the director of the health department of this prison, a certain mr Smoltsov, who reported the matter to his superior, the minister for state security in the Soviet Union mr Abakumov. The Gromyko memorandum further states, that minister Abakumov later on was prosecuted and shot for crimes against the laws of the Soviet Union. All this indicates that the report about the death of Raoul Wallenberg with its most unregular "*cremation without an autopsy*" is a construction from 1957 compiled solely for the Gromyko memorandum. There are clear indications that Raoul Wallenberg was still alive much later.

The true story of his fate is probably as follows. He was arrested by the Russians in Budapest on January 17th 1945 since they didn't believe that his only engagement in Hungary had been to save Jews. They suspected him of espionage and therefore brought him to Moscow, where a number of

other prisoners experienced him in various prisons from 1945 at least well up to 1979. He disappeared probably by the order of the highest authority, that is Stalin. This man had promised Sweden to look into the case and do something about it, after his

ambassador in Stockholm, madame Kollontay, had blundered by admitting that Raoul Wallenberg was alive and well in Moscow, whereafter she immediately was recalled to Moscow. The most probable thing is that Stalin ordered that R.W. should disappear without a trace since he was labelled a security risk for the Soviet Union. In consequence thereof an undisputable document testifying to his death was drafted, and he was made to disappear into the Gulag archipelago. Referring to this document, Stalin and others then could claim that Raoul Wallenberg was unknown to exist in the Soviet Union, which all since has remained the official statement.

The fate of Raoul Wallenberg after 1947 can vaguely be reconstructed according to the stories of witnesses. He was probably tried for espionage by a Soviet court and sentenced (without his guilt being proven) to 25 years' imprisonment. He was kept for years in total isolation in different prisons, during which time he could only communicate with other prisoners by knocking. He was not allowed to receive or to write letters. He appears to have been a singularly energetic knocker, though.

His localities in various prisons seems to have constantly shifted between isolation cells and mental hospitals, especially between Moscow, Vladimir, Mordovia, Vershnye Uralsk and Alexandrovsky Central, the last two places by the Ural Mountains; but he also appears to have been brought around in Siberia. Only in prison hospitals he seems to have been able to keep human contact with other prisoners and then invariably asked them to communicate his whereabouts to the world if possible. The Soviet authorities seems from the beginning to have made some effort in isolating and eliminating all prisoners who succeeded in getting a word out about Raoul Wallenberg being alive.

A typical example is the doctor-scientist, who at an international conference happened to disclose to a Swedish colleague, that Wallenberg at that moment stayed at a mental hospital which was a typical isolating institution for political prisoners. When the matter was internationally known through Sweden, that scientist was immediately summoned up to the antisemite Chrushev (1961), who gave him a profound castigation, which frightened him into recalling all he had said to the Swedish professor. Not long after, this prominent scientist died of heart failure. Such stories and glimpses of the existence of Raoul Wallenberg are innumerable.

These are the main contours of the destiny of Raoul Wallenberg, which only vaguely can be discerned, but paradoxically enough for that very reason appear the more clearly. Considering his outstanding good health both physically and mentally 1945, it is not improbable that he is still alive. Rudolf Hess died 94 years old after 46 years in prison. Raoul Wallenberg would today be only 85.

The cruellest thing in his mistreatment is the obvious and uncompromising isolation he has had to endure all these years. He has never had any chance to learn about all the efforts that were made from the outside world to save and at least to find him, and all his own efforts to communicate with the outside world has since 1947 been quenched with uncompromising cruelty. The opening of old files in the new Russia has not resulted in much increased helpfulness from the Russian side. The official Soviet version, that *'Raoul Wallenberg is unknown in this country'*, is still dominating.

With kindest regards,

- Raoul Wallenberg's friends."

*Reliable information of Raoul Wallenberg's existence in Soviet prisons :*

1) Cell 123 in the Lyublyanka prison from 6.2.1945. The Stalin establishment tries by force to make him admit to espionage for the nazis in Budapest in January 1945, when he remained in Pest with an expired passport despite the Russians having taken that

part of the city. Raoul alleges that he only remained in order to save Jews, especially 7,000 from being annihilated with the Ghetto. The Russians refuse to believe this. He is sentenced to 25 years in prison for espionage although there is no evidence of his guilt.

During the years he is often sent back to the Lyublyanka.

2) The Lefortovskaya prison in Moscow in May 1945.

3) Vladimir 200 kilometres to the north east of Moscow, a prison which Raoul often had to experience, the first time in 1947, then 1949-51, 1952, 1953, - August 4th in Block 2 (the sickness and isolation department) Raoul communicates on his birthday by knockings to a fellow prisoner that he is not allowed to write letters or to receive any; again 1955, 1956-59 and 1967.

4) Vorkuta by the Arctic Sea north of the Ural mountains in 1948.

5) Khalmer Yu north of Vorkuta in 1948.

6) The Butyrka prison in Moscow, a prison specialized on prisoners impossible to crack down, with a comprehensive sick department, perhaps the prison which Raoul saw the most of. He was here at least in 1949, 1951, 1962, 1965 and 1975.

7) Vershnye Uralsk in southern Ural close to Chelyabinsk 1951-53.

8) Alexandrovsky Central by Ural 1954-55.

9) Poima between Krasnoyarsk and Irkutsk in Siberia in 1955, "*a severely ill Swede in the hospital*" with confirmed identity.

10) Professor Alexander Myasnikov's sensational divulgence in January 1961 that Raoul was in a mental hospital outside Moscow "*in a very poor state*". The professor is summoned to Chrushev, who cries him down to nothing, after which the professor clearly under duress and fear contradicts his earlier information to doctor Nanna Swartz. He dies of heart failure in 1965 after the fall of Chrushev when Leonid Breshnev, commissar in Budapest after the war, has risen to power. Professor Myasnikov appears to have written his memoirs before his death, which must exist somewhere in the world of *samizdat* (underground press by stencils.)

11) Wrangel Island north of Siberia in 1962.

12) Mordovia east of Vladimir 1964 and 1971-73.

13) Zadivovo close to Irkutsk 1966 and 1967.

14) Irkutsk 1973 and 1974.

15) "*Shvedsky 040812*" at a research station east of Lake Baykal in Siberia for "non-existent" persons officially pronounced dead but in reality still alive.

16) The Special Psychiatric Hospital in Blagoshevensk north of Manchuria close to the river Amur in 1978. He might still have been there in 1980.

That is the last convincing information of Raoul Wallenberg's whereabouts as a live man.

All the information above comes from convincing sources which have been confirmed by others or by particular details. Unconfirmed testimonies without convincing factors have here been left aside.

Of vital importance is the fact, that Raoul Wallenberg was sent on a special mission to Budapest in 1944 on behalf of the International Bureau for Refugees, established by Franklin D. Roosevelt in America, for the single purpose of saving as many Jews as possible with unlimited economical means to buy them free from the Nazis. For that reason, Raoul Wallenberg was posthumously created an Honorary Citizen of the United States. Consequently Americans should have a special interest in the Raoul Wallenberg case. He managed to save the lives of more than 10,000 Jews - actually they were innumerable: the figure can not be specified nor perhaps even estimated.

### *The Raoul Wallenberg Literature.*

This is extensive, but some books deserve more attention than others for their greater initiation, understanding and seriousness. These are mainly:

1) The Austrian Rudolph Philipp's classic from 1946, the first real book on the subject, which above all explains the Hungarian background better than any other book.

2) Raoul's stepfather Fredrik von Dardel's book from 1970, a concentrated and intimate documentary, which expresses the deepest understanding and gives the best portrait of Raoul as a person.

3) "*The Raoul Wallenberg Case*" by the French Jew Jacques Derogy from 1980, offering the greatest collection of facts on the subject in a broad international perspective.

4) The second book by Eric Sjöquist from 1981, offering the best collection of witnesses from the Gulag archipelago.

These are the four most important books. The novel by Frederick Werbell and Thurston Clarke from 1985, which was used to make the film for TV with Richard Chamberlain, is very well written and interesting but speculative. It claims that Raoul died in the middle of the 60's "by a mistake" committed by his gaolers. This is an entirely new theory with no support.

The Gothenburg journalist Gunnar Möllerstedt made a considerable research into the case in the 70's, which resulted in some journalism but in no book, until his colleague Bernt Schiller wrote the book which appeared in 1991. It is interesting for its revelation of many new facts which were made available by the Glasnost era, and above all it sheds an important light on the Himmler factor and his efforts to make peace approaches to the west through the business of selling the lives of Jews to Raoul Wallenberg and others; but Bernt Schiller commits the mistake of accepting the document of Raoul Wallenberg's staged death in Lyublyanka July 17th 1947, which so many others do with little understanding of Raoul Wallenberg's personality, thus falling into the trap of an artificial version which was published not until 1957 and which still is the official one.

Of course this theory can be as little disregarded as any other theory. But *if* Raoul Wallenberg really died in Lyublyanka in 1947, the most important question is *how*. He could hardly have died of heart failure, since he had a strong heart and in 1947 was only 35 years old. There are two other thinkable alternatives: 1) mistreatment or torture that went too far, or 2) suicide. Both alternatives would have been equally embarrassing to the Soviet authorities, who afterwards would have found every reason in the world to blot out all traces of what really happened, which everything clearly indicates that they did, whether Raoul remained alive or not. Nothing in the whole Wallenberg affair is more obvious than such efforts on the side of the Soviet authorities.

Which is why there is every reason to go to the bottom of things and never be satisfied with less than the *whole* truth of the matter.

### *Raoul Wallenberg today.*

The Raoul Wallenberg Street in Budapest goes through the so called *Swedish Houses*, which he himself bought from Eichmann in 1944 just to shelter and provide homes for liberated Jews. The *Tátra Street* is in the vicinity, where Raoul was last seen by number 6 before his disappearance on January 17th 1945, according to his own words in order to go to Debrecen for a meeting with the new Hungarian government to draw up plans for the rebuilding of Hungary. He never reached Debrecen. This part of the town is directly

opposite the southern tip of the Margaret Island (*Margitsziget*) on the eastern shore of the Danube.

As Boris Yeltsin visited Stockholm earlier this winter, the Wallenberg case was again brought forth to the Russian authorities. They claimed they were doing what they could to investigate the matter, and since nowadays the mystery of the last Czar and his family has been solved, there is also hope that the whole truth about Raoul Wallenberg at last could be found out.

### *The Empire of Evil.*

Thus called president Ronald Reagan the Soviet Union and used this epithet to justify his launching the "Star Wars" to at last reach a settlement after 40 years of Cold War. The Soviet Union was unable to meet his challenge and instead took the heroic initiative towards nuclear disarmament (under Michael Gorbachev), which really was a capitulation and the beginning of the fall of the Soviet Union. But no one was aware of that when Ronald Reagan launched his Wild West campaign to speed up the Cold War. Many considered it somewhat precarious of him to thus irresponsibly put the whole world at risk, that he was a security risk to the world and possibly suffered from some dementia, mentally living still in the forties. However, not even Ronald Reagan himself knew how right he was.

For the Soviet Union really was nothing less than an empire of evil, even if nothing more remained of it, when Ronald Reagan started waving his guns, than an obsolescent wreck which long since had stuck in the mud, run by sleeping mummies who hardly even could appear in television in spite of all the modern technical aids to mask them and keep them upright and make them almost seem alive. Leonid Breshnev and Kosugin, Andropov and Chernenko, they were all brought up by Stalin and had made it their issue to carry on his work. Even Gorbachev was hand-picked by the KGB and brought forth by this notorious terror company, or else he would never have reached power.

How evil was then Stalin's Soviet Union? No one really knows even today, but research is constantly increasing in this unsurveyable field. The world started to grasp a faint notion of the width of its evil by the publication in the 70's of Alexander Solshenitsyn's greatest documentary work "*The Gulag Archipelago*" about the incredible prison industry of Stalin's. A careful appreciation of the number of victims to Stalin's various terror waves amounts to about 63 million people, and that's just a rough guess.

During the last years it has gradually been uncovered what enormous scenes Stalin set up to cover what he was doing. Research is especially increasing concerning the efforts of the Red Army to work up the concentration camps in Poland as these were liberated from the east. The Russians were the first of the allies to get inside views of the Nazi holocaust industry, and Stalin appears to immediately have realized the enormous propaganda possibilities in these camps to further the cause of the communists. The Soviet Union not only made all the horrors of these camps public to all the world at once, but they also found it worth while to "improve" the premises of the camps, so that the horrors would appear even more horrible than they were. Special extra gas chambers were constructed by the Russians to illustrate the premeditated inhumanity of the Germans. That such incredible horrors which were displayed in the Polish concentration camps could not be found in the camps liberated in Germany by the British and Americans made no one in the slightest degree suspect that the Russians in any way had retouched the camps in the east.

The purpose of this blazoning the German horrors abroad after the "improvement" and the "spicing" of the worst terrors of the concentration camps was of course to conceal what went on inside Stalin's Russia. And no one suspected much as long as Stalin lived. No one questioned him, and he got away with it.

When Kruschev took the initiative to expose what Stalin really had been up to, the empire started trembling in its knees, and all the disciples of Stalin went shaky all over, thinking that Kruschev had to be stopped and silenced at once. Among these men were Breshnev and Kosugin, Andropov and Chernenko. They succeeded in checking him, but they could not stop Gorbachev twenty years later, because by then they were all dead, and new generations were taking over, demanding straightness for the sake of the country and the future.

And suddenly the Russians are given the opportunity to relate what they know. Suddenly all those who were buried alive and who survived the empire of evil are resurrected and brought forth into the open, suddenly history is made to bear witness of itself, and so it does with heart-rending screams of anguish. When censure at last was abolished in 1989 you could suddenly see on television old KGB executioners tell their stories about mass executions, which turned the great KGB prison on the Neva in Leningrad so full of blood that the basement was flooded, so that all this blood inundation "had to be pumped out into the river Neva, where then motor boats had to run interminably with their propellers, so that all the blood could mix with the water..."

In the beginning of the 70's, the strong man of Poland and its highest commander Wojciech Jaruzelski had a meeting with eight of his highest military leaders, of whom seven were generals and the eighth one a colonel. He concluded the meeting by divulging, that "one of us has betrayed all the military secrets of the Warsaw Pact to the west, and I assure you, that it wasn't me." All the others immediately responded, that it neither was none of them, but none of them believed each other. Shortly afterwards one of them defected to the west. It was the one colonel in the company, Ryszard Kuklinski. He escaped with his two sons to America, where eventually both the sons had mysterious accidents and died, but the colonel was rigorously safeguarded by the CIA and never had an incident. In May this year he was invited to Poland to give lectures around the country and to have all his property restored to him, which had been confiscated as he defected: a sailing-boat, a villa and a valuable collection of art, among other things. Quite honestly he told his audiences in his lectures, that his one motivation in acting as he did was, that he had "seen through the empire of evil and found it his duty as a human being to do what he could to finish it." The Polish people were asked what they thought about this traitor. 70% of the Polish people thought he had done the right thing, and he was made an honorary citizen of Krakow and Danzig.

The awareness of the real nature and undertakings of the empire of evil is constantly increasing. Also new questions are constantly raised. "If the Russians did so much to retouch and improve the German concentration camps, does that imply that so many Jews weren't killed after all?" is one of the most disturbing. Nothing can excuse or mitigate the German crimes against humanity of actually trying to exterminate all Jews, not even if the crimes of Stalin's communists were even worse, which more and more clearly appears to have been the case. And we must never forget, that the National Socialists of Germany, the so called Nazis, were as much socialists as Stalin's communists.

"What was really the part of the Jews in the making of the empire of evil?" is another recurrent question. It's a fact that many Jews helped the Bolsheviks into power in 1917. Leon Trotsky, Lenin's closest associate, was the foremost of them. Karl Marx could hardly be called a Jew, since he denounced the faith of his fathers. And those Jews that helped the Bolsheviks into power had suffered much under the systematic

pogroms of the Czars. They couldn't imagine that the regime of the communists would become even worse. Lenin started to have misgivings about it in his last years as he saw what kind of a man Stalin really was.

Power always corrupts. The socialists were true idealists in the whole world until they reached power through the Bolsheviks in Russia. The definite abortion of socialist idealism occurred as Leon Trotsky ordered his newly organized Red Army to open fire against the people, the marines in Kronstadt in March 1921, when they asked for free elections, freedom of speech, press freedom, free labour unions and freedom for the farmers to keep their own crops from their own lands. By that massacre, socialism was tarnished forever. Such historical blots can never be washed away. By that massacre, the empire of evil was hopelessly established.

70 years later in August 1991 it had its last dying convulsions in the pathetic effort to topple Gorbachev. It was like a feverish reminiscence of an old sickness. Gorbachev had then already during a number of years been doomed: It was not his efforts to abate alcoholism which caused his downfall but the fact, that he failed his promises. He promised reforms which everyone believed in, he introduced them well, *glasnost* and *perestroika* were successes from the start, but in 1989 he started to fear the speed of the development and to hold it back, and people began to feel betrayed. This paved the way for Yeltsin, who openly declared himself willing to be more consistent.

The empire of evil is fallen today, and the autopsy of its formless terror monster is a constantly growing enterprise. But it is still alive in China, who have spread its terror tentacles into Burma. North Korea is on the verge of collapse, her days are numbered, but China is the last colossus. Not until that autocracy finally has plunged into the self-destruction of all empires, the empire of evil can be said to have been finally overcome.

### *The Sikorsky Case.*

This is an unfathomable mystery, which probably never will be solved. Wladyslaw Sikorski was prime minister of the Polish exile government in London and chief commander of the Polish army. It was much to his desert that Polish pilots in England helped to decide the battle of Britain in Britain's favour. But Sikorski was a determined gentleman who could not compromise, and he was not an easy companion for Churchill to work with. He was even less popular with Stalin. The collaboration between Churchill, Sikorski and Stalin went off in 1941 and became more and more strained in 1943, when Sikorski developed critical attitudes against Stalin and warned against him. In February the Soviet news agency *Tass* transmitted, that Sikorski had perished in an aeroplane accident together with Madame Chang Kai Shek outside Portugal on their way to the US. How on earth did Soviet know about this? The truth was, that Sikorski had had a warning against taking that flight, since a sabotage had been attempted against it, wherefore he took another plane with Madame Chang Kai Shek and managed all right with her. The Soviet Union and *Tass* had committed the error of rejoicing too soon over a successful assassination of an unwanted political character in the west. The following day, *Tass* admitted an error and denied the news when they had learned about their failure.

In April the Germans discovered the massacre in the Katyn forest on Polish officers. The Germans claimed that the massacre had been committed by Russians on the Polish officers, while Stalin claimed the massacre had been committed by Germans. Sikorski demanded what was reasonable for a responsible Polish prime minister to demand, namely an investigation of the matter. This turned both Churchill and Stalin against the wall and developed into a most uncomfortable situation, when Stalin threatened to

make separate peace with Germany if Sikorski was allowed to go on as he did. Stalin did open peace negotiations with Ribbentrop through Madame Kollontay in Stockholm with Willy Brandt as the German mediator. This was not to Prime Minister Winston Churchill's immediate liking.

On July 4th Sikorski flies from North Africa to meet with Churchill in London and stops half way in Gibraltar to change planes. When the plane leaves Gibraltar with a Czech pilot called Prchal, the plane is seen from the airport to fall into the sea. As luck would have it, the pilot Prchal happened to have a safety-jacket on, so he could swim ashore, while Sikorski is drowned and lost.

Of course there is an investigation. This is kept behind locked doors. No Pole is allowed to share the details, which are filed as top secret for 30 years. Officially the explanation is, that the steering system jammed. When after 30 years the matter is investigated by Polish expertise they find, that important documents of the investigation are missing, and that the plane impossibly could have had a jammed steering system, since the plane in that case would have fallen in a totally different way into the sea than it did. Of course, the Czech pilot Mr Prchal knows nothing.

The day after the death of Sikorski, July 5th 1943, the battle of Kursk begins, in which 400,000 Germans with 4,000 tanks go against 500,000 Russians and 5,000 Russian tanks. This is the last German offensive in Russia and effort to reach for Moscow. The battle goes on for eight days and is concluded on July 13th with a Russian victory, which is the ultimate turn of the tide in the second world war. Two days later, on July 15th, Stalin disrupts the negotiations with Germany for a separate peace, since it is now clear to him that he will be able to beat the Germans. And besides, the awkward Sikorski problem has been solved.

### *Raoul Wallenberg and Tibet*

The Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg disappeared in Budapest January 1945 after a peerlessly heroic engagement to save tens of thousands, maybe up to 30,000 Jews from the Nazi holocaust in Hungary. He was last seen alive as he was escorted away by Russian officials of the Stalinist occupation. The Swedish government decided to be patient.

When two years later Moscow reported that Raoul Wallenberg was dead, this was swallowed by the Swedish government without comment. It also swallowed the Russian explanation that Raoul Wallenberg never had entered Soviet territory but had found his end in Hungary. It also swallowed that no evidence ever was produced by the Russians to confirm Wallenberg's death. Whatever could the Swedish government do? The more important then to watch what they did *not* do.

When later there were witness reports that Wallenberg was alive, that he had been seen in Moscow by other prisoners and that these had been tapping messages between themselves through the prison walls of Lubyanka, that psychiatrists happened to mention they had had him as a patient and other such stuff, the Swedish government became active but in the opposite way to what would have been expected as rational. They silenced the matter. The foreign minister accepted the Russian word that Wallenberg was dead (without evidence) and refused to accept any other version or even any other possibility, since he did not want to offend the Russians. "The Soviet authorities are respectable. They wouldn't tell a lie. We must believe them, we have no choice. We must respect them." This cowardice even worsened during the years, during decades the cruelty of silence was the only policy allowed - there was a governmental

effort to silence the matter to nothing, and this policy was maintained until the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Not until then, after 50 years, one acknowledgement after the other started gradually to turn up. The Soviet authorities had been lying from the start, and Sweden had not even questioned the lies. The governmental policy was admitted to have been cowardly false. The first official excuses from the government to Raoul Wallenberg's family were delivered - after 50 years.

This remarkable Raoul Wallenberg syndrome reappears in the even more revolting standpoint of the world in the Tibetan issue. Independent Tibet was occupied by military force by Communist China in 1950. Only El Salvador dared to raise the issue in the United Nations and was silenced. In 1956 the Chinese started their methodical destruction of Tibet with its culture and history by bombings and closing and looting of monasteries, the universities of Tibet, and their temples. Not until Dalai Lama's escape in 1959 did the Tibetan issue start some attention. A commission of international jurists in Geneva decided to investigate the case and arrived at the conclusion that China had already committed genocide in Tibet. Nobody did anything about it. In 1966 commenced the total devastation of Tibet, which was allowed to rave at large for ten years while the United States by the initiative of Henry Kissinger withdrew their support for the Tibetan resistance movement and abandoned Taiwan (which actually was governed by the only legal government of China), to instead start making business with Communist China and Mao Zedong, the murderer of at least 43 million of his own subjects. (Taiwan is today a developed and working democracy while China after 54 years is still the world's greatest dictatorship.) No one did anything for Tibet except specially invited leftist writers, like Han Suyin, who wrote books about Tibet depicting China as her benefactor and liberator. The first book to criticize China from inside Tibet was not written until 1979 (John F. Avedon's *"In Exile from the Land of Snows"*.)

Thereby at last an opposition started to make itself heard in one upsetting testimonial account after the other, the flow of which has never been interrupted; but still the political establishments of the world continue to support China with cajolery: "But China is a respectable nation. They do as well as they can. Although their execution statistics surpass the whole rest of the world they make progress in human rights. After all, they don't perform public executions any longer by shots in the neck but instead by injections in specially designed execution buses, so that the victims can die comfortably. We must respect China and acknowledge that Tibet is part of China, for the sake of China." (China stands for 20% of the world's population but 70% of the world's executions.) While at the same time China enforces mass immigration of Chinese into Tibet to definitely sinocize Tibet by drowning the Tibetan people in Chinese masses, who are not even constituted to live in such an extreme climate; so that Lhasa, the magical capital of Tibet, is now a circus of Chinese brothels, Karaoke bars and sterile business complexes of concrete blocks, where all the profits are Chinese, while the Tibetans are marginalized and sorted out like a lower caste without any rights of their own as citizens or even as human beings.

Unlike the Raoul Wallenberg case, no Chinese has ever made any Tibetan excuses or indemnified anything of the Chinese holocaust against the Tibetan people and culture, which process instead is just kept rolling on and even accelerated together with the Chinese executions, which also are speeded up after constantly quicker summary trials; while the world keeps disinterestedly looking on and lick China under her feet as if in a kind of voluntary blindness and refusal to recognize the evidence of a 50 year old political problem, which by this neglect just keeps growing, given fresh fuel and dirt today in Nepal and France; as the authorities of Nepal in spite of international law returns Tibetan refugees to China (since China pays Nepalese policemen to do this)

where the fugitives consequently are maltreated and vanish; and as the French president Jacques Chirac, duped by a Chinese economical charm offensive, tries to persuade the European Community to resume the arms trade with China, which export was interrupted after the massacres by the Chinese authorities on Tiananmen Square in Beijing, June 4th 1989. For what purpose will China use those arms? Shoot more Tibetans and Uighurs? Start war against Taiwan?

## *The Jesus File*

The Christmas Letter of John B. Westerberg (1996)  
Apology for the Bible and Christianity  
The Jesus Debate, by John B. Westerberg  
The Importance of Religious Criticism, by John Bede

### *The Christmas Letter of John B. Westerberg*

"In my Christmas letter I would like to refer to your most interesting article about Giordano Bruno. Your presentation of how he introduced a completely new theology inspires me with boldness enough to continue that theology.

The problem with established theology is that no one dares to touch what is established. Especially the Bible is impossible to question any letter of. (Already the early Talmudists battled with this problem.) All scholars agree that the Holy Writ is full of inconsistencies, but no one dares to sort them out. Most of them are also aware that it must contain innumerable misunderstandings, especially concerning the story of Christ, but no one dares to point them out with the authority of pure logic and exclaim: "This is wrong!"

Let's start from the beginning with Moses. According to modern research, there is actually much in the Bible which now can be proved to be true, while other material can be doubted on the ground that not a single piece of evidence has been found to support it, for instance the life and work of Moses, as the wanderings of the children of Israel through the desert for 40 years haven't left a single trace behind. Of course, this doesn't prove that Moses never existed, and I embrace the standpoint, that want of proof of what is written is true is no proof that it isn't true.

On the other hand, it is perfectly reasonable to doubt that the children of Israel actually wandered through the desert for exactly 40 years, since 40 years in the Old Testament generally is used to mark just a very long period, just as the figure 40 days frequently is used in the New Testament. This critical manner of thought is elementary in exegetic theology.

There is however no logical reason whatsoever to doubt that Moses grew up as a prince of Egypt and brought the people of Israel out from there down to the mountain of Horeb and up again to Mount Nebo and the Jordan river during a period long enough to have the entire older generation disposed of during the way. It is a fact that the ten plagues of Egypt could be explained by the Santorini catastrophe north of Crete. There is, however, reason to doubt that Moses himself compiled the entire Torah. This is to be doubted especially from a literary point of view, since the Torah with all its dry commandments and paragraphs are completely different in mentality and style from the previous epic accounts of Genesis and Exodus. Moses probably commenced the

establishment of all these laws which then continued to have effect verbally and were amplified according to what was needed in the course of time until they reached their completion at the latest during the days of Samuel. I can myself easily believe, though, that Moses wrote the whole of Genesis himself, compiling what he had heard and learned from Egypt and Babylonia in his youth.

That Samuel was a far more important and more methodical legislator and editor than was ever recognized by history appears to me as credible. I hardly think that anything of importance was added to the Torah during the long decadence after king Solomon.

Swarming with inextricable misunderstandings, though, is without any doubt the New Testament. Its oldest writings are the letters of St. Paul, which even they did not come into existence until long after the crucifixion and without Paul ever having had any personal contact with Jesus. So he could impossibly be regarded as a reliable source and interpreter of the mission of Jesus. St. Paul's disciple was St. Luke, a professional doctor of medicine, who on the other hand made considerable research on the subject and must have known the mother of Jesus personally. His gospel is the only one of any detachment to the subject. Least detached of all is the gospel of St. Matthew, which gives an overwhelming impression of genuineness but which is hopelessly personal and biased. Most positive and matter-of-fact is St. Mark, whose gospel is probably the oldest and most original, written by the pupil of St. Peter, which therefore deserves to be regarded as perhaps the only reliable one. St. John's version is the most twisted of all, the last to have been written, all screwed up on personal interpretations of the man and his pretensions. His unreliability is confirmed by the Apocalypse, which is the most aggressive book in the whole Bible. Both John, Paul and Luke could be meted fair amounts of credit for their literary and philosophical values but are not to be trusted as witnesses. Only Mark and Matthew are of any worth as witnesses.

An unknown and suppressed apocryphical gospel of St. Jude dares to suggest that Judas Iscariot has totally been taken wrong and that the other apostles have perverted both the picture of him and of Jesus. According to this gospel, which is not very well known in the western hemisphere, Judas was the link between Jesus and the Essenes, who later on frightened the soldiers away from the grave, carried off the body of Jesus and resurrected him. When Jesus told Judas at the last supper: "That thou doest, do quickly," he meant that everything was ready and that Judas could start acting according to the plans. No one was better prepared for everything that followed than Jesus himself. He had planned everything to the minutest detail, and in sacrificing himself he intended to unite all the world's religions under the realm of that total divine love, which he felt and understood. But he did it too well, and Judas was not equally well prepared. When he experienced what the fantastic plans really involved practically, it became too much for him, he thought everything was his fault and that everything had gone wrong and therefore took his own life in despair instead of waiting with patience until the end. By the resurrection, which proved that Jesus had survived the ordeal and escaped, the precarious enterprise was crowned with perfect victory and success.

The Muslims came somewhat closer to the truth than the church when they advocated that the crucifixion never had occurred. The crucifixion did occur, but Jesus never died, which the phenomenon "blood and water" gushing forth after his so called death clearly indicates.

Most important of all to go to the bottom with in the Bible, though, is the whole notion of God. It is probable that Moses himself launched all unsound misapprehensions by manipulating the idea of God to better control the obstreperous Jews. All the rubbish about a God who "takes revenge", "regrets", "kills", "strikes with

condemnation" and so forth, in brief, all the myths about a cruel and severe God have to be disposed of. In a certain sense, Christianity succeeded in this, but the cruel and unhuman, the belligerous and vengeful God of violence and hatred then made a comeback with the advent of Islam, which laid a curse on the whole world and history by announcing that Mahomet as the last and perfect prophet gave the world the definite version of God. Thereby atheism was given a justification for existence.

(In the same manner all the myths of Islam and the Catholic Church about hell and paradise have to be disposed of. There is no hell except the one which humankind themselves have created on earth, and no paradise except the one humankind once could have created on earth - and sometimes tried to create to almost succeed therewith.)

As an alternative to monotheistic intolerance, Hinduism and Buddhism appear as much more sensible and human. But Hinduism is primitive and confused while Buddhism goes to extremes in the way of common sense, so that it ends in sterility. The Sikhs united the best of Islam with the best of Hinduism but degenerated into a people of warriors: the necessity to constantly defend their interests made them hopelessly militant and unscrupulous. Jainism tried to unite the best of Hinduism with the best of Buddhism but never reached an acceptable synthesis or any dynamic identity, much because they never found a leader of a Buddha's qualifications. Other interesting efforts to form a constructive synthesis was that of the theosophers, who constantly split up in parties though, just like the Christians.

There are accounts of Jesus having been to India, not only after his youth in Banaras and Ladakh, but also that he should have died in Srinagar in Kashmir in the days of the emperor Trajan. There is no evidence however. But the mere existence of accounts of his activities in India indicates that they took place, just like the existence of Moses and the wanderings of the children of Israel, although there remains no evidence. It is not impossible that Jesus knew the formula for uniting all religions and that he tried to realize it, but that his surviving disciples got it all wrong.

(The theory of Jesus' death in Kashmir at an advanced age is also supported by Islam. The Ahmadiya branch of Islam in Pakistan positively asserts, that Jesus did not die on the cross but that he was in a state of coma as he was taken down and buried. Of this St. John and the women were very much aware, so they managed to prevent that his bones were crushed like on the two malefactors. After the resurrection, however, Jesus was obliged by security to resort to a life underground, which is why he rather avoided the apostles than associated freely with them. He was extremely careful about dispersing St. Thomas' doubts, though, who later followed him to India, where he could live more freely and openly. He had also completed his mission in Israel and didn't have much to do there any more. After the unexpected and most unwelcome death of St. Jude, he gave over the highest responsibility for his community to St. Peter, who had proved himself the most human of his remaining disciples. In India, Jesus is said to have reached the age of 120 years (the same age as Moses) in Kashmir, according to the Ahmadiya branch of Islam, a Pakistani equivalent to the Persian Bahai community.

So there are constantly more sources appearing as witnesses of Jesus' activities in India both before and after the crucifixion.)"

John B. Westerberg

Footnote. The most interesting part of John's presentation is the revaluation of Judas Iscariot. Already Anthony Burgess tried something of the kind. John goes further, however, and depicts Judas as the only initiate in the plans of Jesus. That Jesus himself was perfectly aware of everything expecting him including the crucifixion is evident

from the gospels. This is the first time anyone claims that Judas alone also was familiar in advance with what was going to happen. It is also most evident from the gospels that none of the other apostles knew anything in advance. Experiencing the cruelty and the brutality which the realization of the plans conveyed, Judas should then according to this have panicked, jumped to the conclusion that Jesus had lost control and consequently lost his nerve. This would not have been more than human. The very first thing that the first Christians evidently forgot and overlooked was, that Jesus and his apostles were only human beings.

The Judas theory is however also the weakest point in John's presentation. If Judas meant no harm, how do you explain the 30 pieces of silver? You could explain them by that they were part of the show: only by that could the high priests be convinced by Judas that he was serious about betraying Jesus. Without this transaction as a concrete evidence, the high priests would perhaps never have bothered to arrest Jesus and go through with the plotted trial.

John Bede had this surprising comment:

"At last someone who dares to question the credibility of the gospels! I give him my full support! Here is my contribution:

St. John 12:4-6 ending: "he was a thief, and as he had the money box he used to take what was put into it." (of Judas Iscariot.)

Even if it might have been true, isn't it a strange remark of a holy apostle to make of another after his tragic death? Such an accusation demands proof, but since Judas had hanged himself he couldn't defend himself, and none of the other apostles did either. Is it then plausible that Jesus should have trusted and kept a disciple who stole from the common purse? It is more probable that the accusation is a lie than that Jesus should have kept him. According to me this one verse is enough to render the holy authority of the gospel of St. John questionable indeed.

And why does this verse exist? There is only one explanation: St. John must have envied Judas. But St. John was the disciple whom Jesus loved, according to St. John. This leads us to believe, that St. Jude might very well have been as much loved by Jesus as St. John.

The gospel according to St. Luke is the most charming and beautiful, partly because it is so full of anecdotes and parables which the others didn't care to preserve. What makes St. Luke doubtful is his "Acts of the Apostles", which clearly are in favour of St. Paul at the cost of St. Peter in their silencing down the first christian division between these two, so that Peter is abandoned while Paul is given the entire stage for himself. Also, this book is unfinished. It is impossible to take St. Luke seriously after the "Acts".

Which means, that only Matthew and Mark remain as reliable evangelists, as our friend J. Westerberg so correctly has pointed out.

I also know that there is a grave of Jesus in India. Why would the Hindus find out to dig such a grave unless the body of Jesus was in it? Is Mr Westerberg able to answer that question?"

Another correspondent, a member of the church of Sweden, protested against these arguments and accused mr Westerberg of false motives. We answered thus:

The motivation behind John's reserach is hardly to establish new dogmas. The one thing which he is interested in, we can assure, having known him for 16 years, is to reach closer at the truth. Only in order to find out whether there was anything to the rumours of Jesus' activities in India, he went there to spend years of research on the subject. To the relief of the dogma authorities he found no evidence but many favourable

indications. To this then is added these uninvited surprises to stumble on, like the Ahmadiya tradition that Jesus died of old age at Srinagar, Kashmir, and the Essene information of how Judas alone among the apostles was initiated in the mystery of Jesus' death beforehand but couldn't face standing up to it practically. We suggest that the kiss of Judas more than anything else proved the good intentions of Judas, that this was probably his farewell and wish of good luck on the master's difficult journey, and that Jesus' answer could be discussed indeed: this unexpected gesture of Judas might have alarmed him. His answer could for instance be interpreted thus: "Judas, don't go too far!" or, "Please, Judas, more discretion, if I may ask!" We return this debate to our John in India, the expert on such theological speculations.

But the perhaps most important argument of all is this: if it really turns out to be the case that Judas for 1960 years has been unjustly condemned and exiled to hell for ever under never ending curses of all Christian believers and churches in the world, isn't it then about time that he was given some kind of restitution? Since there is an evident risk that we are here faced by the worst example of mobbing, (and of a dead man even,) in history?

### *Apology for the Bible and Christianity*

by John B. Westerberg.

"No one knows anything for certain about Jesus or his twelve (thirteen) apostles. His activities were from the start until the end a mystery intended only to give rise to mysteries. The first and greatest mistake of his church was therefore to try to concretize any results of his activities in order to establish dogmas. The first one to introduce this denounceable antichristian activity was the great religious founder St. Paul, who failing to understand the mystery as such was the first one to betray and completely debase christianity.

The second who partook in the same destructive activity was the apostle St. John, who by his gospel established Jesus as a cult figure of more divine than human nature. This also was a total corruption of the innermost nature of christianity.

For 1900 years ever since then, in all parts of the world but especially in the western part, you have devotedly continued to ruin christianity by inventing dogmas (the church), or by fashioning hypotheses founded on "science", which generally have sought to explain away the whole Bible as only fairy tales and lies, and which in modern days even cocksuredly have claimed that Jesus never existed and that his religion christendom is totally a merit of St. Paul's. This is how far the continued premeditated destruction of christianity so far has gone.

That's why I left the western world, and my exile from there is to be regarded as voluntary and permanent. A society that constricts imagination, maintains itself by limiting man's freedom of thought, regards idealism and altruism as dangerous and subversive, and which excludes and fights alternatives instead of furthering them, is unhuman and self-destructive. Then I find the most miserable colony of hippies much sounder.

Regarding the efforts to explain away the Bible and Jesus above all, the first and greatest mistake is to deny the possibility that what is written could actually have taken place. Why close the door, when you can't get out unless you open it? Extremely little of what is written in the Bible can be proved to have taken place. It is practically only the history of the state of Israel from the days of king David. What most of all convinces me that what is written in the Bible actually did take place is its psychological realism. The

five books of Moses is the first literary realism in history. This emerges above all in the described human relationships. A story like that of the eternal feud between the brothers Esau and Jacob with all its different turns with deadly enmity alternating with moving reconciliation scenes, the shocking psychology in the described relationships between Joseph and his brothers, the relation of the holy wrath of Moses when he murders an Egyptian taskmaster and crushes the two stone tables with the ten commandments, totally disillusioned about that people's reliability which he has sacrificed everything for, the romantic episode about Ruth and Boas - all such intimate and personal affairs could impossibly be made up. They are too convincing and real to be dismissed as "scientifically untenable". They are too human to be able to be dismissed by an established unhumanity.

In the same way, everything that is written in the New Testament is theoretically possible. Judas could have been a base traitor who stole money out of the common purse of the apostles, but he could also have been Jesus' closest friend and the only initiate in the mystery. The one possibility doesn't even exclude the other. Episodes like when St. Thomas puts his finger through the holes in Jesus' hands, the widow at the well, Peter's fishing party when he gets himself into the water just because he sees the master on the beach, the prostitute who is about to be stoned when Jesus says: "Let him that is without sin among you cast the first stone at her," whereupon the whole enterprise comes to nothing - it is all too humanly realistic, too much alive to be "lying nonsense", as some professors and academicians would term it, representatives of that society which I have for ever rejected, that mortally industrialized welfare society dominated by dry boring scientific sterility, the greatest effort of which since the second world war has been to fabricate Plutonium. Such a society can only be designated with one adequate label: Antichrist. I will never be able to fit into such a society, and neither will, I believe, any human person.

Your friend John Bede's question about the grave in India answers itself.

There are many indications that Jesus educated himself to be a master within Buddhism in India, and that after his completed mission in Jerusalem he returned to Buddhism in India."

### *The Importance of Religious Criticism,*

by John Bede.

Allow me to immediately confess who I am. In all my life I have been involved and engaged in the conflicts of Northern Ireland, being a Catholic of Londonderry. That should be all I should be obliged to say about that. Those who know anything about this the most meaningless of all conflicts will understand what I mean without one more word.

All my life people have tried to force me to take stands. I always refused to. I think both sides are wrong. So I have always thought, and it seems unlikely that I will ever find reason to change my mind.

All my life I have collected bad things to say about my Christian Church, whether it's Catholic or Protestant. They are all the same to me, and I find both equally bad. But if you express your criticism you will raise hell out of nowhere, you will get beaten down, you might get shot in your knees, you simply are forbidden to say anything against any rotten devil in any rotten church.

So the church is full of devils, but you can't reach them. You can't deal with them. You can't settle with them, because all the pious believers will do anything to stop you.

Thus the evil remains with all believing Catholics and Protestants of Northern Ireland. Thus both churches appear totally evil. Of course they are not. I am a solidly confirmed supporter of the paradox, that there is no evil without something good about it, just as there is nothing good without something being rotten about it.

To explain this baffling duality, how good and evil in religious business always is intertwined and almost inseparable, let's have a look at a totally different sort of religion, one of the outsider churches, who people have loved to cudgel occasionally and who has acquired a kind of label of '*all abuse allowed*'. Let's have a look at the extraneous Church of Scientology.

One year I remember the Scientology page on Internet caused some attention across the world since it disclosed confidential material from an advanced Scientology course called OT III. The motive for revealing this remarkable material was apparently, that the source had studied the course, quit Scientology and used Internet to demonstrate why.

After some time this page was removed from Internet by the source himself, since, according to witnesses, he had been intimidated by scientologists to do so. This appears even more remarkable since the material disclosed had been regarded as "science fiction nonsense".

Most remarkable then is the scientologist reaction. If Catholics who leave the Church disclose intimate experiences of exorcisms and promiscuity, the Church doesn't mind at all but merely takes on a Jewish attitude like "that's what we get for our sins". But the smallest objection against the Church of Scientology immediately raises the most violent reactions. They can't take criticism. They are as confirmed bigots as the Catholics and Protestants of Northern Ireland.

Thereby the Church of Scientology places itself on the same level with other American esoteric movements, who all share that characteristic: the members can't tolerate criticism. The more important, then, becomes criticism. What may not be said then becomes vital. If a voiced opinion is silenced it will turn into a scream.

They are all the same, those American salvation armies, with their doomsday outlook on life, claiming to be the only ones capable of saving the world and preparing to do so when the time comes, like the Jehovahs have been waiting now for quite some time, establishing definite coming doomsdays and getting disappointed each time their doomsday prophecies prove phoney. I know you well, all you pious American extremists of naïveté. Your chief problem is that society always seems to be able to manage quite well without all your fatalist sects. It just doesn't care, even when you not seldom end up in a mass suicide.

Yet I will not be critical against Scientology, but on the contrary I must belaud its constructive parts. It has a splendid rehabilitation program for drug addicts which works, its founder Mr L. Ron Hubbard launched brilliant pioneering initiatives in the 40s against psychiatric abuses and within prison discipline and could have made history as a great scientist and psychiatric reformer, if he hadn't turned his assets into a religion and made it marketable in order to shamelessly use the doctrine of the immortality of man to make money.

The Church of Scientology probably went wrong when it was organized into a religion involving secrecy around its materials. The founder made it his ambition to "clear the planet", and in the 60s he launched his own private "Sea Organization" on ships, where the members signed contracts of a thousand million years. Media often mistook this figure and made it only a million years or even less, but the contract actually bound the signer to a thousand million years of service. Most people who signed this contract had low wages and had to work day and night for the organization. One of the most frequently used quotations of L. Ron Hubbard is: "The truth shall set you free," while at the same time it is remarkable that the scientologists can't stand

hearing the truth about themselves and Scientology. I also wonder how much the Scientology religion and its sea organization was the creation of L. Ron Hubbard and how much of his lately imprisoned wife Mary Sue Hubbard. In a publication about the founder published after his death he is quoted during his youth in China ( - another Indiana Jones?) to have found there in the western outskirts the truth about mankind, realized the reincarnation mechanics and how to sort this mental problem out by scientologist technology. Please observe, that he embraced these ideas at the age of 15 in the middle of puberty. His mentality seems very close to that of Chinese emperors and Mao Zedong, who often qualified themselves by advocating ideas which they took for granted must be of universal application. L. Ron Hubbard seems to have taken for granted that his ideas would work not only on criminals and psycho cases but on everyone. Sound people under scientologist treatment have reacted against this. I would recommend, that if Scientology succeeds in curing mentally ill, criminals and drug addicts, it should only devote its energies to them and leave sound people in peace, and above all, not make sound people suffer economically by scientologist encroachment. There are after all people who don't take drugs, who don't become criminals and who are not mentally ill, and all such people I think had better stay off Scientology.

The most suspect thing about Scientology is in my opinion its secrecy. All material in advanced courses is confidential and obtainable only for money at large. All the same, such material has always leaked out by hearsay and even reached Internet. The religion has never tolerated disclosure of such materials, and what is once available on Internet can never be stopped, since even if it is removed it can be copied by any computer as long as it remains. The founder also created a methodical system which made criticism against the religion impossible. Scientologists were prohibited to mention any word of disparagement about each other, all disparagement about the religion was classified as "entheta", which means 'anti-spiritual', and people who committed this crime were labelled as "suppressive persons" and excommunicated, with the practical consequence that scientologists were forbidden to have any contact with them. If they violated this they were themselves excommunicated. In this way uncountable families have been divided by the Church of Scientology, which thereby turned very skilful in making unyielding enemies. And thus, the existence of freedom of speech, freedom of thought and freedom of conscience within the firm was debatable.

I must regret that L. Ron Hubbard never wrote an autobiography. That might have straightened out many question marks. The disadvantage of turning in without first cleaning up your desk is that you can no longer defend yourself after death. We shall now never learn the truth about his first two marriages, which seem to have broken up as the wives considered him out of his mind, which is the most common of all divorce causes. What we know for certain is that he was very apt at writing science fiction, category B. He is no stylist, his imagination is crude and stereotypical, he has no feeling and negligent empathy. One example is the short story "The Man from Hell", an adventure story with a colourful gang of dashing swashbucklers of very obscure origin and character, where captain Norton, the hero, is a fugitive from Devil's Island and the villain Chacktar is a Negro. The story consists of fights, murders, gunfights, violence and a finale by the geographically unknown Hurricane Island somewhere between Devil's Island and Martinique with a machine gun massacre. Bouts of fisticuffs are epically described in detail, and the corpses amassing in heaps during the course of events are almost uncountable. There is no human value - on one occasion the one woman asks the hero most anxiously: "Have you killed a human being?" He has already killed lots, and he answers directly: "You can't call those beasts human, can you?" Of

course, this hero gets her at last. Whatever a writer writes says something about the writer's mentality and what stuff he is made of. In comparison with this pornographic violent trash, the very opposite of Joseph Conrad, a writer of popular adventure stories like Dennis Wheatley stands miles above in quality. If an author of such cheap superficial action nonsense then founds a religion, it is hardly more than natural that that religion in that case will have some difficulty in making itself be taken seriously, especially if that religion turns out to be the best marketed religion in the world, - since it's not very religious for religions to be marketable. Towards the end of his life, when his third wife and many of his closest associates were in prison for phoney tax declarations, he seems to have returned to his science fiction authorship and spent his last years isolated on a ranch somewhere in the vicinity of Hollywood, where he first made his luck. I would incline towards thinking that L. Ron Hubbard's mistake after 1950 was to take his own science fiction fantasies so seriously that he thought they must be universally applicable, and thus all his scientific detachment was lost. Is that what happens to all founders of religions?

Some twenty years ago I happened to hear in a radio program one of his former friends relate how he went out on treasure hunts in the Caribbean Sea with his ships. Since he was certain that he once had been a rich pirate in an earlier life, he was also certain that he remembered exactly where he had buried the treasures. This absolute self-confidence is a rather conspicuous scarlet thread throughout this man's life. He wouldn't have anything to do with the saying, "It is human to err," which he denied, and his life's work the scientologist technology and organization excludes "the human factor" as anything worth considering. All the same, no treasures were found in the Caribbean. The story could have been made up, that's what the scientologists say unanimously with certainty, but that is the kind of stories that circulate about L. Ron Hubbard. On the other hand, if he had found some treasure somewhere in the Caribbean, perhaps the scientologists would have used such a fact in order to prove their leader's infallibility.

During the 80s many scientologists had to stand trial for monkey business, as they had persuaded proselytes to take loans from banks in order to finance their Scientology courses. When these loans couldn't be amortized in spite of completed Scientology courses, these proselytes found themselves in a difficult position, and several turned themselves into enemies of Scientology for life. For this the responsible scientologists were given some thrashing by their chiefs, since their procedure had resulted in bad PR for the whole business. It is possible that all these responsible and excommunicated scientologists would not have been thrashed by their seniors if their proselytes after having completed their Scientology courses all the same had been able to repay their loans.

Conclusion: if criticism is silenced it becomes legitimate. Since 1950 the Church of Scientology has refused to listen to criticism. The result is a mafia-like world autocracy which continues to make money out of the doctrine of the immortality of man. This doctrine can not be questioned, since no one can prove what happens after death; but to make money out of the immortality principle is quite another thing. I would suggest that everything Scientology says can be used against it. The only exception are the few scientific results which the foundation never can be denied the most commendable invention and introduction of, above all the working and successful purification program for the rehabilitation of drug addicts, criminals and mental cases.

In the same way, though, also communism, fascism and nazism are defended by that they started off well with some good ideas. But that can never diminish or indemnify their damage.

An autocracy always remains an autocracy. The Church of Scientology in my opinion thereby remains hopelessly controversial and doubtful, like all monotheistic religions governed by a centralized organization, like the Catholic Church and Islam.

God save us from all religious paranoia and power complex! And may God deliver us from all religious fanaticism and bigotry!

One last reservation: I am only against Scientology as an autocracy, not as an applied philosophy. This distinction is vital.

In the same way, I am only against all religions as autocratic and destructive influences in politics, like in Iran. Please let me not disturb anybody's sacred faith.

No offence! Only just criticism.

July 1999.

John Bede, Londonderry.

*(This article is a revised and renewed version of a WES article from 1996.)*

### *The Jesus Debate,*

*by John B. Westerberg.*

The first thing to be said about the Bible and its God (in all its various versions, interpretations and definitions,) is, that no one ever has any right to try to bereave the Jews of this theology or the right which it gives them to call themselves *God's chosen people*. At the same time, this is the ground for all theology, without which no theology is possible, which always has been the major stumbling block to all other peoples concerning the God of the Bible. The eternal protest has been: "Why should the Jews be so special?" This has been the motivation for all antisemitism of all times and the launching pad to all persecutions. All revolts against Jewry including those of Karl Marx, Islam, atheism and communism have sprung from this argument. These eternal revolts against the Jewish monopoly on God will probably continue forever, and they will always continue to abort. They have always failed and will always fail. No man can indulge in a more foolish task than this meaningless revolt. Already Cain, already Sodom and Gomorra, already Pharaoh of Egypt, already the Assyrians and the Babylonians, already Haman in Persia, already Rome failed in this task, and humanity has never learned from all these perpetually aborted examples. The only aim reached in all these attacks against the Jewish monopoly on God is that the Jews have been inflicted griefs and damages to no gain for anyone. The Jews have their right to their God as he is described in the Old Testament, and no one has any right to even try to inflict on this right to religious freedom. Other peoples, though, have exactly the same right to the same God - if they respect the Jews.

We need to say no more about the Old Testament. Before embarking on the Jesus case I wish to defend Pythagoras in a parenthesis. The noble pacifist philosophy as it was developed in Greece after the fall of the state of Israel could be described as the best possible alternative to monotheism, since it is clinically free from all the disadvantages of monotheism. The risk of having one all-powerful abstract God as the highest spiritual *and* secular authority is that such a conception implies self-imposed authority and power, and all power corrupts. God is the most ingenious justification for autocracy. Not even king David or Solomon succeeded in avoiding getting corrupt by the power position they held by having it confirmed by the dogma of the all-powerful God of Israel. That God from the very beginning equalled power, became the nemesis of monotheism from its very start; and all monotheistic religions were ruined from the

beginning by this, especially Christianity and Islam. This could be described as the unavoidable, unsolvable and self-destructive dilemma of monotheism.

What a relief then is not the Greek philosophy with its unto perfection developed logic thinking and reasoning, which with indefatigable pains tried to find logic explanations to everything and almost succeeded. Without doubt, the greatest lengths were reached by Pythagoras and Plato, and their systems are still tenable today. What a marvellous contrast against all the secular turbulence and vanity caused by that power justified by God leading to infinite mess through war and violence, uncompromising one-sidedness, astronomical political stupidity, brute force, intolerance and plain barbarity! Against that background of all the misery caused by monotheism through eternal power struggles and ceaseless wars all over the world, those peaceful Greek philosophical solutions to the world enigmas must appear a better alternative. And being a philosopher doesn't have to mean that you are an atheist or a materialist.

Now we reach that most controversial case of Jesus. Who was he? At least he was a human being. Everything else is uncertain. It has been doubted whether he existed at all, but such remonstrations are as meaningless as to deny the existence of one Homer or Shakespeare on the grounds of no evidence to prove that they wrote what was published under their names. The Homeric poems and the Elizabethan dramas exist, and someone must have written them. If tradition then mentions Homer and Shakespeare as the authors, no one has any right to deny their authorship unless he can prove they did *not* write their works. It's the same thing with Jesus.

A basic misunderstanding is his name. His real name was Yeshùa, which is the same name which was carried by Joshua the successor to Moses, king Josiah of Israel, the prophet Hosea and Jesus the son of Syrach in the Old Testament Apocrypha, in other words a very ordinary name, like John in English. Some people claim that Jesus in fact lived some hundred years before Christ and that the gospels is a construction based on another Jesus a hundred years earlier. That's like claiming that a novel about a certain John in fact is a distortion of the story of another person named John who lived a century before the John of that novel. Jesus the son of Joseph, Yeshùa Bar Joseph, is as common a name at the time of Christ as John Andrews is in England today. These ridiculous speculations about different Jesuses probably come from the fact, that the unknown Jesus Bar Syrach of the Old Testament Apocrypha has very much in common as a personality with the New Testament Jesus and his teachings.

The controversy about Jesus is not really Jesus himself but rather what his disciples caused in the name of their master.

Before dealing with the disciples (the so called apostles) one by one, we must treat the Jesus case. Although *all* the gospels completely lack reliability (since they were written three decades after the death of Christ or later, and since they are biased and personal not to say tendentious,) they give a very clear picture of an undeniable human fate during the Roman occupation of Israel. He was of royal blood and heir to the throne of Israel, which mere possibility made the old sick king Herod extremely uneasy, who had no such heredity himself. He was related to John the Baptist, and it's not improbable that they were cousins, (so that Elizabeth would have been Mary's elder sister). Both were in close contact with the numerous freedom fighters' movements in Israel against Rome: the Zealots, the Nazarenes, the Essenes, the Sicarians, and others. After John the Baptist had publicly baptized Jesus and so to say launched his debut as an authority and leader among the prophets of Israel, Jesus takes full responsibility for that character. Many acknowledge him both as king and Messiah, and he acts very convincingly as if he was both. He challenges the Roman establishment by letting himself be greeted as king of Israel by entering Jerusalem riding on a donkey, which the Prophets had written the proper king would do. He continues the challenge by driving

all the marketeers out of the holy temple by force. He thereby assumes full responsibility both as king and high priest. No wonder then that the Romans dispose of him.

It's probable that the Gospel according to St. Matthew comes closest to the truth since it is the most convincing and realistic of the gospels. Here we have a Jesus who "doesn't bring peace but swords" and turns "the son against his father and the daughter against her mother" etc. This is no kind pacifist but a brave determined revolutionary, who definitely is subversive against present conditions, that is the Roman occupation of Israel and the position of the Sadducees as Quislings of the Romans. The Pharisees held a position in between of an almost diplomatic character. Jesus had friends among these, but he definitely turned the Sadducee party into his enemies.

The whole crucifixion drama is so outrageous and realistic in its vast complexity with so many differently acting figures, that this can't be any pure fabrication. Pontius Pilate is a historical person, procurator in Israel 26-36, and so are the different Herods and Quirinius, the procurator of Syria at the time. The historical factors are so numerous in the whole New Testament, that it's impossible to try to explain away Jesus as a historical person except by blind and biased idiocy and petty nonsense. He died a martyr to his cause as a rightful heir to the throne of Israel and as a witness of his religion; and it was the Romans, not the Jews (except the Sadducees), who executed him.

The less said about the disciples, the better - Jesus himself at times expressed his exasperation at their stupidity; but some of them went farther in folly than others. I will not dwell on the issues whether Simon Zelotes and Simon Peter were one and the same person or not, whether Thomas, Judas II and James II were the brothers of Jesus or not, if St. John the evangelist was the same as St. John of the Apocalypse or not. Interesting is that St. Thomas also is called "Didymus", the twin; but the name Thomas also means twin. Whose twin brother was he then? My guess is that he might have been the brother of Jesus as well as the so called St. Jude of the epistle, but that he hardly was Jesus' twin brother but might have been called "the twin" since he might have looked very much the same and been particularly close to the master. The apocryphal gospel of St. Thomas expresses a deeper understanding of Jesus and his words than any other gospel.

There is much to speak for the second James as a brother of Jesus, who became the leader of the Christians in Jerusalem after the master's death. He lived up to his responsibility, which led him into conflict with the upstart and maniac later called Paul.

The interesting thing about Simon Zelotes is that there even was a member of that sect, the fiercest of all resistance movements against the Romans, among Jesus' disciples. He might have been Peter himself, who then would have been a Zealot before Jesus converted him into St. Peter. Peter is also known to have used force as he raised his sword against the high priest's servant in the garden of Gethsemane and chopped of his ear - even in the last days of Jesus he apparently was quite ready to use force and violence. It is written that also some of the other disciples had weapons. (*"He that hath no sword, let him sell his garment and buy one."* St. Luke 22:36) Obviously they expected some attack at any time, so maybe it was for some reason that the Romans sent a whole army unit of at least 500 soldiers to the garden of Gethsemane.

Judas Iscariot was probably also a Zealot. The name "Iscariot" is most probably a mistaken spelling of "Sicariot", which was another nomination of a "Zealot". The Sicariots were the most fanatical among the Zealots. The tragical despair and innocence of poor Judas I have treated earlier.

Paul was a Roman citizen and was paid by the Romans to follow their command and persecute the Christians, until he suddenly changed his mind and became a Christian himself. But he became more than a Christian. Apparently he was a man of

exaggerations, and he overdid Christianity into something that no longer was Jewish. He must have had some constant objection against the Jewish authorities, who maybe had brought him up too hard. He had never met Jesus and could in no way have any real impression of him, wherefore he had nothing to go on except the legends. His letters are regarded as the oldest writings of the New Testament. They start the tendentious literature of Christianity on no other ground than an outrageous mythomania. Jesus is made into the Son of God, the unavoidable speculations about the empty grave Paul transforms into the dogma of the resurrection of the flesh; and his myths and fanaticism for the Jesus cult creates such a confusion among the Christians, that when Paul has missioned in Turkey and Greece, the Lord's brother James must in despair send out other missionaries after him to undo the disastrous effects of his boundless mythomania. Thus occurs the first great schism among the Christians between Paul on one side and James with Peter on the other. These tried to avoid the separation of the Christians from the Jews, but the intense labours of Paul compelled this to happen.

The doings of St. Paul are indeed for good and evil. On one hand he starts off the triumphant Christian conquest of the world, which he leads with the same adroitness as Mahomet 600 years later carried on the Muslim conquest of the world; but on the other hand he debases Christianity into an intolerant and dogmatic autocracy, which ruthlessly extirpates all opposition and does not tolerate any argument or criticism against the established myths of Paul. Again we see the ugly monster bastard of monotheism: authority gives power, which breeds corruption, cruelty and violence. Thus Christianity became the fatal executioner of classical antiquity with its wonderful cultural world of Pythagorean enlightenment. This devastating narrow-minded intolerance was exclusively the result of Paul's hard labour and dogmatization.

After the introduction of Paul's eloquent mythomania in eminent letters, the gospels were written more or less under their influence in the same vein. It's important to note, that the gospels were written *after* the incineration of Rome, *after* the first persecution of the Christians, and *after* the destruction of Jerusalem, when all Jewish resistance against Roman oppression had been destroyed and Jewry was reduced to martyred ashes. The Christians had earlier been persecuted together with the Jews - the emperor Claudius for instance made no difference. From this the tendency evolved to try to lick the Romans and blame the death of Jesus on the Jews. This was a political necessity. Otherwise Christianity would never have been able to take over Rome.

The most objective of the gospels is that of St. Mark, the disciple of Peter, which probably also is the oldest of the gospels. I already mentioned St. Matthew. Doctor Luke was a disciple of Paul and wandered completely in his shadow under his influence, but was more careful about his investigations into the matter than Paul. John finally gave his very own personal version of things, inspired by Paul's successful mythomania and eagerness for establishing a lasting cult, and was obviously also bent on establishing his own position for eternity as Jesus' favourite. There is nothing to prove that he did not also write the Apocalypse as a definite stamp on Christianity as a very subversive revolt movement against the Romans.

Theologians of the future face the very difficult and serious task of separating Jesus the man from Jesus the cult figure, distilling truth from myth. To reconstruct what really happened after 2000 years is of course tremendously difficult, but you can always start by cleaning up among the myths, where most if not everything is dusty old lies. On the whole, Jesus the cult figure is just an artificial construction which was fashioned for opportunistic reasons to make way for the career of the militant Church as a political world power.

These necessary settlements must not in any way however harm or threaten the institutions. I rather believe that these only can survive if they undergo a clean sweep. By the institutions I mean the churches, the Orthodox Church, the Catholic Church, the Protestant Church, the Calvinist Church, the Coptic Church, the Anglican Church and almost all Christian churches. They are all as holy as Jewry by their mere faithfulness towards the religious literature and the worship of the idea of God.

Let that be the end of this theological discourse this time. I hope you have not found the topic too boring and exhausting. I apologize, but the subject is comprehensive.

*John."*

## *Scientifical Problems and Speculations.*

The Strange Case of Giordano Bruno  
Concerning the Bomb  
Plutonic Problems  
Concerning Information Technique  
Doctor Sandy on the Drug Situation  
Concerning Drug Liberalization  
The Strange Case of Jonathan Swift  
John Westerberg Concerning UFO  
The Consumption Society  
Concerning Einstein, *by Doctor Sandy*  
One of the Most Exciting Books of Our Time (*Podvoll*)

### *The Strange Case of Giordano Bruno (1548-1600)*

He was definitely the bravest of all the 16th century pioneers within astronomy and the only true martyr for empirical science. Yet he began as a Dominican friar and was even ordained a priest. His home town was Nola close to Naples, where he already as a young man began to have some doubts concerning Christian dogmas and was even accused of heresy. As a result, he left Church and commenced his most remarkable life as an itinerant philosopher all over Europe. In Paris he was at the court of king Henry III; in England he was a friend of Sir Philip Sidney (1554-86) and probably appeared at the court of Queen Elizabeth. In England he felt comfortable enough to publish his most important writings and applied for a professorship at Oxford, which regrettably was denied. He spent two years at the university of Wittenberg, Martin Luther's Vatican, where he enjoyed the highest appreciation; but also at the court of Rudolph II in Prague he found a safe environment. He also spent some years in Geneva studying Calvinism for a possible conversion, but also there he met some conflicts with established dogma.

He was the first astronomer to point out that the stars were other stars like the sun, and he also discovered the poles to be flattened at the poles. He embraced the Copernican theories as soon as he first became familiar with them, which of course

brought him into an everlasting conflict with the Church. Copernicus himself had got away with it: he published his revolutionary theories and succeeded in passing away before the Church had had time to organize a proper excommunication with demands of their withdrawal. Also Leonardo da Vinci dabbled with astronomy and got away with his heretical findings by never publishing anything and by only experimenting in secret. Giordano Bruno preferred to take a stand for the new astronomy openly, never be afraid of speaking his mind and never show any sign of weakness or fear. The only thing you can blame him for is incautiousness.

In Prague he received an invitation to Venice by a nobleman, which offered a situation in which he could move and teach freely in Venice and Padua. In the belief that the Republic of Venice was out of the Vatican grasp, he accepted and taught science and astronomy liberally for years; but his host, the noble Giovanni Mocenigo, was not satisfied with Bruno's activities and denounced him to the inquisition. This treason is probably the most shameful in academic history since the first university was founded. Mocenigo not only betrayed Giordano Bruno but even acted as his prosecutor, improving his carefully considered accusations after that Bruno had been arrested.

This happened in May 1592, and the trials of Giordano Bruno started off at once. In July two months later Bruno regretted and withdrew all his teachings and theories probably after sessions of torture. In spite of this he was not released but instead sent down to Rome for further investigation.

The process in Rome against Giordano Bruno went on for seven years behind barred gates, during which period he was kept imprisoned in Castel Sant'Angelo, originally the mausoleum of the most liberal and tolerant of Roman emperors, Hadrian, which the popes had converted to dungeons. We know nothing about this process. The end result, however, seems to have been, that Giordano Bruno towards the end of 1599 regretted and withdrew that he had ever regretted and withdrawn anything he earlier had professed. Thus he rectified his break-down in Venice in July 1592. For this he was condemned to be publicly burnt at the stake. The execution took place on the 17th February 1600.

Unjustly, Giordano Bruno has been shaded over by the other great astronomers of his age, particularly Galilei, who at Bruno's death was in his middle 30s and kept busy in Pisa. Also Kepler and Tycho Brahe, who met in Prague three days before Bruno's execution, have been awarded greater fame, since they managed to survive. Today it seems absurd that Bruno should have had to be executed because he believed Copernicus was right. That was not the reason, though, why he was executed. His greatest thrust in life was something much bolder.

Giordano Bruno presented a new theology, which made a clean sweep with all superstition. To Giordano Bruno, God was as impersonal as to Buddhism and Hinduism and just as ubiquitous and omnipresent in all forms of life in the whole universe. This could hardly be regarded as very sinful or irritating either. The consequence, though, was for Bruno, that Christ was not the Son of God. This daring thesis galled the Church and its inquisition into madness and hysteria. Professing such a thesis was about the most provocative and forbidden thing that any thinker could apply himself to in the 16th century. By Bruno's extremely solid basis of knowledge and education, universally acclaimed in the whole academic world as a universal man, his uncompromising adherence to this one impossible thesis made the Church shake in her very foundations. It was worse than the whole reformation.

The Vatican tried her utmost to silence him down and almost succeeded. By neither executing nor releasing him during a process of seven years, he was kept buried alive and in death's silence while the world in total ignorance of his fate dared to speak no word about him. There was only one way out of this dilemma, which Bruno finally

found himself: by standing up to his own belief in what he felt to be the truth, angering his judges and provoking the Church to blind fury, he tempted the Church to complete digging the grave of its own credibility by committing the worst judicial error of the age. Bruno was not guilty of anything except freedom of conscience and speech.

Bruno was unique in that he had to stand completely alone. No one before him or after him dared to tread in the boldness of his footsteps. To many, his world of thought became immeasurably important and influential, particularly to the astronomers Galilei, Kepler and Brahe, but also to philosophers like Spinoza, Goethe, Schopenhauer and Rudolf Steiner; but none of his followers showed the same consistency and courage in his life's work. Galilei withdrew anything at the mere sight of the instruments of torture, Spinoza enclosed himself in safety within the soft frames of theoretical philosophy, Goethe was terror-struck at the mere idea of challenging the existing order of the world, Schopenhauer protected himself by veiling himself in pessimistic resignation, while Rudolf Steiner followed Goethe's safe policy of restricting himself to constructivism. The boldness of Giordano Bruno is still unmatched today, and he is still waiting for a lawyer to defend him against the Roman inquisition.

### *Concerning the Bomb*

The supreme responsibility was partly held by Einstein. Three years before the second world war he insisted on the development of the atomic bomb considering the development of Germany. His motive was the risk of Germany developing the same bomb, which would be the ultimate world nightmare scenery. President Roosevelt approved of Einstein's views and arguments and launched the Manhattan project.

Some years before Hiroshima, it became evident that Germany would not and could not develop the bomb. The great crime concerning the bomb was committed when the general in charge of the Manhattan project withheld this vital information to Robert Oppenheimer and his colleagues. The general decided to proceed with the bomb although the only justifying reason for developing it had vanished.

When the bomb was used the official motive was to save human lives, that is American lives. In America the only possible alternative was considered an invasion of Hondo, the heartland of Japan, which would cost an enormous amount of American lives, at least an estimated million. What they didn't know in America was that Japan already before the bomb was used had appealed to Russia for peace negotiations. Since Russia was not yet at war with Japan, the Japanese found Russia (Stalin and Molotov) a proper peace negotiator. But Stalin closed the door and said nothing about Japan's pleadings to America, since Stalin looked forward to the pleasure of invading Japan and occupying a few of her strategic islands.

If Russia had accepted Japan's effort to make peace, a quick end to the war could have been achieved without any further loss of American lives and without the use of any atomic bombs. Stalin's responsibility concerning Hiroshima and Nagasaki is therefore terrible and almost total, since he knew about the bomb. After Truman having released the bomb, Stalin occupied southern Sakhalin and the Kuril islands.

Nothing, however, can excuse the second bomb on Nagasaki. One bomb was more than enough and utterly unnecessary and inhuman as an enterprise. In a matter of seconds, 130,000 civilians of Hiroshima were killed for nothing out of 250,000, while another 114,000 were injured for life, most of whom died from the consequences of radiation. Nagasaki saw another 120,000 civilian victims.

The pilots dropping the bombs considered the mission a great honour and quarrelled about who was to press the buttons. Like French Mururoa soldiers much

later, who sank Greenpeace ships and harassed environment activists, they were officially decorated and awarded public honours.

One of the first to turn against the use of the bomb after Hiroshima was Robert Oppenheimer, its chief manufacturer. He considered the Manhattan project a necessary experiment, but after the tests and the use of the bomb in warfare with results horrifyingly unspeakable and unsurveyable in timeless destructiveness, he pronounced further development unpardonable.

All the same, the world proceeded with the USA, Russia, France, Britain and China leading followed by India, maybe Israel and maybe other countries. And China is still exploding bombs 50 years after Hiroshima, and even France, charming intelligent France, who made the film "*Hiroshima mon amour*", the strongest of all film protests against war.

Einstein's supreme world nightmare scenery finally came true. The bomb was never acquired by a dictatorship like Hitler's Germany, but it was acquired by the dictatorship of both Stalin and China, which latter nation still remains the world's greatest and most oppressive autocracy.

### *Plutonic Problems*

The Plutonium problem is, that humankind has been busy for 50 years in manufacturing this highly radioactive product, which is a perfectly artificial element, which never previously existed on earth. Man devoted himself to this production most liberally and effectively in order to bring forth nuclear weapons, about a number of 60,000, the overwhelming majority in the USA and in the former Soviet Union. Since the days of Michael Gorbachev, efforts have been made to dismantle all these superfluous and absurd nuclear weapons to a number of about 30,000. You have been able to dismantle everything in them except the Plutonium itself. Then, after 40 years' Plutonium manufacturing for 60,000 atomic bombs, scientists are for the first time forced to face the problem: Whatever shall we do with all that Plutonium? (The same problem rose within architecture when all the monsters of Le Corbusier and the American earthquake-proof skyscrapers had been built: "However do you take the darn thing down?") Since it is such an extremely artificial and unnatural element, it doesn't break down and dissolve except after a period of 250,000 years. One single atom of Plutonium then can't be broken up naturally during the whole lifetime of a human being but possibly during 3500 lifetimes.

This is the problem. In Japan they tried to whisk the problem away by insisting that the Plutonic danger was exaggerated, that Plutonium wasn't all that dangerous and that it even could pass through the digestion canal without causing any problem. To prove this, a famous Japanese scientist had a drink with the smallest thinkable touch of Plutonium in it, which was broadcast on television all over the country. He died. Then the Japanese had to reconsider the matter.

There are four possibilities to dispose of Plutonium. The first choice is the worst: to blow it off with the nuclear weapons which contain it. The second is to send it with rockets to the sun. If then a rocket explodes after take-off, like the "Challenger" space shuttle, a whole continent could be polluted by radioactive rains, which is not so good either. The third way is to store it. This is the most common way to keep the problem alive, and there are a number of vast Plutonium depots with the Plutonium in great barrels of steel stored in bunkers, which are guarded day and night, just waiting for a terrorist or thief to break in and steal a barrel or two. In Russia the surveillance is unsatisfactory or doesn't exist. The fourth alternative is to re-use it in nuclear reactors,

but this method is expensive, and it takes many reusing processes before it is neutralized.

What this fabrication of Plutonium has cost economically during 50 years you can get a vague idea of, when you learn, that it costs 300,000 dollars just to disarm and dismantle one single nuclear missile. It is a topic of discussion what is more expensive: to produce Plutonium and nuclear weapons or to dismantle them. It is probably more expensive to dismantle them.

And this production the leading political powers of humanity have been extremely busy with for 50 years and that unpunished, while they have ignored the world environment crisis, the world starvation and all human values. It speaks for itself, that the most pressing task in the world for scientists and scientific research would be to find a more efficient way of disposing of the world's most poisonous element. If man himself managed to find a way of producing it, then surely he must also be able to find out a harmless way of getting rid of it.

### *Concerning Information Technique*

The old agricultural society was all about growing cereals, baking bread, churning milk and breeding domestic animals, so that everyone could eat and survive. It was a very economical system within the frame of nature according to her own rhythm. Then appeared the industrial society. It was all about industrialization and making machines do the hard work for you, which also provided you with food, because it made it possible to can food and preserve meat in refrigerators without any risk of its going to rot. The industrial society resulted in better economy for everyone so that no one had to starve.

And then comes the IT-society. What's it all about? Information technique. What is information technique? It is the technology of surfing on the net. How can that technology solve the problem of unemployment and starvation in Zaire and Rwanda among other places? Can you provide starving multitudes with food by surfing on the net? Hardly. Can anyone be fed or have some more icecream by surfing on the net? No way. Whatever can you gain then by surfing on the net? Oh dear, you can have lots of fun. You can learn how to build your own bombs and grow your own cannabis. And what's the use of that? I mean, both the agricultural society and the industrial society imported some common good for everyone, so that everyone in the world at least could have cheap canned baked beans. But the Information Technique Society? Who can eat his fill on that? Can it do anything about the growing unemployment problem in the world, where fewer and fewer have any kind of salary while more and more grow ill and have to be taken care of? Is the IT-society by its constantly increasing investments in computers able to give the sick and the unemployed food and money and constantly more expensive anti-depressive medicines? We just wonder.

### *Doctor Sandy on the Drug Situation*

"The situation is grotesque and only grows worse. Drugs have been accepted all around the world (except in Moslem countries) as something as common as coffee or tobacco, and it's nobody's fault. You can only blame that untouchable temporary god called Fashion. Taking dope of any kind in any way has become accepted by Fashion, and there is no reasoning with Fashion, because she is never ruled by common sense.

The arguments against this morbid tyranny of Fashion are overwhelming. Heaviest is the fact, that the use of drugs of any kind causes irreparable brain damage - in fact, schizophrenia is one of the most usual results. The increased use of synthetic drugs ("safe" drugs or "smart" drugs) also increases the rate of schizophrenia, the most terrible of brain diseases, because it is the only disease which you never yourself can evaluate or detach yourself from.

Although this is the heaviest argument, it is almost never used. Like in the case of Aids, people in social positions with some responsibility prefer not to scare people and rather silence awkward truths which never can become popular.

But the unsurmountable difficulty in the war against drugs is the unreasonable dictatorship of Fashion. As long as Fashion allows the abuse, which makes it not only acceptable *à la mode* but even popular, it is quite impossible for common sense to do anything about it. Common sense can never be silenced, but Fashion, the capricious Queen of history, can never be overruled.

On the other hand, this abuse is not only of drugs. There are more medicine addicts than drug addicts, and I personally regard the manufacturers and salesmen of medicine as the greatest drug mafia in the world, in accordance with my own definition of health: a healthy person is someone who has no need of taking medicine *and who does not take any.*

Yours,

- Doctor Sandy"

### *Concerning Drug Liberalization,*

*by John B. Westerberg.*

"My dear colleague, according to your wish that I would make myself guilty of taking stands in the question of drug liberalization I will give my view of the matter. I fully understand that you can't take stands yourself since you have never tried any drugs.

It's innocent. It's as innocent as drinking beer. It's as innocent as the first big booze in youth. It's as *comme il faut* as the first whisky. It's not worse than the first hang-over. You get used to it. There are more hang-overs, and you get used to them. But alcohol is base and degrading. It's more sophisticated to smoke. Most people start smoking because it's smart. Most people start smoking cannabis because it's thrilling since it's forbidden. Most people continue to drug themselves since it's thrilling and dangerous. Everything dangerous and forbidden is attractive to youth, for that is part of human nature. Sooner or later you get bored by just cannabis. There is heftier stuff. You get on with it. You try all kinds of things. You get higher every time. And then comes the first backfire trip. And by then you are already hopelessly hooked.

What you never suspected before then was that it would prove so difficult to get out of it. Once a junky always a junky is unfortunately a rule the only remedy against which is that there are exceptions. But even the exceptions maintain their stamp for life, just like in Alcoholics Anonymous.

This was a description of the black hole, its anatomy and how it works. It's characteristic that the urge constantly increases, the whirlpool grows by its own natural force and inevitably expands, the more that are involved, the greater its power and expansion potential, it's not an octopus but an irresistible natural force, like an avalanche never reaching its bottom. From whence comes this overwhelmingly irresistible power?

It's good business. That's how simple it is. Illegal drugs is the greatest business in the world today. Ask the Colombia cartels, the US Mafiosi, the Hongkong triads, the Russian Mafia, the Turkish Mafia and all others profiting from this booming business, for that's what it is. It's a multinational enterprise constantly reaping greater harvests and accelerating profits which can't be controlled by any politician or political power. On the contrary: this business is more and more controlling them. How many stock dealers, mayors, governors and company directors are not dependent on drugs in the USA, and what American family does not have a drug addict in the family? The answer to that question is too obvious to be voiced.

There you have your next Empire of Evil, which will culminate next century. That will be a good start for humanity on the next millennium. When that empire of evil will have been coped with, there will be another Empire of Evil of another sort. Humanity will never get rid of it, since they always develop from human nature.

The situation is very much like that of communism a hundred years ago. Many were those who sympathized with the communists before the first world war mostly because their movement was thrilling and smelt of danger. Through this alluring image of semi-criminal underground subversive power, communism achieved an air of irresistible attraction. The same phenomenon you observe today in the world of drugs. The escape from reality by drugs is experienced as an irresistible temptation to all the suppressed ones in society attracted by the dangerously criminal, completely underground and subversive character of the uncontrolled freedom through drugs. In his weakness man has always fallen to temptations of that kind and historically never learned anything from the consequences.

One who perhaps scrutinized the problem most carefully of all was Dostoyevsky, who lived with the problem all his life. He took part in socialism in his youth, it was for his subversive socialism that he was sent to Siberia, this ruined his life, which gave him reason enough to ruminate upon the problem. The result was the extremely poignant investigation of the mentality in "*The Possessed*", where he categorically denounces socialism and that part of human nature which gives rise to such phenomena. It's his most important novel. It's a perfectly honest settlement with his own part in the phenomenon: the fascination of evil, the temptation to fanaticism, the redeeming self-sacrifice for the mass movement and the moral bankruptcy and unavoidable surrender to the principle of infallibility in the mentality of "the end justifies the means". The mentality in 19th century pioneer communism was exactly the same as in the first rebel drug movements in the 1960's."

### *The Strange Case of Jonathan Swift*

After Christmas was broadcast a wonderful new adaptation of "Gulliver's Travels". Earlier I believe only the Lilliput episode has been dramatized and filmed, but in this version you had not only Brobdingnag but also such illustrious places as Balnibarbi, Maldonada, Lagado and Glubbdubdrib, and the film even offered live luggnaggians and struldbrugians and, to top it all, yahoos and houyhnhnms. You even had a most visual experience of Laputa.

Laputa is described as the island that floats in the sky. It hovers strangely far above the earth and has a completely blank underneath, which has led some to suppose, that the description of Laputa is nought else than the author's own experience of a rendezvous with a flying saucer.

As we all know, Jonathan Swift was quite bizarre. He stayed a bachelor all his life, and the worst thing he could imagine was to be obliged to accept a state of being

dependent. His boundless imagination demanded complete freedom of mind without encroachments and infringements. Born Irish, he could only find this vital freedom on that savage island, although he found it necessary to accept a dean's position in order to support himself. "Gulliver's Travels" appeared when he was about 60 and is more than any of his other works a flamboyant proof of his reckless freedom of thought and imagination, which to some felt offensive and unhuman.

Dean Swift was above all a ruthless satirist with such a sober detachment from reality that the keenness of his satires almost alienates him from human society. Although the journey to Laputa is the mildest episode in "Gulliver's Travels", it can well be regarded as maybe the most significant, since according to modern experts it could explain Swift's later case of mental illness.

Last autumn were transmitted two American programs about people who claimed to have been kidnapped by UFO:s and never quite afterwards have become the same again. They asserted that they had been used as guinea-pigs and experimented on by ET:s, who then had eradicated the victims' memories of the experience as unwilling guests in the saucer in a sort of brainwash shock therapy. But the trauma had stuck in the brain anyway, and they had been alienated from human society for the rest of their lives.

Certain experts in that field claim that the same thing could have happened to Jonathan Swift and that he himself testifies of this in his journey to Laputa, and that this would have alienated him and in the course of time resulted in his mental illness.

In the American film the "Gulliver case" had been dramatized most exaggeratedly, so that an extra Gulliver drama had been invented, in which Gulliver himself is experimented on by 18th century psychiatrists and locked up in an asylum. Strange in this version is, that Gulliver with all who believe in him are Americans while all his doctors and enemies are English. But that is quite another topic not relevant to our discussion.

You can't escape the fact, that the theory of Laputa having been a flying saucer, and that this episode then could be the most realistic one in the entire "Gulliver's Travels", is interesting. That reminds you of the prophet Ezekiel's most intriguing description in the Old Testament:

"And I looked, and, behold, a whirlwind came out of the north, a great cloud, and a fire infolding itself, and a brightness was about it, and out of the midst thereof as the colour of amber, out of the midst of the fire." (1:4)

"The appearance of the wheels and their work was like unto the colour of a beryl; and they four had one likeness; and their appearance and their work was as it were a wheel in the middle of a wheel." (1:16)

"And the likeness of the firmament upon the heads of the living creature was as the colour of the terrible crystal, stretched forth over their heads above." (1:22)

"And above the firmament that was over their heads was the likeness of a throne, as the appearance of a sapphire stone; and upon the likeness of the throne was the likeness as the appearance of a man above upon it." (1:26)

"As the appearance of the bow that is in the cloud in the day of rain, so was the appearance of the brightness round about." (1:28)

Nowhere in the world is the commitment and interest in UFO phenomena as vivid as in Israel.

Our theologian in the Himalayas, mr John B. Westerberg, has the following interesting views on the UFO issue:

"The UFO problem is that he who observes it can never count on anyone believing him.

How convinced he is himself is of no matter.

As unidentified flying objects the UFO have namely a disappointing habit of never leaving any visiting-cards behind.

They appear from the sky and disappear in the sky.

They land without wheels and so never leave any traces on earth.

How difficult it is for them to prove themselves is shown in the fact that not even photographs of them can be taken seriously.

They have appeared on earth since the beginning of time, they are described in the Bible, but since only a very small number have actually seen them, only a very small number can really believe in them.

I will never tell anyone that I have been in contact with UFO since I know that no one will ever believe me.

There are different theories that they come as tourists, as kidnappers on a hunt for guinea-pigs, or as protectors and benefactors. I can only say that none of the different theories can be proved wrong.

Perhaps my only comfort is, that even if no one can prove beyond a shadow of a doubt that UFO exist, no one has neither ever been able to prove that they do not exist.

So it appears to be a question of faith, just like God, who neither can be proved to exist or not to exist, but with a difference: the faith in UFO and science fiction can never be made a religion, since, in contrary to God, we are here dealing with concrete creatures and palpable objects.

Therefore man prefers to believe in God, who never can be made manifest, than in UFO, which can turn out too manifest for their pleasure, so that people even suppress their experience of them.

All things real and tangible can be suppressed, but never the essence of God."

The greatest problem about UFO seems then to be, that those who have experienced UFO never can make themselves understandable to ordinary people who have not experienced UFO. They seem to have reached some kind of insight into an extra dimension which we ordinary people can not fathom. The phenomenon is the same as when an astrologer tries to explain his reality to a materialist. Judging from his experience, the materialist must reach the conclusion that the astrologer is out of his mind, while the astrologer feels the painful loneliness of having a certainness of knowledge which he can't make understandable to others, the so called "Cassandra syndrome". (Cassandra was the prophetess in ancient Troy who prophesied the fall of Troy while the Trojans just laughed at her. As we all know they found reason to regret this later on when it was too late to do anything about it.)

Diagnosticized schizophrenia does then not necessarily have to be a state of mental alienation but could sometimes be the opposite: insight into a higher reality which for ordinary people is incomprehensible.

Perhaps one day we shall have good reason to withdraw all doubts in UFO. But until today it has not been possible to scientifically prove that one single documented UFO observation actually has taken place.

### *John Westerberg Concerning UFO*

In the Swedish issues of "The Free Thinker" we have published the brief autobiography of John B. Westerberg entitled "The Holy Obligation of Silence", which has given rise to

a considerable amount of interest but also some objections. Here is one of them from John Bede in Ireland:

".....

I am no materialist, but I don't think that anyone ever has understood God. As a comment on your most interesting UFO article I would like to express my belief, that Moses was guided by UFO and was finally fetched by one, just like Elijah and maybe even Jesus. The most part of the Old Testament I regard as a UFO story. That's why I think Israel, believing the presence of UFO to be the face of God, always has been more materialistic than truly religious.

But my first invective against Mr Westerberg concerns his chief hobby-horse "the holy obligation of silence". I feel fully convinced that only backward underground movements like satanic sects really need such an obligation of silence to conceal their own lies. The strictest observer in the world today of this religious "obligation of silence" is Islam: fundamentalistic terrorists never reveal anything; while you can only trust and have faith in what is open to discussion, investigation and criticism. So I have to doubt Mr Westerberg's "holy obligation of silence". He uses this sign of respectability to conceal the weakest of all soft spots: a gap, maybe a black hole. What is he afraid of will become known?"

"Of all the queries you have sent me, your friend John Bede's invectives arouse my greatest interest. (...) Since you have dared to publish a rather comprehensive article on UFO including some lines by me, I will dare to go one step further.

We are here dealing only with theories. Nothing can be proved. Although Americans and Russians for 50 years have run different UFO investigation projects, there is still after these 50 years not one proven UFO manifestation in the entire world history. The only certain thing about UFO is that the UFO theories exist, and all these extremely varying UFO theories can not be explained away. Many of them have been proven false, most of them can be refuted, but there always remains a small portion that can not be explained away.

We have the Nazca plateau in Peru with its inexplicable mysteries. We have the historical fact that giant pyramids of the same kind were constructed suddenly and almost simultaneously in Egypt, Babylon and Mexico. We have the ineradicable stories of Atlantis, Mu, Lemuria and other lost civilizations. I will not deal with any of these vast subjects. Instead I would like to go further away and further back in time to other planets in our solar system.

Further away from the sun than the earth we have the smaller planet of Mars, which is very similar to Earth, since it has an atmosphere and water. But the atmosphere is very thin, and the water is drying out. You can't deny the probability that the planet Mars once had more water and a denser atmosphere. This gives rise to the theory that Mars long ago was like Earth with oceans of water and fertile continents, but that somehow the water ran out and the atmosphere vanished, which is now also gradually happening on earth by the expanding deserts and the increasing ozone holes by the poles.

Between Mars and Jupiter we have a number of small heavenly bodies called the asteroids. There is no other explanation to these asteroids than that they once were a planet. How then could this planet have become so many asteroids? There is a creepy theory that it was once a planet like Earth with the same developed technology as we have today, but that they committed the mistake of pressing the red button for launching a nuclear war, and so the whole planet was blown to pieces, a theory which is scarily plausible. Earth has had this technological capacity and has it still. This theory about the asteroids could also explain the otherwise unexplainable strange location and

twisted orbit of the small planet Pluto far away beyond the solar system, where it could have been thrown out from an earlier orbit closer to the sun by the explosive world suicide of this X-planet by nuclear reactions comprising the whole planet blowing it all into bits and pieces.

The consequence of these theories is the desirability that Earth does not commit the same mistake of blowing itself into pieces or transforming itself into a red desert dying planet like Mars. We don't have an affluence of living planets in this solar system, we seem in fact to be the only one, since we can't trust Venus. So it turns out to be vital that Earth does not enter into an atomic war, suffers from too many ocean draughts or loses its atmosphere.

How then could this be avoided? A nuclear war was avoided with difficulty in 1962 but has since then been avoided with increasing success, but we still run the risk, although the processes of eliminating the danger continue in right directions. The security risks are mainly autocracies like China and Iran. That these autocracies first of all are transformed into democracies is a necessity for greater world security on the nuclear front.

The oceans are not exactly running the risk of drying out, but the ozone holes by the poles are increasingly risking life on earth by letting through lethal radiation from the sun, which is a result from the global environment destruction. This must be stopped. The deforestation of the planet must cease, especially the rain forests have to be protected, and you have to stop the world population explosion. The worst environmental crisis of all must be stopped: the uncontrolled urbanization, causing monster cities of more than 10 million inhabitants, where everyone feels sick and no one can breathe properly. These are poison centres to all humanity, breeding a new kind of human animal which is completely denaturalized and artificial and damaged by the environment from his birth. I regard these monstrous eight-figure slum cities as the world's greatest danger to humanity and civilization, and no one has any idea how to solve this problem.

First of all I think these great cities must be rehumanized. Environments like Los Angeles, Tokyo and Johannesburg are not human environments but monster environments causing vicious circles of criminality, violence, sterility, cancer and what is worse. Such environments contribute to the dehumanization of humanity, more irresponsibility and power abuse, greater apathy and unwillingness to do anything about it.

What is then the obstacle to this utterly necessary global assuming of responsibility, which everyone living on this planet should partake in, since their mere presence on it demands their responsibility? The greatest hindrance is human self-love. In practice this self-love is the supreme law for the human being. If you in the least hurt the self-love of anyone and breaks this unwritten law, you are an outcast from the human society.

Therefore you have to do away with this self-love with all its expressions like prestige thinking, ideologies, presumptuous religions, greed, thirst for power, fixed positions, partiality and so forth. To accomplish this we need a universal revolution consisting of each one's own private settlement with his own self-love, which is pure narcissism, which when allowed free reins only will lead to suicide, dissolution and extinction.

My secret, to return to the query of John Bede, is maybe then my self-negation, which I think every human being should apply himself to in order to in the long run save the life of this planet."

JBW. (March 1997)

*Comment.* The above mentioned theories concerning Mars and the asteroids have earlier been advocated by Jules Verne and Dennis Wheatley among others. If there is something to them, one of the most interesting professions of the future would then be *space archaeology*.

### *The Consumption Society.*

It could be likened to a holy cow type "Belgian Blue" but of more astronomic proportions, since this holy cow is not only worshipped and blindly respected as an infallible authority and law all over the world, but also has certain characteristics which all people find it best to turn a very blind eye to. These characteristics are the marks of a bad-tempered bull in a china-shop but of rather astronomic proportions, since this bull in steady acceleration is running wild.

Who cares what sources of water are contaminated, what if rain forests are turned into deserts, of what consequence are the garbage mountains of New York growing higher than skyscrapers, as long as man undisturbedly may continue abandoning himself to unlimited consumption of unimportant luxuries? Who cares if the whole atmosphere is poisoned by the oil fumes of man, so that the global warming constantly increases its pressure, as long as we may peacefully continue drive to work every morning alone in our cars, getting stuck all the time in queues of other cars with equally lonesome drivers? Who cares where all the waste dumps of uncomsumable plastics grow as long as we don't have to see them?

What would life be without Coca Cola and Pepsi Cola, hamburgers and MacDonaldis, sexy trash on television every night and day, beer, liquor and smoking with all the other neediest intoxications, noisy music everywhere and constant ubiquitous brainwash indoctrination through mass media? The answer is, that without all that, life might for a change become worth living.

The lethal blind alley of the artificial uncontrolled consumption society is that all things natural and human must suffer. The mortal stress of the consumption society leads to human relationships becoming predominantly aggressive, ending up in violence. The individual gets burned, isolates himself and is pushed by the hard society to criminality or mental problems. Natural communities disappear, by stress the aggressions take over the social domination, the hard urban society of concrete and asphalt is enforced, sterilizing the environment, and people in cities don't even notice how they gradually are poisoned by their own consumptive gases.

What then is to be done? There is only one thing to do. Abolish the whole consumption society with its unsound stress and bolting environmental destruction, the absurd hunt for meaningless luxuries, the incurably vulgar and ridiculous media publicity business and everything that can't be recycled. Of course, this can't be done all at once. First of all we must find alternatives to the energies, but these are on their way. It's only a question of time until the problem of making solar cells remunerative is solved, wind power is constantly increasing as a sensible source of energy, and also fusion energy, the cleanest possible energy form, only needs some time to have its problems solved and reach full workability. We are on the right course. Germany has already decided to dismantle all her nuclear power plants, and all since Greenpeace started their actions in 1971 the grass root movements all over the world have constantly grown more vital. More and more people realize that Non-Governmental Organizations do more good in the world than any chatterbox politician, and this tendency keeps expanding. More and more people realize that you can be of more

constructive and practical use working on your own together with other idealists of the same mind than by any imbecile political apparatus whose primary function is to foster its own bureaucratic complacency.

What we need is a thorough world revolution in the field of energy. Solar energy, wind power and fusion energy must replace the environmentally destructive energy sources we are comfortably misusing today. And the exaggerated self-indulgence of the insane consumption society must be called in question. We can't allow that such a world and future destructive phenomenon be held sacred and blindly obeyed as an infallible bolting holy cow, which in its disastrous avalanche course drags the whole human society with it into maybe another deluge.

*(Dedicated to Helena Norberg-Hodge, in sincere flattery.)*

### *Concerning Einstein*, by Doctor Sandy.

"To find Einstein the person of the century was something of a surprise although I am inclined to agree. He might have been the most influential man of the century as well as the most controversial. Although he undoubtedly was a very good man personally, his achievement was for good and for worse.

His greatest achievement no doubt was his solution of the world of materialism, his proving the inadequacy of materialistic empirical science based entirely on logic and mathematics, thus opening the doors of science to the necessity of almost metaphysics.

More debatable was his enforcement of the development of the atomic bomb. He believed the Nazis were developing it and therefore insisted on America doing the same. The Germans never came close to the A-bomb. The Americans manufactured it and used it against civilians, well aware of that the Germans never had a nuclear program and that the Japanese were utterly defenceless against it. All this could be assigned to Einstein's debit side.

This brings us to the greatest problem of the 20th century - the necessity to assume responsibility for both good and evil with the risk of turning inhuman. In many ways Einstein was the first to enter the world on this precarious ground. The problems of humanity today transcend the human faculty. We are faced by global crises of the environment which man has no known experience of. These crises will force man to take unhuman stands against himself. I know how critical you are against the unhuman population regulation of China, and the whole world is enraged for human and very natural reasons, but we must face the fact that such unhuman measures might be the only possible way to ensure a future for humanity.

We are 6 billion today. 40 years ago we were only 3 billion. In 20 years we will only be 12 billion. In 10 years after that we might be 20 billion, and then it will no longer be 'only' 20 billion. We might get crowded even in countries like Scotland and Sweden, and a majority of our northern populations might then be Negroes, Chinese and other Asians.

Nature herself might intervene and cause global destruction by tempests and epidemics, for instance Aids, malaria or TBC. That would in my opinion be the best solution, because then man would be less traumatized than if the population explosion resulted in berserk terrorist wars.

I am just making hints, sketching possible outlines.

Concerning your interesting question whether Jesus could have survived his crucifixion, I would estimate his chances at 10%. Of course, the blood-and-water-phenomenon indicates his survival, but then he was entombed for about 24 hours. That

reduces his chances to 5%, left without any medical care in a cold dark and probably damp room. Could he have opened the grave himself from the inside? No chance. If he came out alive he must have had assistance. The chances for this to happen and for his possibility to carry on a somewhat normal life after such a trauma I would estimate at a maximum of 2%.

You may publish this under my signature.

Your old doctor

*Sandy.*

### *One of the Most Exciting Books of Our Time.*

Edward M. Podvoll is only a doctor. When you read his "*The Seduction of Madness*" you could believe him to be a psychoanalyst at least, but he isn't. He frequently quotes C.G. Jung and refers to both Freud, Konrad Lorenz and R.D.Laing but only practically. Dr Podvoll doesn't theoreticize or speculate. He is only interested in curing: "The purpose of this book is to inspire our civilization to more charity in the care of the mentally sick," which he sees as the most important step to make them well. More than Jung and Freud and Laing and others he applies Buddhism though, and above all Tibetan Buddhism, which in contrast to the western world concentrates entirely on common sense and has a thoroughly practical attitude in the care of the mentally ill.

The greater part of his book deals with authentic examples of real mental cases, which differ from ordinary cases by their having documented their own cases. Thereby they can be analysed in their minutest details, which Doctor Podvoll does with astonishing results. Very much in his book is directly sensational in its pioneering research, and one of his boldest conclusions is that *everyone* (without any exception) can become mentally ill. All you need is circumstances arranging that kind of upset balance which results in the psychosis. Heredity would then be of no significance whatsoever.

The first case is the son of Prime Minister Spencer Perceval, John Thomas Perceval. Spencer Perceval was unique as a British Prime Minister since he got murdered. His murderer was a maniac who displayed the same kind of symptoms which were later manifested in the Prime Minister's son, wherefore the family's treatment of the patient became mildly speaking exaggerated. John Thomas Perceval's entire life was then dedicated to rehabilitating himself and thereby reforming the entire mental health care system of Britain, and he succeeded. He died 75 years old in 1876.

The second case is John Custance, who in 1951 went to Berlin intent on settling a world peace and uniting the world from then the most divided of cities. His intentions were the best and most constructive imaginable, but he was no politician and not even a realist. If John Thomas Perceval was schizo-affective, then John Custance was manodepressive but could also resolve his own problems. He died in 1990 at the age of 90.

The third case is perhaps the most interesting one. Donald Crowhurst (1932-69) was a technical genius who could solve all problems. In 1969 he was supposed to sail alone around the world in a technically extremely advanced and well equipped sailing-boat. But soon after the start one technical fault occurred after the other, and Crowhurst got lost in the Sargasso Sea. There he started to sail in circles while he faked a log according to which he succeeded in sailing around the world alone setting world records. His illness was megalomania, he thought he was God or at least something close to it, in which speculations he neglected his sailing completely. After much dreaming and log-faking he finally saw through his self-deception; and to avoid losing his face before all

England and his sponsors he disappeared over board somewhere outside Brazil but left all his logs and diaries on board - to the immense delight of psychic research.

The fourth example is the French painter, poet, composer and scientist Henri Michaux (1899-1984) who during some ten years of his life (1957-66) experimented with drugs in order to chart their psychic effects on himself, while he carefully documented his own case. He was a hermit nature who sought anonymity, and he still has not received the acknowledgement for his accomplishments as an artist which he deserves.

Doctor Podvoll documents and analyses these four different mental cases constructively - he is constantly looking for the practical cure. He criticizes all conventional methods, like hospitalization, electro-shock treatment, lithium medication and all else but admits there are risks in demedication. He advocates 10-percent progressive demedication or less, and if it doesn't work out well it has to be interrupted. He denies the existence of chronic cases and recommends as the best cure simply to make the patients physically well by good human environment, good relationships, fresh air, long walks and everything else which is good for everyman.

But the best remedy of all he claims is the doubt. If there is no doubt about anything the mania has taken charge, and then anything might happen. The faculty of doubting is like a mental thermostat, regulating, balancing, bringing clarity and sober detachment. Where doubting is not allowed insanity rules, and doubt also then implies criticism and self-criticism. Only by constant purge you sort out the golden dust from the clay, those "islands of clarity" which is Doctor Podvoll's favourite expression.

How then does Doctor Podvoll suggest that mental illness occurs? It's very simple: egocentricity, self-fixation, egoism, self-love, - all that exaggerates the self so that the real perspective to reality gets distorted imperils the ego with risks of derailment. Therefore the best cure of all is always natural relationships with other people, - quite simply to have company.

## *Philosophy and Literature*

*An Eternal Issue - about the desert island*

The Emperor Marcus Aurelius and the European Community

Talks with my Doctor

An Interview with John B. Westerberg

Gore Vidal's Three Greatest Novels

The Most Important Authors of the 20th Century

The Finest Author of the 20th Century

An Orientation in Contemporary Literature

### *An Eternal Issue*

"If you were marooned on a desert island and was allowed *one* book for company - which book would you choose?"

This query is not unusual among literary colleagues, but it is always impossible to answer. The problem is, that once you have got yourself involved with books, you just can't do without them. William Somerset Maugham solved his abstinential problem with literature on going on travels by simply stuffing a large sack full of books without distinguishing which, and thus be well stuffed with books for the journey, of which

some would inevitably provide agreeable surprises, while others could be left on the way, thus providing space for purchase.

The problem with the first question is, that the better you know literature, the more vital it becomes not to go to a desert island without bringing at least a complete library. The question is generally modified with: "Well, if you were allowed ten books, which books would you choose?" whereupon ten books would certainly not be enough, growing to a number of twenty indispensable ones, demanding references of another 20 volumes, which would automatically increase the diet to a hundred, and then you easily reach two hundred, and before you can tell how you already have a thousand books which you simply can't do without, which demands another thousand for reference - in brief, sooner or later you arrive at the conclusion that you can't go anywhere without bringing with you a well assorted library.

But if you are compelled to concentrate on bringing with you only the most important items from world literature - what would you choose?

No matter how you try to limit your concentration to a minimum, the answer must become encyclopaedic.

In an independent project of history of literature, which for a start was enthusiastically encouraged by the Institution of Literary Science at the Gothenburg University, we tried 1984-88 to pinpoint what an everlasting classic really was. We proceeded from a basic material of just 40 selections from world literature, but in spite of this disciplined limitation, the project soon swelled out into a smaller history of all the world literature until 1942 and further on. When the project was concluded by an analysis of the circumstances and occurrence of the suicide of Stefan Zweig and was delivered to the University with Index and all, we had the sour reaction from the University that the work could never be published, since it was too voluminous and at the same time far too incomplete. So we were urged on to continue working on the limitless job forever, one of its countless descendants eventually emerging as *The Free Thinker*.

The original query of this essay transports us to the basis of a new enterprise of such insurmountable pyramidal dimensions worse and more engulfing than the tomb of Cheops.

All the same it might perhaps do some good thus ten years after the beginning of that distant project commenced so long ago to make a review and attack the problem from a different side and thus turn the issue upside down:

"What books would you manage without?"

Of course the answer couldn't be generally acceptable but would have to be most personal.

Of course, every person could do without most of world literature and is usually compelled to do so, since he has to live and work and eat, which is more necessary than to read. All the same, there are classics which the history of literature simply can't dispose of no matter how many people gladly would do so. Here follows a personal recommendation of what books you *could* bring with you to a desert island without ever getting bored.

Of course, the Bible is a safe bet with everything it contains and even the apocrypha of the Old Testament. If you forget that book at home the excursion to the desert island is doomed to fail. Even if you don't read it, this book is better than any other for just turning up pages at random to find some stimulation from some loose sentences - and you never risk getting the same verse twice.

Homer is the second surest card with both the Iliad and the Odyssey including the Homeric hymn to Apollo. The other Homeric hymns are worthless in comparison, and Apollo was the only one of the Greek gods to be really original - he had the only

interesting oracle (at Delphi) and was the only god not to betray Troy. Homer is the first must to all lovers of eternal feuilletons, as when you reach the end of Homer you realize that you have to read it all over again from the beginning - and slower each time, just as with Shakespeare.

Hesiod, though, you can do without. His two works are strangely heavier and duller than Homer, although they are so much shorter, and you don't even reread them willingly once you have come through.

You can never let go of Herodotus, though. Once you have made friends with him, you'll never let him out of sight, for not only has he embraced all the ancient history in a nutshell, but he is also the most entertaining and spiritual of professors of history ever.

Also you have to bring along all the dramas of Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides - they are only 33 and much fewer and shorter than those of Shakespeare - and in addition all well versed from beginning to end, so they are easy to read. Here you find everything from shocking thrillers to exorbitant comedies, dire tragedies of destiny and sophisticated social debates, challenging women and the boldest of heroes storming against heaven, and always generous floods of blood. This is the most colourful and bloody literature before Shakespeare.

Then the problems begin. Plato goes on talking forever, and it becomes rather burdensome and painful as nothing ever happens, and we all know already what happened to Socrates. This only drama in the world of Plato is talked around most infinitely and bores most listeners into perfect sleep. All the same, my advice is to bring all the dialogues and letters of Plato. You never know when suddenly "Phaedo" or "Symposium" or "Timaeus" pop up again in conversation and you need the sources. Aristotle, though, you can safely leave at home. *That* dryness is not fit for a desert island.

You can also leave Aristophanes, Menander, Terence and Plautus at home without any greater risk of missing them. Possibly you could make allowances for Aristophanes' "The Frogs" and the works of Terence. You could also leave Cato, Titus Livius and Cicero at home but not Cicero's letters. That best pen friend in the world must never be overlooked.

You should also bring Virgil and Horace in complete editions - their works are not so voluminous and heavy, and you don't have to read the last six songs of the "Aeneid"; while Ovid is a matter of discussion. The risk in taking Ovid with you to a desert island is that the spleen of his "Tristia" and the less constructive morale of certain other arguable works could worsen your sentiment on that desert island instead of the contrary.

You could also do without Seneca, that old boring debauchee, the greatest advocate ever of double standards, but not the brilliant Lucanus nor Tacitus, whose complete works are unsurpassed in sardonic morbidity. You could bring Suetonius along as an appendix to Tacitus.

More difficult to come by are the complete works of Plutarch, which therefore are the more anxiously recommended. Besides being the greatest biographer of antiquity he was also the most brilliant essayist, and his "Moralia", which are as valuable as his comparative biographies if not more, constitute an excellent foretaste to the much heavier and slower Michel de Montaigne.

One of the handiest books to bring is the short collection of "Meditations" by the emperor Marcus Aurelius, more to the point and more replenished as a philosophy than the whole world of ideas of Plato. The tiny book could really last for years.

Those are the main items of Antiquity. Other books of the same age to remember are Lao-Tzu's indispensable "Tao Teh King", if possible even more invaluable than

Marcus Aurelius, and the Indian "Bhagavad-Ghita", if possible even more invaluable than Lao-Tzu.

This basic list of ancient literature could be complemented with Xenophon's interesting books about Persia, "Anabasis" and "Kyropaedia", the account of "The Pelopponesian War" by Thucydides, a most sober work which takes time to read, the charming "Argonautica" by Apollonius Rhodius of the love story between Jason and Medaia, the sympathetic love poetry of Catullus, the love story of "Daphnis and Chloe" by Longos, and maybe in spite of their nastiness and simplicity the farces of Aristophanes although they are so base, and, if you really care for utter sobriety, Lucretius' "The Nature of the Universe". Anything less sensual about love has never been written in world literature, so you'll after all definitely need Ovid's exquisite works of love and poetry to balance up that wooden log.

### *The Middle Ages*

Objections have risen to our last chapter. How can you omit Pindar? Or Sappho? Or Anacreon? Or some other dozen of Greek poets?

Of course, all these classical poets are utterly indispensable - if you can read them in Greek; since it is very difficult to do them justice in translations. So bring them all along to the desert island, the more of them the better, but only if you are able to study them or learn to study them in the original.

Many other candidates have been brought forth by opponents to our list; but the very purpose of our task was to make an effort to limit ourselves. So of course the excellent Sallust is unforfeitable in his acute historical annals, and also the invaluable biography of Alexander the Great by Arrian - including all other classics of antiquity, from Julius Caesar to Plotinus, from Herondas and Epictetus to Flavius Josephus and all the apocrypha of the New Testament; but then we have completely forgotten our purpose to instead start bringing the whole library of Alexandria to our desert island.

So let's be strict and really concentrate on the main thing. With the Christian era begin the awkward Middle Ages with their oceans of Christian and Moslem literature, both problematical from their bias. Almost all Christian and Moslem literature during the Middle Ages is partial and tendentious, which makes it very difficult in this jungle to find a flower suitable for our special garden. One of the most biased and voluminous is St. Augustine, so leave his wild forest out in the jungle where it belongs; and the same accounts for St. Thomas Aquinas and all the established church leaders, with one brilliant exception: St. Francis of Assisi. His small flowers collected and preserved by his small brothers and sisters together with his poems and legends constitute the most precious pearl in Christian literature of edification, which also must be of universal value outside church. The same applies to the radiant conclusion of the Christian Middle Ages, "The Imitation of Christ" by the unknown Thomas à Kempis, the one book that the Secretary General of the United Nations, Dag Hammarskjöld, brought with him on his last journey as he was shot down.

What about Islamic literature, then? Are there no equal exceptions there? At least the Quran does not belong to them, the angriest book ever written, where 60% of its contents were taken from the Old Testament in Arabic transformation and 8% from the New Testament, a most controversial book mainly because of its "holy wars" commandment and its promise of "houris" in Paradise to all successful fighters in the holy wars who die as martyrs to the only proper faith - for these reasons an extremely doubtful book to found a world religion on. Mahomet can not side with Buddha and Christ as a holy religion founder since he had wives. Fortunately religions like this never fail to bring forth heretics. One of the prohibitions of the Prophet was against

telling fables, wherefore fables became extremely popular. Some were collected into "Arabian Nights", which is to be preferred for a proper reading for a long stay in a desert island to the much more arid Quran, although most of the tales are merely repetitions of the same phenomena of mainly magic, sex and djinns; but gems like "Sinbad the Sailor" and "Ali Baba" fit very well into the context of other superb storytellers like father Perrault, the Grimm brothers and Hans Christian Andersen.

Another work from the Moslem world must be brought, and that is the wonderful chronicle of the Persian poet Firdausi called "Shah Nameh", the ancient Persian story of kings, a work of the same stature as the Indian "Mahabharata"; and the wonderful Danish masterpiece in Latin by Saxo Grammaticus, "Gesta Danorum", containing among other titbits the original story of prince Hamlet.

This brings us into the problem of handling the vastest body of literature in the Middle Ages: the Icelandic sagas. You can't just bring any number of trunks of literature to a desert island. So my advice is: bring at least "The Saga of Burnt Niall" and of "Grette Asmundson", the two greatest sagas, together with "Gunnlaug Ormstunga", the most idyllic one, for a change, and you have the best portion out of the unique Icelandic contributions to the world of letters.

Then we reach the highlight of the Middle Ages and the first somewhat objective Christian poet Dante Alighieri from Florence. Of course you have to bring his Comedy, which he never claimed to be divine himself, and the first and best collection of love poetry in the new age, "Vita Nuova", about how his great love affair with Beatrice really started never to end; because in writing so beautifully about it, he fulfilled his ambitions in documenting his love in such a form that it would never die.

The art of Dante opens the gate to all the great Italian renaissance poets: the Sonnets of Petrarca, the wonderfully entertaining "Decameron" of Boccaccio, Ariosto's fantastic visions of what really happened to the furious Orlando, Macchiavelli's controversial originality and political ambiguities - it is still argued about whether he was in earnest or not - and the high-strung Torquato Tasso's devoted homage to the idealistic supreme effort of the Middle Ages - although it failed just like Torquato Tasso - the First Crusade, ardently celebrated in "*Gerusalemme liberata*".

Of course, many have been left on the side of the way. We have all the wonderful medieval minstrels and their songs about the court of king Arthur (Chrétien de Troyes), about Parsifal and the knights of the Holy Grail (Wolfram von Eschenbach), Tristan and Isolde (Gottfrid von Strassburg) and other such wondrously romantic chevaliers. Also we must not forget Chaucer's frivolous Canterbury tales, his best work, or François Villon's bizarre poems about the gutter life in those days. Doctor François Rabelais' bombastic excesses in proper indecency must also not be left behind - but then we are already well into the Renaissance.

### *Proceeding from the Renaissance*

Two names have appeared that shouldn't have been left out, according to certain complaints: the venerable Bede and Snorre Sturluson. Bede's chronicle contains wonderful stories and exciting phenomena that are interesting to read about also outside Britain; and considering the proportions which English literature later acquired, Bede becomes prominent as the first person to try writing in English.

If we include Snorre Sturluson's Scandinavian chronicles, we must also include Egil Skallagrimson, the only humorist in Icelandic literature.

Then it is also opportune to include the old Spanish songs of "El Cid" and like the cathedral of Cologne imposing dome of thought imposed by the excommunicated but the more interesting Meister Eckhart.

The problem about the Renaissance is that suddenly there are classics galore. Three stand out, however: Michel de Montaigne, Miguel de Cervantes, and Shakespeare, whoever he was. All three are uneven, why it is safest to include all their works so as not to forget something. Especially "Don Quixote" is very unstable and really overestimated, but you can't do without it.

Then we have an avalanche of philosophers like Francis Bacon, Spinoza, Hobbes, John Locke, Descartes, Pascal and others, who all produced massive works without end. My advice is to leave them all behind. On a desert island infinitely sophisticated philosophy easily becomes too much soporific.

French literature of the 17th century offers many costly pearls, such as Jean de la Bruyère's extremely astute observations of his times, all the dramatic works of Racine and some of Corneille, the maxims of la Rochefoucauld, a selection of Molière with at least "Don Juan" and "The Misanthrope", la Fontaine's alluring fables and as many works of Marivaux as possible, since they are difficult to come across. If we continue in France we soon stumble over endless sets of volumes by Voltaire and Rousseau. Bring as much Voltaire as possible and as little Rousseau as possible. Also Choderlos de Laclos' "Dangerous Liaisons" is a must especially for a desert island.

Among the dramatists of the Renaissance we also find the Spaniards Calderón and Lope de Vega, but the latter is too petty and provincial while Calderón is more enduring. His "Life is a Dream" is a definite must, but it's worth while taking on more of him.

If we then approach Germany with care we are surprised by the splendour of the sumptuous work of Grimmelshausen's called "Simplicissimus", apart from Münchhausen and Wilhelm Busch perhaps the only German instance of any sense of humour. We can also survive without German baroque philosophers like Leibniz and Kant, but with the age of enlightenment things begin to happen in Germany. A literary and philosophic friendship and co-operation like that between Moses Mendelssohn and Lessing is almost an even more significant flower for all times than that between Goethe and Schiller, and the result of that friendship was above all the unsurpassed play of tolerance "Nathan the Wise" by Lessing, which evidently the Nazis later on overlooked in their education. It is advised that it should never again be overlooked by anyone.

Goethe and Schiller by all means, but they also wrote a lot of dead-weight, especially Goethe. You can bring all the dramatic works of Schiller along without hesitating and give them together with his poems a place of honour, and few poems are more outstanding than the whole production of Goethe's. "Faust" and "Werther" you should of course also bring along with Goethe's other plays, "*Die Wahlverwandtschaften*", the epic poem "*Hermann und Dorothea*" and perhaps his autobiography "*Dichtung und Wahrheit*", although that fiction and truth hardly can be separated as they are both his versions about himself.

Thereby we reach the shore of the romantic age, and that stormy ocean of overwhelming sentiments is rather too precarious as yet to embark on, as a good sailor always waits for the right weather. Meanwhile we could rest among some precursors.

On both sides of Shakespeare we find Marlowe and Ben Jonson. Marlowe didn't have time to write much, but it is all interesting stuff written in good language, so bring him all with you. Ben Jonson though was a duller pedant, so spare him your attention. Just bring "Volpone", because he was never better.

Samuel Pepys' description of the fire of London in 1666 is an exciting curiosity, so bring at least those chapters out of his endless diary. John Dryden is agreeable for his polished style but rather without sting: you miss Shakespeare's sharper but sincerer tongue. More interesting topics are then being displayed by Daniel Defoe (all of his works and not just the most indispensable of all for a desert island: "Robinson Crusoe"),

and Jonathan Swift (ditto), the former as a bold and controversial documentary, and the latter as a most irresistible humorist.

Laurence Sterne could be discussed along many other over-valued English 18th century authors, (fuck Richardson!) but not Henry Fielding, whose complete works must be included, the only worthy successor to Shakespeare's liberality of mind. The idyllic Oliver Goldsmith is more doubtful like Doctor Johnson, but not that most priceless book about all that glorious bunch written by James Boswell.

Also the sentimental masterpiece "Manon Lescaut" by Abbé Prevost is worth a place in the list but not "Gil Blas", a dilettante work of stylish balderdash. But now it's time to embark on that vast stormy sea of Romanticism.

### *Across the Romantic Sea*

Before proceeding we should remember a few extra renaissance artists, first of all Benvenuto Cellini for his personal moral victory against all the popes, but also others, like the Spanish soldier Bernal Diaz del Castillo with his authentic documentary of the Spanish conquests in Mexico with the annihilation of the Aztec Indians and their unique capital Tenochtitlan, built like an Indian Venice on islands in a lake, which the Spaniards dried out after having levelled the city with the ground. In this context we should also remember the anonymous "Lazarillo de Tormes", Spanish black humour at its best and in a way preferable to Don Quixote's acrid ridicule of all ideals.

Someone reminded us of John Milton's famous characterization of Satan. Of course all Milton's poetry is recommended even for company on desert islands, no matter how puzzling his fantasies and speculations occasionally may seem.

More convincing then is the mammoth piece of Edward Gibbon "The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire", a meticulous chronicle of all the political turns within the Roman and Byzantine empires from the golden age of Augustus to the fall of Constantinople in 1453, most entertaining in its constantly increasing decadence.

The age of Romanticism really started in Germany with the *Sturm und Drang* period of Goethe and Schiller but soon spread as an epidemic all over the world, to France (never forget Chateaubriand's "Atala"!), to Italy (the exquisite poetry of Leopardi), to Russia (Pushkin's and Lermontov's fantastic masterpieces: their collected works are definite musts!) to find its strongest vent in England, though. Wordsworth, Coleridge, Byron, Shelley and Keats are all qualified poets but alas! How vulnerable, unreliable and susceptible! The only one of these five whose complete works will do is John Keats, who died youngest of them all. Shelley is difficult to understand even on a desert island, but his collected works will not occupy much space in your luggage. Lord Byron was more a colourful personality than a qualified poet, and you can find vexing anomalies in all his poems. For those who like being irritated by a poet's vanity, Byron will be their idol. In Wordsworth you can sort out most of it all, since he is almost completely provincial (like Jane Austen, Anthony Trollope, George Meredith, Thomas Hardy and other such by English local patriots overestimated Englishmen) while the output of Coleridge is so rare that you must save it all. Even America has a poet closely related to all these emotionally possessed romantic poets: Edgar Allan Poe, whose complete works is almost as treasurable a collection as the Bible.

The romantic flagship however is Sir Walter Scott, in later ages sadly neglected. His production is more than vast, but everything is worth taking care of, especially his verse, the most neglected of all his writings. A poem like "The Lady of the Lake" outshines all of Lord Byron's poems, but Lord Byron was all the same given a higher esteem for his more demoniacal and theatrical gestures. Byron *is* more dramatic, but there is always gold glittering in the calmer and wider waters of Walter Scott, if you

only care to wash the sands carefully. He was rumoured to become duller and weaker in his later novels and that only those he wrote with a pseudonym are worth reading, but we must disagree. Such a late story as "A Highland Widow" is one of his most poignant works, and the eminent Balzac's favourite was such a late novel as "The Fair Maid of Perth". Even an odd end like "Castle Dangerous" has its own worth for its toweringly gothic style.

Behind the flagship of Walter Scott appears a ghostly fleet of the most wondrous ships that ever sailed in literature, crowding in chaos into a crammed but previously well ordered harbour. The strangest of these vessels should be identified. We find the first horror novel Matthew Lewis' "The Monk", Mary Shelley's wonderfully romantic "Frankenstein", the highstrung sea novels of Captain Marryat with "The Phantom Ship" leading, the fantastic production of Ernst Theodor Hoffmann with madness prevalent everywhere in glorious ebullience with "The Devil's Elixir" as a supreme masterpiece of its kind, all the horrible tales of the Grimm brothers and H.C.Andersen to frighten small children out of their wits with, the unbalanced Nikolay Gogol of Russia with his weird tales of witches and magicians, martyrs and heroes of Ukraine and St. Petersburg with "Taras Bulba" as an unforgettable masterpiece, and the most absurd of them all: Victor Hugo, with his poems, dramas and novels of monsters and hunchbacks, convicts and suicides, the expert on victims of fate and the supreme master of supreme exaggerations. His first novels are so ridiculous that his reputation was unfairly tainted with the mark of his first absurdities. "The Hunchback of Notre Dame", "Les Misérables", "Workers of the Sea" and "The Laughing Man" all belong to the most fascinating masterpieces of world literature, and the least consummate of these is actually the most popular, "Les Misérables", while "The Laughing Man", the most notorious, is his most intelligent and splendid composition.

On the other side we find the most overvalued Balzac with his boring bourgeois novels about mostly bored, petty, quarrelsome and greedy people of narrow minds, who never see a world outside their small vicious circles. "César Birotteau" is first recommended, his overwhelming account of a simple bankruptcy, and we could add "Eugenie Grandet", "Papa Goriot", "La recherche de l'absolu" and a few more of his best known novels, but certainly not "Life of the Courtesans" or "Lost Illusions" - boring mastodon pieces without life or meaning. Maybe his supreme masterpiece is "Cousin Pons" about the meanness of ignorance and human blindness - nowhere in French literature is the narrowness of human nature more bitterly exposed.

More vivid and interesting is then Stendhal in all his works and even Alexandre Dumas in his best novels like "The Three Musketeers", "The Count of Monte Cristo", that part of "Vicomte de Bragelonne" which recounts the story of the man with the iron mask, "The Black Tulip", "The Corsican Brothers", "Joseph Balsamo", "The Werewolf" and "The Cavalier of Maison-Rouge". Dealing with novels of some weight we must not forget to bring an extra coffer for the complete works of Charles Dickens, always impossible to do without especially on desert islands, but then we are already well into the new world of realism.

### *The New Age of Realism*

Balzac has been given prominence as the greatest pioneer of realism, and of course he is nothing but a realist. But the greatest realist of all should rather be considered the Russian Leo Tolstoy, the most sober of writers, who mercilessly sees through everything and everyone and who can't be fooled by anything or anyone.

Also the naturalists are great realists, like Emile Zola, Henrik Ibsen and others, and like the ways of Ibsen are related to the ways of Tolstoy in regard to people, so Zola is a

continuation of Balzac. All these are superb material for our luggage to the desert island. Still there is another category of realists who are to be preferred.

Dickens is the foremost of them, but many others belong to the same kind, in the first row the Brontë sisters and William Thackeray, Thomas Carlyle and Wilkie Collins. Sir Arthur Conan Doyle comes later but is of the same highest society. They are not only realists but observe something else than just palpable reality. Their characterizations are not just cold literary photographs but fine psychological portraits painted with care and nuances, and they leave some space for metaphysical imagination and speculation. "Jane Eyre" (Charlotte Brontë) and "Wuthering Heights" (Emily Brontë) are both precise realistic novels which have their chief interest though in the unfathomable psyche of man and especially its abyss. Thackeray's "Vanity Fair" is a dreadfully cynical novel with only mean egoists, but the whole novel is built on one sole too benevolent person: Dobbin, who is completely outside reality with his Amelia. No one has depicted the French Revolution more realistically than Thomas Carlyle, but his whole revolutionary pathos is coloured by a personal temperament constituting an intensive empathy in a historical past which must be considered a marvel of artistic ingenuity. To the same category of realists with extra dimensions belongs the Russian Fyodor Dostoyevsky.

All his novels are completely almost exaggeratedly subjective to such a degree that they almost appear psychic or expressionistic, and in this overwhelming ocean of intuitive feelings and passions you easily lose sight of that knife-sharp realism which is always there at the bottom. Dostoyevsky never commits a casual error, an inconsequence or anything that doesn't fit. His personages always blindly follow their own ways and create their own ruthless destinies in terribly logical consequence of how oddly they are fashioned from the beginning in their souls. His saints never step down from being saints, and his more demoniacal characters never cease to become more demoniacal. Probably never has any author succeeded in achieving such a thorough psychological realism as Dostoyevsky.

Also Anton Chekhov is a realist but adds to his realism a unique extra temperament of melancholy and sadness. His fine infinity of subtle nuances is perhaps the finest literary filigree-work of all.

To the same category of extra tempered realists belong John Lewis Runeberg in Finland, Henryk Sienkiewicz in Poland, Jules Verne in France, (his extra dimension to realism is the invention of science fiction,) Herman Melville in America and the exotic story-teller Selma Lagerlof in Sweden, who miraculously makes the most supernatural thinkable tales appear as utterly real. Oscar Wilde is less effective, for all his wit can not disguise the fact that he is not at all a realist.

That leaves us not much left for our catalogue to the desert island. After the outstanding century of realism followed the two world wars with only disastrous effects on literature, and the world conquest of mass media almost finished it. The art of writing a great novel has almost completely vanished in our century and been forgotten together with true poetic feeling and the Homeric-Shakespearean ideal view of man. Few authors have in our century been able to continue this great tradition.

Two who made efforts were Robert Louis Stevenson and Rudyard Kipling. The former died too young to succeed completely, and the latter lost his son in the First World War without young John Kipling's grave even ever having been located, which broke the vein of the most constructive of imperialists. Instead the bleak pessimist Joseph Conrad survived with his Polish fatalism, while the great tradition in England was chiefly carried on by such first class B-writers as Somerset Maugham, James Hilton, Henry Rider Haggard's late and decadent romanticism, Nevil Shute's flying novels and the broodings of Graham Greene.

In France the first writing generation of the new century was instantly broken in the person of Henri Alain-Fournier. His one novel before the war that killed him cries out painfully about what wonderful possibilities were buried in futility. He was like a direct heir to the fine arts of story-telling as advocated and mastered by Gustave Flaubert and Maupassant but much brighter. The other Frenchmen to survive promise less and usually end up as dry old academic bores and duffers excelling only in insolence, but Jean-Paul Sartre's plays after the Second World War are a magnificent exception. And then we have Romain Rolland.

He wrote best and most about music, but his enduring biographies also contain for instance Michelangelo, Tolstoy, Gandhi and other Hindus. He introduced Hinduism in Europe so successfully that it became fashionable in the 20s, and he himself converted to Hinduism. In this connection we should also remember Rabindranath Tagore, but above all the closest friend and heir to Romain Rolland's frame of mind was Stefan Zweig.

There is an overwhelming number of German-speaking writers who all came to grief because of the Second World War, since most of them were Jewish. But Erich Maria Remarque was not, whose novels are still interesting, and neither was Thomas Mann, although he wrote four bulky novels about Joseph and his brothers. The novels by Thomas Mann of everlasting interest are almost only the late "Doctor Faustus" and "The Holy Sinner". His other novels are almost all interminably and unbearably dry.

All the works of Stefan Zweig are valid though for all times. This unhappy Austrian refugee, who committed suicide in exile in Brazil when he could bear the world no longer after the fall of Singapore in February 1942, is perhaps the most indispensable of all during a refuge on a desert island, so he is apt to conclude this list of recommendations. You could still add names like Boris Pasternak, Mika Waltari, Mark Twain, Jack London, Pearl Buck, John Steinbeck, the colleagues Charles Nordhoff and James Norman Hall, Robert Graves, Karen Blixen and some more, but not Hemingway (except "The Old Man and the Sea") not James Joyce (except "Dubliners"), not Freud or Jung, certainly not Nietzsche and not even Maurois, Malraux or Mauriac.

We have to admit though, that there are always many authors left to discover.

### *The Emperor Marcus Aurelius and the European Community*

Anthony Birley has written a comprehensive study about the Roman emperor, who died 1800 years ago in Vienna at the age of only 58, after a lifetime of unceasing wars and worries, probably of an ulcer combined with angina pectoris and cancer. But this emperor was no ambitious man of power or warfare but a philosopher. What was it then that turned his life into a tragedy?

The man who set him on an unavoidable course towards the imperial office was the emperor Hadrian, who during a long reign secured the frontiers of the Roman Empire and staked everything on maintaining peace within the realm. He adopted his successor Antoninus Pius, the wealthiest man in Rome, on condition that he already then (138 A.D.) adopted the seventeen-year-old Marcus Aurelius, who was already a philosopher, for his successor. Marguerite Yourcenar's famous book "The Memoirs of Hadrian" about the old emperor Hadrian's fictional letters to Marcus Aurelius is not a fantasy but in the highest degree an illustration of reality.

Antoninus Pius sustained world peace during the whole of his reign of 23 years, and Marcus Aurelius married his daughter. The only war enterprise during this reign was the advancement of the frontier against Scotland from Hadrian's Wall (by Newcastle) to the Antonine Wall, which went through Glasgow. But this new frontier

had to be abandoned later on from the land of the wild Picts and moved back to Hadrian's Wall, which was longer but safer.

Marcus Aurelius, who after the reign of Antoninus became an emperor at the age of 40, had up till then almost never left Rome. Thus he had been able to always live in peace and harmony with his philosophy. Almost directly after his installation a very long war with the Persians in the far east broke out, by which the plague was brought to Rome, which inflicted the whole empire. The epidemic is comparable to the Black Death of Europe in the 14th century, which reduced the population of Europe by about the same percentage. As soon as the Persian war was over and the plague had ceased, the Germans invaded the north-east provinces by Vienna and Budapest (Vindobona and Aquincum). This compelled Marcus Aurelius to a soldier's life in the cold north-east for the rest of his life. During these interminably dreary years at the front he wrote his "Meditations", a kind of summing-up of the whole world of thought of classical philosophy but well refined and with a profound touch of pessimism. For the first time in classical antiquity death becomes a more interesting theme than life. To the constant harassment of the imperial philosopher was added a painful rebellion in the east instigated by one of his most trusted generals, the victor in the Persian war Avidius Cassius, in which turmoil also the empress Faustina, Antonine's only daughter, was implicated. She bore twelve children during her lifetime of 46 years in her one matrimony with Marcus Aurelius, but only six survived and only one son. This was Commodus, so different in his vulgar pleasures and vices from his father, that doubts occurred whether the children of Marcus Aurelius really could be his own, since he was so long away at the front. These speculations go on still today.

Marcus Aurelius has been criticized for two things: an augmented persecution against Christians, and the fact that he allowed Commodus to succeed him. Marcus Aurelius never persecuted Christians personally, and the fact that those persecutions increased during his reign was a result of the frontier threats against the empire. The Christians refused to acknowledge the emperor and to obey Roman laws. They were the conscientious objectors of their day and this during a time when the barbarians started to threaten the existence of Roman civilization. As the result of the economic world crisis which the wars brought on, it became too expensive to have professional gladiators at the public festivals, which was why cheaper victims on the arenas came in demand. The only way to solve this problem was to allow enemies of the state on the arenas. According to the law, in times of war conscientious objectors were enemies to the state. The Christian conscientious objectors were innumerable, and many of them wouldn't even defend their lives on the arenas. For that reason the performances became extremely boring, awkward and painful, no one liked gladiators who wouldn't fight, and an age of fiascos was introduced, which eventually brought on the end of such public festivals.

That Commodus was allowed to succeed Marcus Aurelius had more serious consequences. Since the days of Trajan, all Roman emperors had been the adopted sons of their predecessors, since neither Trajan, Hadrian nor Antonine had sons of their own. Marcus Aurelius happened to have one, and even though he from Commodus' manners and immature ways had reasons to doubt his legitimacy, he never could find out the truth, since Faustina died rather prematurely. And when Marcus Aurelius found reason to question Commodus' fitness as an emperor, it was too late to change the course of things. Laws could not be violated, Commodus had already been thoroughly established, and, most serious of all, Marcus Aurelius passed away too early and too suddenly.

Commodus was worthless as an emperor, he preferred playing the gladiator in the Coliseum, he ruined the imperial finances and allowed the barbarians to overrun the

frontiers with nothing checking them. He was murdered 31 years old after 12 years on the throne, after which followed the gradual disintegration of the empire. A few decent and valiant emperors tried to repair the damages, like Pertinax, Septimius Severus and Aurelian, but the dissolution had already gone too far, and gradually Christian pacifism prevailed against military rule by force.

The greatest enterprise of Marcus Aurelius was the long tedious war against the Germans north of Vienna and east of Budapest, which Marcomannic and Quadian countries today constitute the whole of Czechia and half of Slovakia. Marcus Aurelius tried to transform these countries into Roman provinces and thereby remove the frontier from the rivers and valleys around the Danube to the mountains and hills which constitute the natural northern border of Czechoslovakia. This would have been a much more favourable frontier on the Germans. Commodus abandoned this new frontier, the Germans immediately started to overwhelm the borders, and Christian victory in Rome was a poor comfort for the loss of a universal civilization, which was allowed to be raped and utterly destroyed by those northern barbarians who Marcus Aurelius was the last one to make a firm stand against.

Not until 600 years later the Roman Empire was resurrected by the coronation of the German king Charlemagne in Rome 800 A.D. He reunited western Europe, which gradually continued to form the medieval Roman Empire of the German Nation, which lasted until 1806, when Napoleon finished it off. Its chief heir was the Habsburg empire of Austria and Hungary, which was completely dissolved after the first world war. Then the idea of the United States of Europe was born and introduced by president Woodrow Wilson of America, and the idea was adopted by most of the new democracies of Europe. One of its greatest advocates was Stefan Zweig, who in 1932 gave an important lecture in Florence, Italy, on the subject ("The European Idea in its Historical Development"). All these idealistic efforts were brought to nothing by the ravages of Hitler-Germany.

Another of its advocates was Otto von Habsburg in exile in Switzerland, heir to the Austrian throne. In the organization and development of EC he found the great possibility for the ideal to materialize, and so far things seem to have developed accordingly. This year Austria, Sweden and Finland became members, and negotiations are proceeding with Poland, Czechia, Slovakia, Hungary, Slovenia and the three Baltic states.

The philosopher Marcus Aurelius died in Vienna defending the great idea of universal political unity, and in Vienna this idea has never vanished but always been carried on. The ECU-coin carries Charlemagne as a symbol, and never since Marcus Aurelius has Europe been more united than it is today, even if it may take some time until the international monetary system of co-operation starts to work - the preliminaries to the painful birth travails seem to be endless.

### *Talks with my Doctor. (March '98)*

"Honestly, I don't think the Aids crisis will be as serious in the next few years as the great political crisis in the Muslim world, when the idea of God gradually will collapse most infernally, going down like a rusty old ship which never should have been launched in the first place."

I asked him to explain this shocking statement.

"It has already begun," he said. "Islam will fall. The fundamentalists are themselves leading the enterprise of scrapping their own religion. Algeria leads the way. God will not survive next century, neither in Islam, Jewry, Christianity or Hinduism. The idea of

a personal god determining man's life is the most monstrous abortive foetus that any man ever fertilized. Confronted with the facts of political reality it just falls flat. Islam has made God its political ideology. Consequently Islam and all Muslim countries must politically go down."

Still I was not satisfied. "You'll see for yourself. Suharto will fall. The Syrian dictator will fall. Iran will dissolve. Saddam Hussein will fall. Khadaffi will fall. Sudan will be dissolved. The dictatorship of Burma will fall. The economy and running party of China will dissolve and collapse."

"But Burma and China are not Muslim states."

"No, but they are autocracies, and that's exactly the same thing. What is the idea of God if not a justification and legalization of pure autocracy?"

He also implied that Castro and North Korea would fall soon. "You'll see," he said. "All autocracies will fall maybe within this very year."

And he was never more serious than when he stated this and at the same time solemnly raised his glass of white wine to his mouth without considering the pipe that already stuck in it. He was so cock-sure about the certainty of his visions that he already took them for facts with the same ease as he thought he could smoke and drink wine simultaneously. A good doctor like mine always knows indeed what he is talking about.

"Is there nothing more for you to execute while you are at it?" I tried to tease him.

He laughed. "I'll be delighted! What's your wish? What authorities come next to the religious ones? Politics belong to the gutter snipes. But what about the great humbug philosophers?"

"But doesn't philosophy rank higher than religion?"

"You are right, that the most religious and wisest of the founders of religions stand above all criticism. Both Buddha and Jesus are irreproachable as philosophers, and the one thing contaminating them is their founded religions. But there are others. Zoroaster, for instance, was no philosopher but just an unreasonable fanatic, and let's say nothing of all the Jewish prophets - bigots all of them and worse than puritans. But the price goes to Mohammed. Beside him Zoroaster appears as a holy ghost of peace. Mohammed definitely ruined all religious sanctity by starting a world religion on the dogma of violence, war, and women oppression. For that he deserved to be the most criminalized person in the world since he actually created a religion of violence in the name of God. There is nothing wrong in the faith in God, but to use the faith in God to establish a rogue power based on violence is worse than any ordinary autocracy. He was such a failure as a thinker that he couldn't even philosophize. The only real philosophers were in Greece."

"So you can respect them at least?"

"Not Socrates. He was a sophist. Plato used his name just to legitimize his own dubious ideas, while Xenophon was a realist who depicted Socrates as he was: a mean old grumbler who wanted to ruin Greek society and tried to do so by undermining the Attic spirit. That's why the Athenians found it necessary to silence him for good. He hurt their feelings on purpose. He was a very dirty old man. No, the real impeccable philosopher, perhaps the greatest philosopher of all time, was Pythagoras. He was wise enough not to leave a single written word behind. Socrates was stupid enough to let Plato write a lot of nonsense in his name that never passed his lips, but Pythagoras was not that dumb. Pythagoras, Plato, Aristotle and maybe Epicure - there you have the great canon of Greek philosophers. Epicure was also wise enough not to let one written word of his survive him. All later philosophers in history have committed the disastrous mistake of leaving all their follies in writing behind, so that generations after

their deaths could read for themselves in black and white what perfect fools they all were without one single exception."

"So you dismiss all philosophers after Epicure?"

"Unrelentingly. All that nonsense they left in writing has brought philosophy into lasting dishonour and the more so by each new philosopher in each new century. Philosophy means 'love of wisdom', but all those humbug philosophers after the completion of Greek philosophy did not love wisdom. They used philosophy for a means to enforce their own egoistic ideas on humanity, from the holy fathers of the church with St. Augustine as the worst humbug of them all down to that preacher of violence, the lunatic Karl Marx."

"So the entire church history with its high scholasticism and profound ascetic thinkers is all just humbug?"

"Yes, principally. There is not one oasis in that desert until Dante liberates the word from philosophy and transforms it into literature and poetry. But even in Dante you still have all the high scholastic dross of church dogma."

"But there are other philosophers who went further, like for instance Giordano Bruno."

"There, you said it! That man is worth all respect of all times and more than any philosopher of that age, for he died a martyr to the freedom of thought. You have there a brilliant exception from the rule that all modern philosophy is rubbish. Contrary to all others, he had a most important meaning with his philosophy."

"And then we have the enlightenment philosophers beginning with Francis Bacon and Spinoza..."

"Francis Bacon is not without interest, but he was a very green dilettante. He thought clear enough but didn't reach very far. Spinoza was the first modern flummer. He thought and speculated most profoundly in bottomless depth but never came to any conclusions. Descartes at least found out that he himself undoubtedly existed. Not everybody reach that far. He died by the way in your own country of Sweden. There he ceased to exist, but his philosophy still exists and manages somewhat and might even be underrated."

"What about Hobbes and Locke?"

"Hobbes is the first in the line of dreadfully boring pedants and prigs using the name of philosophy to establish their unbearable complacency. Leibniz was another of those, introducing a row of hard thinking Germans, who all just went from bad to worse to reach the bottom of the line by the complete maniacs Karl Marx and Nietzsche."

"Not so fast. In between we have the French philosophers of the enlightenment."

"Voltaire has my full respect and admiration. He made his art serve the cause of tolerance in a most heroic and admirable way. He never boasted himself as a philosopher. He was a plain writer and preferred being a dramatist. But he was the only real one among the enlightenment philosophers. All the others - Rousseau, Montesquieu, Diderot and the rest - dwelt in his shadow. Rousseau unfortunately brought the positive and constructive renaissance philosophy down by degrading and dishonouring it although he was such a wise man. He knew what he was thinking, but he thought destructively."

"But wasn't Lessing also part of the enlightenment philosophy?"

"Definitely, and there you have another positive aspect of that philosophy. But he was a poet. He never passed for a philosopher, and Goethe and Schiller followed his course with honour. They never were dictating philosophers. They only wanted to be poets."

"Well, what about Schopenhauer?"

"Schopenhauer is the outsider in the great muddle of German romantic nonsense. You have to take Schopenhauer seriously, for he was the only realist in that context."

"You haven't said anything about John Locke."

"A gaga prattler, who committed the mistake of taking himself seriously, like so many other so called philosophers."

"Kant?"

"The worst strayer of them all."

"Hegel?"

"A populist fool, who put some vain effort in making all the worst maniacs in the world his disciples."

"Rudolf Steiner?"

"That turns us into another field, namely the teosophic disorder. Steiner started a theosophist but was sorted out of the company, so he called his Christian theosophy anthropology instead. He was a great idealist with many good ideas and perhaps the only sound 19th century philosopher."

"The other theosophists?"

"Allow me to execute them all. Madame Blavatsky was a blue-stocking with a most shamelessly superior physical constitution, which made her believe that she could achieve any degree of hubris and get away with it without any opposition. But wise people opposed her. They dared wonder how she could claim so many unheard of truths without one single reference. She took all her material out of the air and claimed that everything she thought had to be infallible truths since she was the one to construe them. Her successor Annie Besant was of the same sort - an intolerant fanatic dogmatist without any detachment or dualism or any place in her heart for dialectics and alternatives and constructive views of other people. God save us from such megalomaniac and over-emancipated dames!"

"Do you prefer Bertrand Russell?"

"A chatterer. Well, he could be sensible sometimes and occasionally brought important arguments into public debate. And he was at least sympathetic. You can't say that of many philosophers. To a certain degree he achieved the most commendable task of restoring the name of philosophy from that dishonourable swamp of nonsense into which all those imbecile humbug philosophers during the centuries brought it down. I presume you could say about him that he was OK. He belongs to that 5-10% of philosophy which could be regarded as not entirely absurd."

"Well, what about music? Would you like to execute all music as well?"

"Not quite. Music could in fact be regarded as the only untouchable philosophic system, since music never can do any harm, as long as it remains founded on its three components: melody, harmony and rhythm. As long as music sticks to these three elements, and most music does, from the greatest oratorio down to the basest common shanty, it remains edifying to people. On the other hand, I would like to deal with the great peril of music: superiority.

Most professional musicians fall into that trap. When they really bale out they become divine in their own eyes. But even a common crooner could fall into that trap, that music bestows on him a mentality which in his eyes separates him from ordinary mortal human beings, so that he looks down on them more or less with contempt. When you meet or talk with a musician you often get the feeling that his presumptive view of you is that you are not musical and consequently worthless as a human being. This mentality also leads to some difficulty for musicians to open themselves to other people. They can even appear to be loveless."

"I just read a book by Cyril Scott wherein he presents the theory that the power of music is so transcending that it indirectly and imperceptibly can influence the course of history. What do you think about that?"

"I know nothing about that, for I am no musician. But you should know something about it. What do you think?"

"It's a fact that at least Handel, Beethoven and Wagner believed themselves capable of and wanted to influence humanity with their music. At least Haydn, Chopin, Verdi and Sibelius did influence the course of history with their music whether they themselves desired to do so or not."

"So you suggest that music can have that power?"

"Yes, but only constructively. Unlike Cyril Scott I don't think that music could have a destructive influence on humanity and history."

"All the same Joshua blew down the walls of Jericho with trumpets."

"That's not proved."

"No, we don't know exactly how it was done. But bad music could have a very destructive influence on me."

"Yes, but then it's bad music, and bad music exists only in order to vanish."

"There speaks a musician."

### *An Interview with John B. Westerberg.*

(Excerpts. He was clandestinely educated in underground Russian orthodox monasteries during the 50s and 60s.)

- What kind of schooling did you get from the Russian orthodox monks?

- My education was extremely scant except within one area. All my education was centred around the written word and thereby became exclusively humanistic. My language education in first Swedish, Finnish and Russian and then within Russia in other languages was the best and most thorough imaginable. Of course, much literature was liturgic and religious, extreme significance was given to Church Slavic, but there was also great importance attached to my education in history. To them the most important chapter in world history was the conflict between Czar Peter I and the Raskolniks, the old-believers, since they considered that all the problems of Russia had emanated from there. What was grossly disregarded was all the natural scientific subjects like physics and chemistry, mathematics were not considered very important, and even biology was much neglected. Instead I was given all the major languages and the whole world literature. My tutor professed that the only really important knowledge in life was the knowledge of human nature, and that knowledge could only be mastered through what was written and by experience through life.

- Do you regret that you had no education in natural sciences?

- On the contrary. I had the best possible education. What do you need natural sciences for unless you are to become an engineer or scientist? Of course you have to know how to add, subtract, multiply, divide and calculate with percent together with other such mathematical aids of practical usefulness which also can be of sound logical training, but the higher mathematics are to me like abstract music with no meaning so far as I can see. Biology can of course be very useful especially if you travel much, while for my part physics and chemistry are closed areas of locked up laboratories with unsound chemicals. And is it not the scientists and the engineers that have ruined our earth and turned it ugly by their destruction of the environment, the cultivation of the population explosion, the unhuman industrial deserts, the sterile modern architecture,

the lethal monster urbanizations, the asphalt jungles of criminality, social problems and environmental disasters? The brave new world of universal destruction of the environment was not developed by humanists but by scientists, engineers and profiteers.

- You mention that your tutor was 80 years old when he died. He must then have been born in the 1880s. Leo Tolstoy didn't die until 1910, and he had much to do with the Orthodox Church. Did your tutor ever tell you anything about Leo Tolstoy?

- It will delight me to answer this question. Leo Tolstoy, the greatest of Russians, was deeply disappointed with the Orthodox Church for its uncritical bias towards all the Czar's policies. He therefore denounced his own church. The result was that the church banned him and warned all Russia against him. Still Leo Tolstoy's own sister was a nun if not even an abbess, and spiritually he never abandoned the Church. He went on pilgrimages to holy sites and monasteries still as a very old man. My tutor was especially engaged in the Tolstoy controversy since he once met him as a young man. He described him most vividly to me. He offered a strange mixture of all the most Russian inconsistencies, grand aristocratic airs combined with tasteless coarseness, awe-inspiring wisdom with a peasant's stupidity, universal love and philanthropy with devastating indiscretions and the highest altruistic visions with fatal irresponsibility. Leo Tolstoy was the human ideal and at the same time everything a human being should not be supposed to be.

My tutor deprecated very much the fall of Tolstoy. Perhaps he went too far when he put the blame on Tolstoy for not only the bolshevik revolution, (Lenin was an ardent admirer of Tolstoy,) but even for both the world wars, the rise of stalinism and even the German holocaust against the Jews. That last thesis he defended by advocating, that it was Tolstoy who opened the door for the bolsheviks and that the bolsheviks gave Hitler his reasons for acting accordingly.

"But wasn't Tolstoy engaged in the cause of the Jews?" I then could object.

"He was indeed. He studied himself with a Rabbi in Moscow. But many Jews were bolsheviks, above all Leon Trotsky. And in the same way that Tolstoy partly made himself responsible for the two world wars and the holocaust, his engagement in the cause of the Jews also partly resulted in the establishment of Zionism and in the state of Israel in 1948."

I really should write a whole book only about my tutor (*who was a Russian monk*).

-----

As we met in the Himalayas in October, John provoked me for not engaging myself well enough in the cause of Tibetan Buddhism. I then had to answer him by making my position clear in relation to the world religions. I told him straight, that my moral support of Buddhism was 99%, granting it 99% credibility, mostly because at the moment it was the most persecuted and endangered religion in the world, being at the same time the most reasonable and constructive one. Second I gave 75% support to Jewry, since we all regrettably must admit, that Jewry by the establishment of the state of Israel has acquired political power, which must have negative consequences for its morale. Just watch how the Jews flirt with the Turks as their only Moslem friends and keep quiet when the Turks still assert that the genocide on the Armenians never happened, (which involved at least 1,5 million victims in a Turkish holocaust which Hitler considered a paragon example). I support Christianity by 60%, I can only grant it 60% credibility, since by its establishment 1700 years ago it corrupted itself by dogmas and intolerance, besides that it still goes dragging on immense burdens of superstition. Hinduism I support with 50% for its irresistibly dynamic and incredibly positive vitality

which through its imaginative freedom at the same time is so revolting by its lack of discipline, want of order, inclination towards recklessness and its erotical exaggerations. Islam, finally, I only grant 10% credibility, since it is the most corrupt religion in the world and by its fanaticism the only really destructive, hostile and unhuman one.

At the same time as I give Buddhism 99% support, I am aware of its weaknesses. It can not survive being corrupted, getting too rich or becoming too well established, for by its own basic character it can only survive as itself if it remains clinically free from dogmas, intolerance and earthly power. Buddhism is really the religion of the poor more than any other religion, for it's the only one that always defends and supports life in all its forms and especially in its more vulnerable forms: poverty, suffering, illness and death. Only Christianity has preached the same compassion as Buddhism, but Buddhism has never fallen into the same trap as Christianity, when it became an established state religion with dogmas and intolerance as weapons for a church autocracy, which must run off the rails, since that was the very contrary of what had been Jesus' intentions and preachings.

Thereby John had to defend his Moslem engagements. He explained them to be more political than religious. He explained, that Allah really from the beginning was a local god confined to certain tribes in Arabia, and that Mahomet got the idea that this local god was identical with the universal God of the Jews. In the same manner some Greek could have instituted Zeus, or some Roman could have turned Jupiter, or some Viking could have established Woden as identical with the severe monotheistic Godhead of the Jews. Mahomet then more or less forced the Arabs to accept his idea to blow up a local deity into a universal divinity, which he couldn't have achieved without a certain amount of fanaticism and applying the formula that 'the end justifies the means'.

At the same time as John senses the necessity that Islam must be cleansed from all fanaticism, injustice and autocratic tendencies, he feels it important to defend Islam against the established atheism of the Chinese, which is worse and more destructive. Therefore he supports and encourages the resistance among the Uiguris and other Muslims within the borders of China against the Chinese autocracy. We also agreed that the Kurds were right against the Turks and eventual other regimes in Iraq, Iran and Syria suppressing them. The Kurds were the greatest people in the Orient that were left without a country of their own when Britain and France split up the Orient into Syria, Lebanon, Iraq and Palestine after the first world war, and they were perhaps greater than any other people in the Orient after only the Arabs and the Turks.

On the other hand, John does not support the Chechenians or any other Moslem people within the borders of the new Russia, since he, being born within the Orthodox Church, always at heart remains a champion to this church and other branches of it in the east, not least in the Orient and Egypt.

### *Gore Vidal's Three Greatest Novels*

"Messiah" (1955) is a remarkable philosophical experiment. The author seems to have put himself the question: "If a new world religion would rise, how would it manifest itself?" and then committed himself to answering it. The result is a kind of science fiction satire which is very dramatic, convincing and above all worth considering. The religious founder in the novel is a very simple man called John Cave, and his religion, like most religions ever, is really only about death but is more direct than any earlier death-considering religion, since it concentrates completely on doing away with the fear

of death. The consequence is that death is justified - and abused. "Cavesway" becomes the nomination for justifying one's life by doing away with oneself. By good publicity and expert marketing the religion achieves an overwhelming power of expansion and efficiency and completely outmanoeuvres Christianity, mostly through an extremely clever high priest called Paul, (what else?) who furnishes the modern religion with a proper and impeccable façade in the same manner in which Joseph Goebbels turned nazism irresistible. The religious founder finally desires to abandon his firm, when he becomes aware of how his religion is being abused and misinterpreted, which leads him into a conflict with his own propaganda minister Paul, who kills him. And then there is nothing to stop this man from managing the religion in his own way, establishing it through dogmas, assuming power (by force, of course) and making it the new world dominant religion, all through "Cavesway" as the end which justifies the means.

The teller of the story, the ego of the book, is John Cave's originally first collaborator and the only one who really understands what John Cave means and what his religion is all about. He becomes John Cave's private secretary and prime "evangelist" of the religion and its chief editor, the one who provides the religion with its basic literature. But when he becomes aware of how power thinking takes over the management of the religion he leaves it, is banned as a heretic and is persecuted until he dies, so that he must live incognito in the deserts of southern Egypt in order to survive. His name is Eugene Luther, but his name is eradicated from all the literature which he himself has provided the religion with, and "lutherans" becomes synonymous with heretics. This lonely man is the only one who understands and sees through the religion, and he is at the same time its actual founder and greatest doubter.

Such an interesting novel naturally leads you to think of several of those world sects, which spread around the world in the 60's, and above all of those suicidal sects of which the most prominent ones were the Jim Jones movement in Guyana and the inferno of David Koresh in Waco, Texas, both ending in mass suicides. Beholding these actual apocalypses and others of the same kind, you have to admit that Gore Vidal was right in his divination.

You find in this novel already the seed to the great novel about the emperor Julian, a very ambitious neo-classical effort in the style of Robert Graves, which treats the subject of Julian the Apostate with careful and profound pregnancy and even love. The subject has been the interest of many great authors, Gore Vidal himself mentions Henrik Ibsen and Lorenzo de' Medici, but also the Swede Viktor Rydberg's great achievement "The Last Athenian" is a notable idealistic novel about Julian.

The emperor Julian was nephew to Constantine the Great, whose three sons divided the empire between them in order to fight about it until only one was left alive, who finally died without an heir. There was no other relative left than Julian, who was a philosopher trained in the old heathen ideals and who regarded Christianity as a world plague and superstition. During his short reign he did everything possible to re-establish the old religion, the Greek gods and their temples with their rites and ceremonies, mysteries and oracles, and fought Christianity with logic and common sense as a superstition. Like Marcus Aurelius, he regarded the Christians as unreasonable and biased fanatics, and he is throughout the novel compared with Marcus Aurelius. However, Julian died only 32 years old during an invasion in Persia, according to Gore Vidal assassinated by a Christian fanatic, who thought he did right in the name of Christianity.

The tragic end is, that when Christianity completely took over the old world and stamped out all the remains of the ancient culture (including the famous oracle in Delphi), the barbarians got the upper hand, as no Christian army could stop the Goths, the Vandals, the Huns or the Arabs from barbarizing the entire world, burn its libraries,

destroy its architecture, ruin its statues and works of art and replace its culture with the opposite. It would take a thousand years before Dante resurrected the classical ideals again from that hell into which Christianity had thrown a world and civilization of beauty.

The culture of the ancient world with its ceremonies and traditions, rites and tolerance is described with considerable melancholy, as Julian is the last one in history to defend the ideals of the ancient world for a thousand years. It's a dying religion described in its last phase, and you see frightening parallels today in the condition of Christianity, where protestant churches stand more and more empty, where the Pope in this world of swamping over-population wants to forbid abortions and preaches against Buddhism, (the only religion except Christianity propagating celibacy,) while he flirts with Islam, which more than any other religion supports the over-population explosion, and where the only church with some continuity seems to be the Orthodox Church. Will Christianity perish like the ancient classical world (which it killed), and, in that case, what will come instead?

But Gore Vidal's greatest novel will probably appear to be "Creation", which excels "Julian" in richness of imagination and genius. It's a historical novel from the fifth century B.C. telling the story of Cyrus Spitama, Persian ambassador in the Great King's service on missions in Hellas, India and China. He is the grandson of Zoroaster and a real Zoroastrian or fire worshipper, of the ancient Persian religion which was deeply influenced by Jewry and perhaps the real progenitor of Islam - the use of veils to hide the beauty of women from other men than their own was originally a Persian custom. As a believer in the proper faith, Cyrus Spitama is very critical against both Greek, Indian and Chinese ways of life. He meets Buddha, Lao-Tzu and Confucius with whom he discusses the problems of creation, but he never really understands Buddha, he finds Lao-Tzu somewhat ambiguous and sly, while he is completely charmed by the bourgeois Confucius. Here Gore Vidal's own tendency shines through: to defend and support the established order of things. Gore Vidal is not only a politician but even an imperialist. He may be faithful and stalwart as such, but we find the order of eternity more reliable as it was explained through the very Buddha and Lao-Tzu, whom the Cyrus Spitama of Gore Vidal finds unpleasant and almost uncanny - probably since they obviously knew too much.

Also the Greeks are very vividly depicted in Vidal's excellent fabulations, but none of them holds water in his opinion, neither Herodotus, Pericles, Socrates, Themistocles, Cimon or anyone else. Themistocles, the glorious victor of Salamis, is the one he admires most, but neither Aristides nor Homer are hardly more than mentioned. For a pupil, Cyrus Spitama wins the "happy philosopher" Democritus, who also was the favourite ancient philosopher of the great learned theologian Robert Burton's (in the 17th century, by some believed to have written the works of Shakespeare).

Considering everything you might find to object against in Gore Vidal's assessment of all the deepest thinkers of that age, "Creation" remains none the less his philosophically most rewarding, his humanly most entertaining and the most ingeniously composed of all his novels.

### *The Most Important Authors of the 20th Century.*

Recently there have been some referendums in various countries about the best book of the century. In England, John R. Tolkien's "*The Lord of the Rings*" was elected and in other countries other books. Such referendums must be considered extremely biased and unreliable, however, since the dominating category of voters in such referendums

usually are ladies of a certain age. Many who really know something about literature will not take part in such referendums. Their view is, that referendums is something that only should be applied in political affairs of such a maximum degree of importance that they have urged a supreme democratic procedure of decision. You can't decide aesthetically sensitive issues in a vulgarly democratical way.

We wish to present a proposition of the most important authors of this century with motivations.

1. Leo Tolstoy. Although he more belongs to the 19th century, his importance to the 20th has been unsurveyable mostly because he was the first demonstrative pacifist and dared challenge his contemporary world by this for a man of world fame extremely brave principle. All the foremost men of the 20th century have been his followers.

2. Stefan Zweig, perhaps the most sincere follower of Tolstoy, who by his broad universal humanism became the most influential writer between the wars through his ability to embrace different mentalities and unite them internationally in a most unique idealistic constructivism.

3. Henrik Ibsen, the greatest of all dramatists after Shakespeare, whose plays never have ceased to remain irritatingly concerning and revolutionary through above all their sensational way of treating women, with which quality he has combined an impressingly deep and warm knowledge of the human heart.

4. August Strindberg, the second great Nordic dramatist, whose plays remain as concerning as Ibsen's although he lacked Ibsen's deep humanity but managed to replace this with other qualities and productions in prose and poetry, experimental writings and indefatigable debates.

5. Jean-Paul Sartre, another great dramatist, who also indefatigably produced interesting prose and never ceased to stand in the centre of world intellectualism by his constantly energetic interest in everything that went on. Albert Camus would have surpassed him, though, if he had been permitted to live.

6. Selma Lagerlöf, the wonderful fairy tale lady, whose inexhaustible stories continue to fascinate a world by their deep human concern and wisdom and which even raise a greater international interest than the works of Strindberg.

7. John Ruel Tolkien, who by his trilogy about the Ring created a completely new literary genre which has proved volcanically and explosively fertile: *fantasy* is today a concept as well-known as science fiction, cartoon figures, cowboy literature and the historical romances a hundred years ago. At the same time, the *Ring* is a vast symbolic allegory of our own horrible time.

8. Ernest Hemingway, the overwhelming macho American, who also introduced a completely new literary style, which has almost found too many followers: chauvinistic manhood with hard-boiled unconquerable superiority as a criterion.

9. John Steinbeck, who remains loved by a world of readers for his sympathetic compassion with above all ordinary and simple people, often loafers and drunkards, while at the same time he has an epic force with an impressing sense of form which Hemingway lacked.

10. Erich Maria Remarque, the German pacifist, who remained steadfast as such in the midst of the cataclysmic war convulsions of his home country. His almost documentary novels of his own war experiences remain unsurpassed as human documents and eternally valid protests against war.

11. Joseph Conrad, the great Polish pessimist and sailor, who searched the depth of human hearts and found a life philosophy of detachment, who became an Englishman and created a new kind of literary English forming a school. His novels remain unsurpassed as deeply psychological investigations of the modern human conditions of life.

12. Romain Rolland, the teacher and colleague of Stefan Zweig in a pacifistic crusade against the first world war, at the same time perhaps the greatest literary investigator of music and a portal figure to the international interest in Hinduism, having introduced Ramakrishna, Vivekananda and Tagore to the western world.

13. Conan Doyle, who brought the detective novel into the limelight and made the genre the most popular of the century through his unsurpassed sharpness of mind. Unfortunately his equally outstanding historical and science fiction novels came unjustly in the background thereof.

14. Jules Verne, the greatest and most important of all science fiction writers, the only pioneer and creator of the genre, who also adorned it with human qualities which none of his followers had the power to embrace.

15. Mark Twain (Samuel L. Clemens), whose broad human repertoire and ingenious sense of humour is still unsurpassed today. He was not only perhaps the best writer of boy's books of all times but also pioneered the detective novel and wrote a serious book about Joan of Arc, which was hardly to be expected of such a downright and total humorist.

16. Bernard Shaw, the great satirist and socialistic philanthropist, who with his wit and sense of humour made his challenging social plays totally irresistible and irresistibly popular. His star has been sinking, however, following the decline of world socialism.

17. Bertrand Russell, perhaps the greatest philosopher of the century, an indefatigable fighter for common sense and human values against injustice and power abuse, who has almost served as the world conscience of the century.

18. Jack London, whose adventure stories out of the wilderness remain unsurpassed in their category. All his books from Alaska will always remain outstanding as samples of extreme realism and as documentaries of the heroism of life under the extremest possible conditions.

19. Somerset Maugham, whose manifold short stories and novels almost dominated the first half of the century. They will continue to stand out by their brilliant exposure of the oddest circumstances of life.

20. James Hilton, the Cambridge student who gave us Mr Chips and Shangri La among other unforgettably charming stories, a profoundly human analyst of life who has been grossly underestimated, and whose novels about the Russian revolution, the far-reaching human side-effects of the first world war and the making of the atom bomb, will remain classics.

21. Graham Greene, the brooding introverted Catholic, who continued on the experimentally psychological way opened by Joseph Conrad to efforts of solving life's most difficult and impossible problems.

22. Anton Chekhov, probably the finest writer of short stories in world literature, whose warm humanity and delicate aestheticism beautifully coloured in a melancholy view of life never has been matched. In his sublimely sensitive art he stands alone.

23. Henryk Sienkiewicz, the great epic Pole, whose novel "*Quo Vadis?*" has had a tremendous influence and to some degree resulted in a rebirth of Christianity.

24. Boris Pasternak, the first one who dared shed some light on the dark side of the Soviet Union and who had to stand some fire alone for his civil courage. But others followed, and gradually the avalanche began.

25. Bertolt Brecht, a dramatist who can't be ignored whatever you may with good reasons have against him. His harsh expressionism and poetical realism constitute a dramatic art which always will remain alive and actual.

26. Thor Heyerdahl, the controversial but splendid voyager, who never gave up, and whose travel books and example have had an enormously positive influence on all thinkable primitive sport initiatives, especially sailing.

27. Robert Graves, who never has been enough rewarded for his magnificent efforts to restore and bring Antiquity back to life.

28. Karen Blixen, the exotic story-teller, who proved that romanticism certainly still can exist in our time, and whose autobiographical novel "*Out of Africa*" was commended by Charles Chaplin as the only novel of our time which you really had to read.

Thereafter could be mentioned Herbert George Wells, Dr Axel Munthe, Rabindranath Tagore, Rudyard Kipling, Nevil Shute and P.G.Wodehouse.

Marcel Proust is a border line case. Eugene O'Neill and even more Tennessee Williams are excellent playwrights but do not reach the European level. The influence of Ian Fleming is of course unoverestimable, but so is that of Raymond Chandler, Agatha Christie, Dorothy Sayers, Phyllis D. James, Dashiell Hammett, Alistair MacLean, C.S.Forester, Victoria Holt, Mickey Spillane and dozens of others of that category. Aldous Huxley and George Orwell are both interesting, but like the equally inhuman science fiction writer H.G.Wells their visions have failed more often than not. Aldous Huxley is the more interesting one of them, but his remarkable intelligence suffers from an unsympathetic trait of coldness and inhumanity.

Franz Kafka and James Joyce are probably the most controversial authors of the century. Both are bold experimentators, but both speculated in making themselves as artificially difficult as possible, as if they wanted to cloak their insufficiency and dilettantism in unintelligible artificiality.

Thomas Mann and Hermann Hesse are both highly appreciated Nobel Prize winners but in our view hopelessly overestimated. Hesse is more durable with his fine stylistic qualities, and his masterpiece "*Siddhartha*" will be read and loved in all times.

### *The Finest Writer of the 20th Century.*

His suicide together with his wife in February 1942 in Petropolis outside Rio de Janeiro when the Second World War raged at its worst has never ceased to foster new speculations as to his reasons. But the most tragic thing is, that he thereby was lost to contemporary literature, more or less cancelled from book-stores and shelves, and forgotten. The war was more exciting news than a casual suicide, and after the war it was more important to write new literature than to remember the victims. To the generation of the 50's he belonged to a lost epoch which never again could be brought back to life. Many other authors in similar melancholic situations were forgotten with him, like for instance Dimitri Mereshkovsky, the leading author of Russia before 1917, who was compelled to leave Russia, never found himself at home anywhere abroad and was forgotten, while instead the unfortunate buffoon Mayakovsky became the flagstaff of the new Bolshevik literature.

Stefan Zweig was a Jewish writer of Vienna who early made his debut with some poetry, which so charmed his publishers, that they promised to publish whatever he would write. Instead of using this opportunity he turned so severely self-critical, that it took many years before he appeared again. His international break-through was his pacifist play "*Jeremias*" under the shadow of the first world war, which made way for him into the heart of the greatest pacifist of his age, Romain Rolland. From Switzerland they worked together for their pacifist movement as long as the war problem remained.

During the 20's his long list of biographies started to appear. At first he dealt only with well-known authors like Dickens, Balzac and Dostoyevsky, but he soon broadened his investigations to also fathom characters like Nietzsche, Mary Baker Eddy, Napoleon's favourite policeman Joseph Fouché, Erasmus of Rotterdam, Marie Antoinette, Mary Stuart and Maghellan among others. His *"Sternstunden der Menschheit"* is a vast kaleidoscope of biographies concentrating on decisive historical moments, concluding with a dramatization of the escape of Leo Tolstoy from home at the age of 82. Stefan Zweig's psychological insight and careful empathy is universally acknowledged, and Sigmund Freud was one of his close friends.

His good days lasted until 1934, when nazism started to ruin everything. Until then he was at times the most widely read author in the world, and he counted all his greatest contemporaries in music and literature for his friends, who frequently visited him up on Kapuzinerberg above Salzburg, where his 'Villa Europa' still remains. But already in 1934 nazism became such a threat even in Austria that he found no option but to leave, and his exile was for life.

He found a new home in England and lived in Bath until 1939, when the new war broke out. He was then sequestered as a war prisoner, being a citizen of Austria. As soon as he had got his British citizenship he left England for good. He escaped to America, never liked it there and continued to South America and Brazil. There he chose to voluntarily end his life at the age of 60 in the very darkest moment of the Second World War, a few weeks after the Wannsee conference, where 'the final solution to the Jewish problem' was resolved, and one week after the fall of Singapore to the Japanese, the final blow to allied control of Asia. All his books had then already been banned in all German-speaking countries since eleven years. What good did it do that he was the finest stylist in the German language, when he was a Jew?

He was not forgotten right away, although he immediately disappeared in the new age deluge of mass media culture of vulgarity and cheap nonsense, since all those who had read him never forgot him. But the new readers found no meaning in reading a writer of the 30's after the 40's. They preferred stranger originals without too much clarity and difficult messages of conscience, which compelled you to think, as for instance Franz Kafka and James Joyce, one more queer and weird than the other. It became *à la mode* to claim to understand what no one could understand. The same cult status was offered to Mayakovsky, who committed suicide protesting his disappointment in the bolsheviks, who nevertheless continued to boast him, since they had no one else. I am sure the day will come, when people at last recognize those three, Mayakovsky, Franz Kafka and James Joyce, as the three greatest humbugs of 20th century literature. Some have dared to express that opinion already long ago but were reduced to silence, forcibly forgotten and deported to that same rubbish heap where other scrapped great stylists have been sorted out as disqualified for a rotten age, like Dimitri Mereshkovsky and Stefan Zweig.

*Gothenburg, August 1999.*

## *An Orientation in Contemporary Literature*

(The Darjeeling Lecture.)

*The Bible - Homer - Dante - Shakespeare.*

These are the four corner stones of world literature and civilization: the Bible as foundation for the three monotheistic world religions, Homer as the firm ground of the whole classical civilization, Dante as the originator of the Renaissance, and Shakespeare as the maker of modern man. These four authorities almost make up half of the history of literature.

*Victor Hugo - Charles Dickens - Dostoyevsky - Leo Tolstoy.*

These are the four literary giants dominating the 19th century, Victor Hugo by his romantic spirit, Dickens with his humanitarian pathos, Dostoyevsky by his psychology and Leo Tolstoy by his realism.

Then comes the 20th century, but why don't we have giants like that in that age? The First World War destroyed an entire generation of hopes and talents, such a brilliant and promising novelist as *Henri Alain-Fournier* fell on the western front, many were the poets that shared his fate, and the Second World War was even worse. The disasters of the first half of the century made it almost impossible for creative writers of classical literature to exist.

Among the most typical examples are the collaborating couple *Romain Rolland - Stefan Zweig*, pacifists who detached themselves from the mundane world and almost completely dedicated themselves to writing only biographies, to preserve for the future the lives of real artists and writers, the existence of which a new unhuman age had made impossible. Romain Rolland ended up as a Hinduist, and Stefan Zweig, after perhaps the most brilliant literary career of the 19th century, committed suicide in the third year of the Second World War, being an Austrian and a Jew. He found it impossible to exist in a world which could have brought one Adolf Hitler to power.

All the same, there have been writers in the 20th century, but what kind has dominated it? Affected modernists and posing humbugs like T.S.Eliot, James Joyce, Samuel Beckett and other freaks and frauds of unintelligible language distortions. Classical literature has almost completely disappeared, like classical art and music, to be replaced by nonsense, ugliness and noise.

Fortunately there have been exceptions though, and a few examples are worth keeping in mind. In America there are but very few, since vulgarity seems to dominate everything produced there, but in England we have several interesting examples.

*Robert Graves* had enough of the western world by the First World War and afterwards almost exclusively dedicated himself to classical history and mythology. *Joseph Conrad* was a Pole but wrote in English, and his greatest admirer was *Graham Greene*, who must be regarded as one of the most important authors of the century, like the great connoisseur of human nature, *William Somerset Maugham*. Another underestimated writer is *James Hilton*, educated at Cambridge, with his sometimes ingenious novels. Among later authors *John Fowles* should be noted, whose novel "*The French Lieutenant's Woman*" is a successful attempt at reviving the great 19th century novel.

Let's also remember a few authors outside England. By the epoch-making "*Doctor Zhivago*", *Boris Pasternak* continues the great Russian tradition from Dostoyevsky and Tolstoy. The dramas of *Jean-Paul Sartre* are completely original and very effective, while

at the same time he continues the tradition of the ancient Greek drama. Another very important modern novel is the Italian *Elsa Morante's "History"* in its deep neo-realistic settlement with the times of Mussolini and Fascism.

Although the great romantic-realistic story-telling tradition has had its hardest setbacks since the darkest medieval ages it has survived and is continuing. But the same rule applies as ever: we have nothing else to build on but tradition. We have our great universal examples in the Bible, Homer, Dante and Shakespeare, and we have the great 19th century novelists to look up to, and even if the first half of the 20th century was almost only disastrous adversities we still have the old examples to keep in mind, continue to learn from and keep up for the future.

Why, then, finally, is that tradition so important? Why bother about reading books? Because in those great immortal sacred books we have all the humanity there is. We have to look to them to find the sources of humanity, humanitarianism, the very identity of civilized man. The great classical writers are those who best understood and knew about man and thus could improve him by setting new examples. That's why I call the writer behind Shakespeare's dramas 'the maker of modern man', for so far no one has understood human nature better and improved it more than he.

*Darjeeling, November 2000.*

## ***The Shakespeare Debate***

Shakespeare's Identity Revealed?

Two Views on King Arthur

King Arthur and Shakespeare - a Third View

The Shakespeare Debate with John Bede and Carl O. Nordling

A Case for Christopher Marlowe

The Sun-Spots of the Poet

The Revelation of the Sonnets

The Controversies of Timon, Pericles and Henry VIII

The Method of Doctor Mendenhall

The Unfathomable Melancholy of Robert Burton

The Contribution of David Rhys Williams

The William Shakeshafte Mystery

A Temporary Summary

Ventilating the Theories, *by Laila Roth*

Scrutinizing the Sonnets

John Michell's Solution to the Problem

All We Know About William Shakespeare, *by Mark Twain*

The Secrets of Anthony Bacon

Comments on A.D. Wraight

The Marlowe Case - Another Presentation

The Difficult Case of Sir Francis Bacon

Fact and Speculation in the Case of John Penry

A Shakespeare Apology, *by John Bede*  
Presenting a Baconian Problem  
The Perfect Set-Up - a Summary of the (lack of) Evidence  
Melancholy  
The Mystery, *by Laila Roth*  
More Marlowe Theories  
The Gothenburg Shakespeare Symposium, May 2002  
Comments to "Arden of Feversham"  
Main Traits of the Marlowe Theory  
Doubts about Bacon

*Shakespeare's Identity Revealed ?*

The man who made the issue was really professor Abel Lefranc (1863-1952), one of the leading scientists of literature in France, who after a lifetime of serious research in a book called "Behind Shakespeare's Mask" launched a new theory of the real man behind the name. The name was indeed William, but the surname was very different from that in those days very common name Shakespeare (also spelt 'Shakspere', 'Shagsbeard', 'Shaxpier' among other variations). After all, one must admit, that the common actor William Shakespeare from Stratford, who had to marry his eight year older wife because he had made her pregnant, who escaped from her to London to start his theatrical career guarding horses of the visitors to the theatre, who never left England and who retired early to die at only 51 after having left only his second best bed to his old shrew of a widow, is difficult to recognize as the author of 37 very highbrow plays which all reveal intimacy with the ways and manners of high nobility, kings and dukes, expert knowledge of conditions at sea, at war and of such distant places as Turkey (the Bosphorus), Denmark (the Kronborg castle), Italy, Greece and the Orient. By his quest 1918 professor Abel Lefranc started an avalanche of new speculations of who the real William Shakespeare might have been, but most of these speculations ended up in the conclusion, that since Shakespeare could not have been Edmund Spenser, nor Francis Bacon, nor Christopher Marlowe, nor Thomas Kyd nor a whole lot of other prominent Elizabethan candidates, it remained the least doubtful that William Shakespeare simply had been William Shakespeare. Very few thereby chose to walk through the door that professor Abel Lefranc had opened, but some dared the challenge. They were above all A.W.Titherley 1952 in "Shakespeare's Identity" and Carl O. Nordling in "Hamlet's Secret" from 1995.

These have followed the track of professor Abel Lefranc's theories and confirmed them. These theories point to, that the man who wrote under Shakespeare's name was no one less than William Stanley, the sixth earl of Derby, a grandchild of Henry VIII:s romantic little sister Mary Tudor and a cousin with both Anne Boleyn, Queen Elizabeth, Mary Stuart and king James I in different lines. He was in other words very closely related with the royal family and could have become king himself after Queen Elizabeth had he wanted to. But instead he wrote "Hamlet" to explain why he declined.

Carl O. Nordling from Borgå (Finland) confirm these theories with an overwhelmingly convincing chain of circumstantial evidence. One of the most pregnant arguments is the idiomatic idiosyncrasies of Shakespeare, which in their dialectical ingredients are dominantly northernish from the parts of Yorkshire and Lancashire, the

homelands of William Stanley, which Shakespeare never came in the vicinity of. Numerous plays betray expertise knowledge abroad, which William Stanley must have acquired on his extensive journeys, while the actor from Stratford never came outside the doorstep of his country. Scenes of "Hamlet" betray intimate knowledge of proceedings at the court of Frederick II of Denmark in the Kronborg Castle of Elsinore (inaugurated 1585) where William Stanley was a guest, since he probably wrote the German first version of "Hamlet" which was given there at the inauguration probably with himself in one of the leading parts, that amateurish play in bad school-German out of which the later English versions were developed. These are only a few examples of argument.

This thesis opens up an entire world of new interesting queries, of which all must turn around the question who this remarkable excentric high nobleman really was, who rather wrote plays than vied for the British crown. The mystery of William Shakespeare thereby becomes greater and more unfathomable than ever.

Our only light along this dark and blind alley are a very few known facts of William Stanley's life and the 37 completed plays under the name of William Shakespeare. Of these two sources of light, the second provides more material.

With relatively reliable certainty you can nowadays establish the chronological order of the Shakespeare plays. Among the first are the impassioned chronicles of English medieval history - the Lancaster tetralogies - which betray an emotionally extreme historical interest and a profound engagement in the very house of Lancaster, to which William Stanley himself belonged. An equally ardent interest in Italian mentality and affairs appear in the early Italian comedies and above all in the tragedy of "Romeo and Juliet". The affluent production of dramas until 1600 yells out loud in every play how much the author enjoyed writing them, almost wallowing in constantly surpassing himself in developing higher dramatic standards in every new play. Then suddenly comes the Hamlet crisis as a definite climax. Suddenly politics interfere on stage with devastating realism. "Hamlet" is nothing but a profound expression of a personal political crisis - Hamlet, who might have become the ideal king, is the author himself, whose conscience compels him to refrain from politics with all its power temptations since it is all so rotten. Carl O. Nordling poignantly exposes how the play "Hamlet" was psychologically used by its author against the kings James I (whose mother herself married her husband's murderer) and Frederick II of Denmark, who is king Claudius in the play, who fires cannons to his revelries, which is exactly what the Danish king did. The highest point of the ingenuities of "Hamlet" is when the leading actor uses a play to stir the conscience of the king - which is exactly what William Stanley did.

Gradually the plays then become more solemn and resigned - the great tragedies follow with the letting loose of king Lear's utter despair and terrible bitterness, and the criminal established power position of Macbeth, which forces him to ever more atrocious crimes. Resignation finally culminates in the last melancholy fairy plays, where Prospero in "The Tempest" in the end disrobes himself of his magical mantle and throws his books into the sea.

Here we are faced with the greatest issue - if William Stanley really was the man who wrote all this superb body of work, why then did he stop so suddenly and so early? He was born in January 1561 and only somewhat over 50 when he stopped writing. He lived for another 30 years, and no one knows anything about these 30 years. Did he fall out of favour with his royal cousin? Was he prohibited to write any more controversial and critical plays against the establishment?

The full picture thereby becomes a rather melancholy one. We see a young brilliant talent of royal blood brush society, blood and ancestry aside to instead devote himself

passionately to the theatre under a rigorously observed pseudonym - if his real name had come out it would have been a most unacceptable scandal - royal persons were not supposed to write plays like "Titus Andronicus" and "Richard III". As a perfect actor he kept to his silent part - and could thereby continue to write plays. But after "Hamlet" age begins to make itself felt with disastrous consequences. It is too clearly felt that it becomes less and less fun to write plays, and more and more of them are never finished, like "Timon of Athens", "Pericles" and "Henry VIII", which are completed by others.

Finally only one thing remains to the author - to maintain his part by sticking to his anonymity - it is never revealed.

And is it a coincidence that all theatrical scenes in England are closed in September 1642, the same month that William Stanley, the 6th earl of Derby, expires? The British theatre thereby finds its grave to be replaced by the joyless wet blankets of the Puritans and their bloody civil war against monarchy - the staged political reality outmanoeuvres and closes the theatre.

What most of all convinces me that earl William Stanley is the author of Shakespeare's works is the consistent noble quality in all of Shakespeare's works - there has never been a writer more noble. I have often wondered: "If Shakespeare wrote all these works and was so successful - why then was he never knighted?" There is nothing more royalistic than Shakespeare's plays, no matter how bitter they may be about the use of power. Shakespeare's chronicle plays are the very heart of the matter of British monarchy. Therefore it is not more than self-evident that they should have been written by a person inside the royal family. All this is really rather incompatible with an ordinary middle class commoner of Stratford, a small place in the country, which he fled to make his fortune in London mainly by speculating in house-property. It doesn't fit with the internationalistic connoisseur of all Europe with such a heavy partiality for British royalism and every drop of noble blood in England.

The most difficult party to win over to this "Derby theory" will then of course republican nations be with the United States at the front. Real republicans will never be able to tolerate that William Shakespeare was not an ordinary upstart from the country. And the possibility that he instead could have been of the very highest nobility would simply be unthinkable.

It would be very difficult for ordinary people to understand this royal self-negator, who in fact is such an extreme democrat, that he sacrifices his royal and political possibilities just to be able to present the truth about the establishment on stage instead - and to give all the honour and credit for the show to the actors.

However, important pieces in the jig-saw puzzle are missing, and the most important of all is: If William Stanley of Derby really was the writer behind William Shakespeare's name, why then did he stop writing at the same time as the actor William Shakespeare retired?

The most likely answer to that question is that William Stanley and William Shakespeare had some kind of agreement and perhaps even partnership. It was William Stanley who sponsored Shakespeare's theatre company and who practically paid everything for them. In return his terms might have been, that they were allowed to produce his plays on condition that he was allowed to hide himself under Shakespeare's name and thus was ensured of an incognito. When Shakespeare suddenly retired after the Globe having burnt down in 1612, perhaps William Stanley suddenly found himself without a writing partner and found it difficult if not impossible to find a new name to hide behind. Ben Jonson was an entirely different character. Consequently William Stanley might have found it impossible to avoid recognition if he continued to write for the theatre when Shakespeare was gone. This is the most probable explanation. A born aristocrat of the highest order, earl Derby was vain enough not to risk his reputation

and good standing as a cousin of the royal house and therefore preferred allowing William Shakespeare to keep the honour of his writings for 300 years - as long as the British Empire lasted.

The next great problem to stumble across in this argument is the Shakespearean Sonnets. This is the most personal and intimate work of the poet and the one which shows some unambiguous self-expression. The only theme of the Sonnets, however, is love, the love for a beautiful young man and a dark lady. The Sonnets were privately circulated during Shakespeare's career and were not published until 1610. They are dedicated, in the style of a most typical Shakespearean mystification, to a certain mr "W.H.", which abstruse dedication has puzzled scholars for 370 years and continues to do so. The most widely embraced theory has been that mr "W.H." was lord Henry Wriothesley of Southampton, one of the younger Shakespeare's foremost patrons, an extravagant young man with extremely long hair, who could be the male main figure of the Sonnets.

The whole Derby theory seems to totter on this precarious ground. However would anyone else than the author himself circulate these extremely intimate poems, which were known only among Shakespeare's closest friends? The language is that of the dramas but even more beautiful, elaborate, sensitive and even more ambitious.

What have the Derby followers to put against this? Simply that mr W.H. was William Shakespeare himself, whom the earl of Derby loved. William Stanley married not until 1595 at the age of 34 when probably most of the Shakespearean separate poems had been written. Further on even the tone of the Sonnets becomes more resigned as if it was slowly tiring, like in the tragedies, and the last two sonnets rather dryly express the death of love in a matter-of-fact sort of utter resignation, as apparently the whole unique Shakespearean inspiration is drying out after a period of 25 years' unequalled fruition.

William Stanley's marriage appears to have been stable and conventional with three sons. Stanley could have written the Sonnets to Shakespeare, as Shakespeare might have written them to Wriothesley. The initials "W.H." fit better with Henry Wriothesley than with William Shakespeare, but here the border lines of probability are extremely vague.

However, there are two poems preserved by William Stanley which no one else could have written. They are two poetical epitaphs from about 1632 on deceased family members, one of them being William Stanley's second son, who died 25 years old. One of the epitaphs has by tradition always been attributed to Shakespeare while the other must be written by the same hand. The churches are the Chelsea Old Church and the church in Tong outside Birmingham. These two epitaphs could be the earl's only *lapsus linguae*, the one instance when he lost his mask and unconsciously revealed himself as the man behind the art of William Shakespeare, who was himself dead since 16 years when these two epitaphs were engraved, which epitaphs could not have been written earlier, since the buried persons didn't die any earlier, which is why the motive for writing these burial poems neither could have existed any earlier.

Summary. It cannot be proved that Shakespeare was not the person who wrote the works of Shakespeare. Neither can it be proved that it was William Stanley who did it. Neither can it be proved that it was Edmund Spenser, Christopher Marlowe, Francis Bacon, Ben Jonson, Thomas Kyd nor any other Elizabethan who did it, although the least probable is that anyone of these could have done it. For arguments we can only use probabilities. It is as improbable that Shakespeare wrote all these works alone as that Stanley did it alone. We can't overlook the most probable possibility that they in a certain sense did it together, like later Alexandre Dumas - Auguste Picqart, the brothers

Goncourt, Erckmann-Chatrion, Nordhoff and Hall and other famous co-operating writers. Then it is probable that the language is that of William Stanley while many scenical effects probably could be Shakespeare's own, since Shakespeare as an actor and director had more experience of practical details in stage work than Stanley as only a spectator and dreamer. What makes it very probable that Stanley was the writer and Shakespeare the technician is the fact, that Shakespeare (most probably) had to work all year round on stage while he almost only could have found time to write in summer; while Stanley had all the time in the world as a free independant noble. What makes this partnership most probable is that it broke when Shakespeare left the stage and that neither could continue alone. Another strong argument for Stanley being the poet is his slightly superior age - it is almost impossible to imagine that Shakespeare could have written the Lancaster tetralogies, "Romeo and Juliet" and other early masterpieces in his early twenties, while Stanley, who had already had a high education and travelled a lot, more probably could have done so. Shakespeare's imagination and quick thought could have picked up Stanley's higher international knowledge and experience and used it for his own purposes, for instance to give "Othello" some local colour. But Shakespeare could never have written the first version of "Hamlet" in bad anglicized school German which was staged at the inauguration of the Kronborg Castle at Elsinore in 1585. Instead, this was probably the first in a long line of magnificent dramas without a published name produced by the theatrical maniac the earl of Derby, whose title and position excluded him from this work, which fact served him as a spur to perform it all the more but in secret, which motivation lasted only as long as he could continue to do it in secret.

So we neither exclude the Derby nor the Stratford theory but recommend a compromise that includes both as indispensable for the appearance of the plays, proposing, though, that the dominating hand and quill belonged to the earl of Derby.

This will naturally upset all faithful Shakespeare fans most terribly, who every year go to Stratford in tens of thousands on pilgrimage. But truth must not be moved by that. What we are most interested in here is to help the truth to come forth. William Shakespeare can not be proved to be the author. If William Stanley was the author, then let it be proved.

#### *Bibliography :*

Abel Lefranc : "Sous le masque de William Shakespeare", Paris 1918.

A.W.Titherley : "Shakespeare's Identity", Winchester 1952.

Carl O. Nordling : "Hamlet's hemlighet", Faktainformation A-Z, Stockholm 1995.

### *Two Views on King Arthur*

The oldest complete account of King Arthur is Sir Thomas Malory's immense work from the 15th century, which he almost completely wrote in prison. On this solid ground of Sir Thomas Malory, Terence Hanbury White has composed a very original and humorous paraphrase, which doesn't take the age of chivalry and its ceremonious ways and manners with an equal amount of utter seriousness. Who, then, was Terence Hanbury White, the man behind "The Once and Future King", the four novels about king Arthur of which the first, "The Sword in the Stone", was so much in the taste of Walt Disney, that he made it his last cartoon picture?

He was born in Bombay in 1906 as much an Anglo-Indian as Rudyard Kipling. His father was a police inspector, and his mother was the daughter of an Indian judge. As that of Kipling, White's childhood was extremely unhappy since his parents did not

agree. The thirst for knowledge saved him, he educated himself at Cambridge and published "The Sword in the Stone" in 1938. Twenty years later all the four novels were ready, and he died in 1964 on board a ship outside the port of Piraeus.

No matter how funny and entertaining "The Once and Future King" is, it contains at the same time much of more doubtful worth, above all lots of nonsense. He ridicules the age of chivalry a little too much, and the dialogue is often base. Noble ingredients never appear except to be made fun of. What saves the novels, though, is the unforgettable characterization of Sir Lancelot.

The third and greatest of the novels, "The Ill-Made Knight", is all about him. No one ever has dared to picture Sir Lancelot as ugly and awkward, but White manages this with overwhelming consequence. Also Sir Mordred is depicted with greater nuance and understandability than in other Arthurian tales, and White undertakes the effort to rather convincingly explain the strange behaviour of this destructive villain. But Sir Lancelot is the only complete character in the lasting life-work of Terence Hanbury White.

In the same way, we find in Marion Bradley's immensely more weighty cobblestone of a novel, "The Mists of Avalon", the leading character in Morgan le Fay, the half-sister of king Arthur, the mother of his bastard son Sir Mordred. Marion Bradley is an American born in Albany, New York, in 1930, and her much more impressing and elaborated, psychologically poignant and deeply analyzing Arthurian romance is without equal in its penetration of the old Keltish religious life in prehistoric England. Historically her Arthur appears in the critical days when Christianity replaced the Roman realm in England. Queen Guinevere represents the Christian establishment of the brave new age while Morgan le Fay is the last representative of the old Keltish natural religion which is dying, while Arthur stands between them, is dependant on both and is hopelessly divided and destroyed like the whole kingdom when Christianity can not tolerate "heathendom". The tragedy of king Arthur in Marion Bradley's novel is then that his enlightenment and all his glorious court falls prey to Christian intolerance - a great, ambitious and extremely challenging theme, which gives a very convincing impression that that could really have been how it all happened. What you miss in Bradley's novel, though, is all the greatest advantages of White - the glorious good humour of the court life among the knights and the warmth of it.

We have asked John Bede of Northern Ireland to give his opinion about these two masterly tales of king Arthur with certain misgivings, though, that he might prefer "Prince Valiant". Our Irish colleague is if anything an Arthurian expert, and he has himself written an account of the fall of Camelot. We are happy to be able to include his answer to our queries right away:

### *King Arthur and Shakespeare - a Third View*

by John Bede.

"Derry, July 1996.

My dear friend, without any hope of success I will try to make an effort to answer all your queries in your very own fine Swedish.

1. *King Arthur*. T.H.White's four novels are not serious. They are as entertaining as Wodehouse, but you can't turn an Arthurian chronicle into a joke. T.H.White is not without blessings, but he has completely misunderstood his subject and messed it all up.

Marion Bradley's novel is instead more serious, and of all the efforts that have been made to reach the truth, hers is perhaps the greatest. "Prince Valiant" is the most superficial of all Arthurian tales, but it is also the best drawn of all.

Marion Bradley's historical location of the Arthur saga in the 5th century could be correct. I have myself preferred to locate it outside the dimension of time, since to me the Arthur saga is an ageless manifestation of the eternal political problem of the impossibility to make a perfect ideal come true. Prosaically enough, the probable historical origin of the Arthurian political problem - the tragedy of the ideal regime - is the emperor Frederick II's court in Palermo. This emperor of the 13th century had that in common with king Arthur that he according to the legend once would rise again from the grave and come back to fulfil his realm.

2. *Shakespeare*. The ground pillar of the interesting Derby theory is that Shakespeare and Derby had much in common. Earl Stanley might very well have been the model for Hamlet. One can find a vast amount of material in support of the Derby theory. The perhaps most interesting piece is the reason for Derby's silence after the death of Shakespeare. Derby did not agree well with James I and his court. To the dominions of the earl of Derby pertained the Isle of Man, which he almost ruled as a sovereign and which still today sustains unique privileges in Great Britain and stands outside the European Community. Sir Walter Scott has written a great novel which points out the perhaps gravest crisis during the reign of James I. It is not very well known and is called "Peveril of the Peak". It deals with an insurrection which was instigated by a certain Mr Christian, a chieftain of the Isle of Man and a forefather to Fletcher Christian, who made himself famous in the mutiny on the "Bounty" in 1789. This ancestor, I think his name was William Christian, was also unjustly bereft of life and honour and even decapitated by mistake. In this insurrection from the Isle of Man the earl of Derby must have shared some of the responsibility. This could have resulted in that king James I commanded him to silence and perhaps even threatened him with the horrors of the Star Chamber.

So much in support of your theory. I think, however, that your theory falls on the very corner-stone which according to you is its decisive support - the two epitaphs by Stanley. Shakespeare could never have written them. It is obvious that they are inspired by the style of Shakespeare, but they are rather imitating than convincing. In my view earl Stanley's poems confirm that earl Stanley is not Shakespeare the poet.

You allege that Shakespeare the man is difficult to combine with the 37 grand dramas. Could he then not have had some imagination? Jules Verne wrote fantastic travel stories and described conditions abroad in far off countries without ever leaving France. I am sorry, but your and Mr Nordling's and professor Lefranc's theory does not hold, no matter how much material there is in support for it. As there will always be doubts about Shakespeare's identity, there will always be greater doubts about another's substituting Shakespeare's identity.

But here's another theory for you: have you never wondered why Shakespeare never wrote a play about king Arthur? Of course, the Queen deceiving her sovereign with one of his knights was a delicate theme to represent on stage, but all the same he succeeded in writing about it, and it became his most delicate drama: that's what his Sonnets are all about: king Arthur reflecting on Sir Lancelot and Lady Guinevere. The dark lady then is most probably Morgan le Fay. It's just a theory, but it fits."

-----

Our friend John Bede thus maintains that Shakespeare could not produce a play showing how the King's Queen deceives him with his first knight - it would not have been proper. For the same reason the play "Henry VIII" does not say anything about the king's adultery. That Shakespeare should have found the theme of king Arthur so irresistible that he simply had to treat it in some way and found a method of doing so in the cryptical sonnets is a most enthralling theory.

We have objections, however, against John Bede's view on the epitaphs. They were written 20 years after the last writings of Shakespeare, and nothing implies that earl Stanley wrote anything in between. During 20 years even a poet has time to rust. If the epitaphs are not on level with Shakespeare's finest sonnets, they are all the same sustained by an almost Shakespearean pathos and honesty and depth of feeling. Above all: the nature of these epitaphs bear witness that these were not the first poems that earl Stanley ever wrote.

Here are the epitaphs in modernized spelling:

"To say a Stanley lies here, that alone  
were epitaph enough; no brass, no stone,  
no glorious tomb, no monumental hearse,  
no gilded trophy or lamp-laboured verse  
can dignify his grave or set it forth  
like the immortal fame of his own worth.  
Then, reader, fix not here, but quit this room  
and fly to Abraham's bosom - there's his tomb.  
There rests his soul, and for his other parts  
they are embalmed and lodged in good men's hearts.  
A braver monument of stone or lime,  
no art can raise, for this shall outlast time."

(Chelsea Old Church, the monument on his son, Sir Robert Stanley,  
and his children, 1633. )

"Ask who lies here, but do not weep.  
He is not dead; he doth but sleep.  
This stony register is for his bones.  
His fame is more perpetual than these stones,  
and his own goodness, with himself being gone  
shall live when earthly monument is none.  
Not monumental stone preserves our fame  
nor sky-aspiring pyramids our name.  
The memory for him for whom this stands  
shall outlive marble and defacers' hands.  
When all to time's consumption shall be given,  
Stanley, for whom this stands, shall stand in heaven."

(Tong Church, in the outskirts of Birmingham, the monument on his uncle  
Sir Thomas Stanley with wife and son, 1632.)

## *The Shakespeare Debate with John Bede and Carl O. Nordling*

This continued for several volumes, but the last word was John Bede's:

"Thanks for sending me the works of Carl O. Nordling. He has put forth a most admirable and magnificent work of research, and I wonder if he realizes himself the importance of his findings. I am inclined to agree with him and accept his theories on almost every point, but in the end he stumbles on his own wicket and backfires. I must maintain that Shakespeare was *not* Marlowe nor Thomas Kyd and least of all Robert Burton. This clergyman is the very opposite of Shakespeare: a devout protestant, an unbearably tedious pedant, and a most unspiritual and unsophisticated bore completely lacking the art and vocabulary of Shakespeare. His work has merits but far from the merits of Shakespeare.

On the other hand, this Derby theory remains interesting and not without a certain plausibility. Mr Nordling's case is hopeless, however, without proper evidence. You'll never convince the world that Shakespeare was not Shakespeare without definite material evidence. The Shakespearisms of Marlowe, Burton and others can always be explained in other ways. It is known that Marlowe collaborated with Shakespeare at least in Henry VI Part One. Burton was clearly influenced by Shakespeare, since he has references to him, while there is not one reference to Michel de Montaigne in Burton, which clearly is one of Shakespeare's greatest influences. This is only one point of many indicating a clear incompatibility between Shakespeare and Burton.

The link between many Elizabethans and post-Elizabethans is a certain spirit of mind, which is felt both in Kyd, Marlowe, Jonson, Bacon, Burton and others, which reaches its highest expression in the personality of Shakespeare. Also William Stanley voices this spirit in his late epitaphs. But although Shakespeare leaves the scene and dies, the spirit prevails and never leaves England. It is also felt in Milton, Dryden, Swift, Coleridge, Keats and Shelley, the Brontë sisters and even in Conan Doyle and Robert Louis Stevenson, Kipling and Somerset Maugham. But this spirit must never be confused in the days of Shakespeare with other personalities than Shakespeare. William Stanley might well have been under its influence, since he knew Shakespeare personally, but the intimacy with this spirit does not imply that Stanley was Shakespeare.

This is my argument against mr Nordling and Lord Stanley as a Kelt and representative of the English-speaking peoples and, as I claim, myself an intimate of the spirit of Shakespeare.

The issue remains interesting, more material will certainly appear to shed some more light on the mystery, but no scientist will get anywhere in the ways of new theories without proper evidence which dispels every shadow of a doubt."

So much for John Bede. His answer is oracular and ambiguous. He accepts mr Nordling's theories with one hand only to refute them with the other. One could also say, that he neither opens nor closes the door but leaves it slightly ajar. And one can well ask if such an explanation to the mystery as "Shakespeare's spirit making itself felt in others than Shakespeare"

can be regarded as scientifically acceptable.

Mr Nordling's theories are basically these:

1) Shakespeare's dialect is not the language of Shakespeare's home county but belongs rather to the north of England in counties like Lancashire, Cheshire and Yorkshire, which Shakespeare never visited, and which dialect is not used outside these counties, while earl William Stanley was from these very parts.

2) The two epitaphs in Tong and Chelsea are easier to identify with Shakespeare than many of his sonnets. These epitaphs were provably written by William Stanley in 1631 and 1632, that is more than fifteen years after Shakespeare's death.

3) "Hamlet" can only have been written by someone intimately familiar with the life of the Danish court at Kronborg Castle in Elsinore in 1585. Shakespeare had no connection with the Danish court while William Stanley most probably did have.

4) The social position of William Stanley as a close relative of both the English and the Scottish royal families and his resignation from the rights of royal succession fits psychologically perfectly with the position and predicament of Hamlet in the play.

5) Many details and geographical descriptions in the plays of Shakespeare show that the author knew the world well outside England, so well that he must have been a traveller himself. Shakespeare was not. Stanley did travel in his youth.

These are the main arguments of Carl O. Nordling, of which the three first are the most important.

### *A Case for Christopher Marlowe*

Christopher Marlowe, not even two months older than Shakespeare, was the acknowledged creator of the classical Elizabethan drama in blank verse by seven great tragedies of an epoch-making nature, among others the first great drama of Doctor Faustus, which later inspired Goethe to his life's work. But apart from being an ingenious dramatist and poet, he was also a man who lived dangerously, working as a spy for Sir Francis Walsingham until his death in 1590, having reputedly homosexual connections and being (reputedly) an atheist.

In 1589 he was involved in a deadly duel with William Bradley. Marlowe's friend and colleague Thomas Watson interfered, and since this was the man Bradley really had sought quarrel with, Bradley left Marlowe and concentrated on Watson, who killed Bradley. This extremely thrilling triple duel must have made a strong impression on Marlowe - if Watson hadn't interfered, Marlowe would have been dead, being a small person (166 cm) and no fighter. Watson had a short term in prison for the duel, while Marlowe was acquitted.

May 18th 1593 Marlowe was arrested for alleged atheism and suspected coining of money. He had been informed against by his colleague Thomas Kyd, who had been arrested and tortured for political pamphlets. Marlowe was released on bail but forbidden to leave London, where the plague was raving. His life was on a tight-rope, and the odds were against him. Others had been executed for less. At this moment, on May 30th, he is accidentally killed in a fight over a bill in a Deptford inn by three companions who had been his friends. According to the coroner's report, Marlowe died instantly of a wound by a knife above his eye. Because of the plague situation, the body was instantly buried without even having been identified in an anonymous grave no one knows where.

Now, is this a credible story? Marlowe was an expert on intrigue, which he had proved in seven great tragedies, all works of a genius. Is it probable that he allowed himself to be involved in a fight with three common men for some pennies? No, it is much more probable that he arranged this scene without other witnesses in order to escape the difficult situation of his life and officially vanish. Pronounced dead, he would be free. All his three murderers were on the payroll of Sir Thomas Walsingham, cousin to Sir Francis Walsingham and Marlowe's benefactor - some even say lover.

The body that was slipped away could have been someone else's. There has never been evidence of Marlowe's death, the body never had a known grave, the brawl took place when the inn was empty with only its owner, a widow, present; the body was never identified and never had an autopsy, and the death certificate, discovered in 1925, seems fabricated. Experts have stated that no one can die of a wound of that sort which according to the coroner Marlowe died of instantly. Experts have stated, that to die of such a wound would take at least a few days. According to the coroner's report, Marlowe was the attacker whom the defendant killed by accident in self-defence while the other two did nothing. All four had been associating peacefully the whole day, after dinner Marlowe rested on a bench while the other three remained seated, then came the bill, and Marlowe suddenly attacked the middle man from behind, who could not defend himself, and sitting in the middle he couldn't even turn around against Marlowe. All the same, according to the coroner, he managed to give Marlowe a fatal wound above the eye, which no one else could have died of, but Marlowe did.

Also the coroner had been selected by Sir Thomas Walsingham. Every detail in the coroner's report seems premeditated long in advance to create a perfect crime scene in which Marlowe could officially vanish for good. The report seems fabricated to the very purpose of leaving no doubts and nothing to question. The fellow responsible for Marlowe's accidental death was of course prosecuted but soon released since he had acted in self-defence, and he immediately continued in the service of Sir Thomas Walsingham.

According to theories, Marlowe escaped to France and Italy. The scene in "Romeo and Juliet" where Tybalt kills Mercutio seems copied from the very fight between Marlowe, Bradley and Watson - but of course dramatized. Mercutio then could very well be a self-portrait of the young Marlowe.

There was one drawback in Marlowe's staged death - he could not return to life. He could continue to write plays, but not in his own name. The name provided for Marlowe's continued progress as a playwright was found in a decent fellow who willingly let himself be paid by Walsingham to give his name to Marlowe's plays. His name was William Shakespeare, an honest actor from Stratford.

*"Your name from hence immortal life shall have,  
Though I, once gone, to all the world must die...  
Your monument shall be my gentle verse,  
Which eyes not yet created shall o'er-read;" - Sonnet LXXXI.*

This is the Marlowe case in brief.

Without doubt, the reports, rumours and backbiting on Marlowe must have been an unbearable burden to him. This remarkable shoemaker's son from Canterbury, an only son with four younger sisters, worked himself up alone to a brilliant degree in Cambridge. Just this career of a student without any family fortunes or titles must have been something unique in England at that time. This brilliant intellectual talent came by his sheer endowment early into contact with such influential gentlemen as Sir Walter Raleigh, perhaps the most colourful of all the Elizabethans beside the earl of Essex, and Sir Philip Sidney, another literary genius who died young, but who had time to act as a host to Giordano Bruno when he visited England. It's possible and probable that Christopher Marlowe might have been in some contact with Giordano Bruno, since you can trace some influence from him and from Sidney, which surprisingly is voiced in "Love's Labour's Lost".

But Marlowe was never an atheist. That reputation was false. In almost all of Marlowe's plays there are religious arguments, which show an astounding ability to discern between what is true and false. In "Tamburlaine the Great", the first classical Elizabethan drama, the chief character Timur Lenk rejects Mohammed and denounces him, but he never rejects God. This is a typical Marlowian differentiation. In "The Jew of Malta" the greedy Jew occasionally seems both heroic and sympathetic in his wild intrigues, and his religion is never derided. When he quite surprisingly perishes in the end it almost seems unfair. This Jew Barabbas sustains the whole play by his enormously complex religious character, just like Shylock does the same in "The Merchant of Venice", who could be regarded as a more modulated and developed version of the Barabbas character. Marlowe goes furthest in his interesting religious dealings in "The Massacre at Paris", where the victim to the slaughter is religion itself, which commits suicide by its moral collapse and bankruptcy. A better reason for never more dealing with any kind of religion couldn't be imagined on the part of Marlowe or king Henry IV of France.

Marlowe might very well have known king Henry IV of Navarre personally. "The Massacre at Paris" seems to convey that impression, and even more "Love's Labour's Lost", which leads us to suggest that Marlowe escaped after May 1593 to king Henry in France. He had earlier been on missions to Rheims, he must have known France well with the problems of the Huguenots, and many English Catholics had sought refuge at Rheims, whom he knew, since he had been spying on them for Sir Francis Walsingham.

"Tamburlaine the Great" has another interesting common denominator with the historical Shakespeare plays. In this early drama the poet already demonstrates his total freedom to deal with historical facts exactly as he wishes. Everything is allowed in rewriting history in order to fit it in on the stage. Tamburlaine has exactly as little to do with the real Timur Lenk as Shakespeare's Antony has any resemblance with the historical Antony, the murderer of Cicero. Such perfect parallels in the utterly shameless and disrespectful way of illustrating history are more than just striking.

Neither was Marlowe any proved coiner of money. It is true that he knew the art of coining base money, he probably tested doing it when he was in Holland,

("When I have seen the hungry ocean gain  
Advantage on the kingdom on the shore,  
And the firm soil win on the wat'ry main..."      Sonnet LXIV,)

but there is no evidence that he ever practised that craft in England. Thus the Crown had no real charge against him.

Also his reputed homosexuality could be questioned. It is most probable that he with other British poets of the highest rank (like Byron, Shelley and Oscar Wilde, whom we must never forget was married and had two children: his homosexuality was in fact only a left-handed escapade,) quite simply was liberal enough to be bisexual - or asexual, which highly intellectual thinkers often are. This gives the Marlowe theory an advantage to both the candidatures of Shakespeare and Stanley to the authorship of the dramas: without any family ties Marlowe could more easily concentrate on creating the world's greatest dramas than both Shakespeare and Stanley.

When Marlowe vanishes from life, Shakespeare doesn't yet exist as a poet or playwright. Four months after the Deptford 'murder' he turns up as the author of his first publication, the poem "Venus and Adonis" eloquently dedicated to the dashing earl of Southampton, Henry Wriothesley, which dedication makes it impossible for anyone to doubt the author's identity as W. Shakespeare. This dedication eliminates every suspicion of Marlowe's haunting the verses, although the poem fits perfectly as a

continuation and development of the theme in the last work in Marlowe's name, the idyllic love poem "Hero and Leander". Perhaps it was necessary to furnish the two Shakespearean poems with dedications to avoid suspicion: The two poems fit as a continuation of Marlowe's poem like hands into their perfect gloves, as if, as one scholar put it, "*Marlowe reminds you more of Shakespeare than Shakespeare does himself.*"

Fleeing from England, things indicate that he found a safe environment with the knavish king Henry IV, who took nothing seriously and took all political intrigues for a joke. He changed religion a number of times and didn't care to which church he belonged as long as it matched his politics. Such a king would have been the ideal refuge to a vulnerable adventurer, who was embarking on a new life. "Love's Labour's Lost" was probably written on this occasion as the poet's first comedy. It's an intimate chamber comedy with the thinnest plot of all the plays, suited to a very small stage but full of French wit and trivialities: it's a trifle and the ideal experiment in comedy for a playwright who never had tried writing comedies in his life. Much in this almost over-spiritual comedy reminds you of "As You Like It", which also takes place in France. Most Shakespeare scholars agree, that "Love's Labour's Lost" can only have been written by someone who knew France and Henry IV intimately.

Then follow the Italian comedies, which betray the same thing: plays like "The Taming of the Shrew", "The Two Gentlemen of Verona", "Romeo and Juliet" and "The Merchant of Venice" can only have been written by someone who stayed long enough in these north-eastern parts of Italy to know them more than well. The local knowledge they display, like for instance about the water ways between Venice and Milan, could in those days only be acquired on the spot. To this comes the phenomenon about the sources to some of the Italian plays.

The source of "Romeo and Juliet" was a widely read and extremely popular short story by Luigi da Porto (1485-1529), which the poet simply has dramatized, but with some innovation: the characters of Mercutio, the Nurse, Benvolio and Prince Escalus have been invented, neither Paris nor Juliet's father play any great part in the short story, Tybalt is killed by Romeo without having killed any Mercutio, and Romeo is not dead when Juliet awakes in the tomb. The story of "Othello" is a true one recorded by G.B.Giraldo Cintio (1504-73), who got it live from Emilia, Iago's widow. In "Othello" the dramatist has not invented any extra characters, but he has given Othello a character of his own, the moor is not a nobly tragic figure in the original, but the whole series of events is a most brutal and vulgar story of vile desire. Iago's motivation is, that Desdemona has turned him down, she can't understand that he, who is already married, could try anything with her, who passionately loves only the moor, and so Iago decides to revenge himself on her. The story is very racist: to be turned down for a moor is the supreme insult to Iago, who breeds suspicion in the moor and prompts him to murder, which they however commit together, breaking down a wall on Desdemona, who is crushed. They were both tried for murder, but Othello admitted nothing and was acquitted though dishonoured for life, while Iago was badly tortured and died from it. The only name mentioned in the whole novelette is "Disdemona", the "un-devilish", while all others remain anonymous.

More remarkable is the origin to "The Merchant of Venice". This story is part of a collection like "Decamerone" written by a certain Ser Giovanni, and this short story is called "*Il Pecorone*". The remarkable thing is that the poet has come across this obscure collection of short stories, found this long one and dramatized it exactly according to the text. There are no extra inventions here. The drama concentrates the action on the middle part of the story, which really is like a short novel with complicated intrigues and long voyages in far off countries; and every detail is copied from the story: the

Jew's refusing to compromise, the faked court of justice - only the Shylock character is developed and is like a brother of Barabbas in "The Jew of Malta", only more human.

Published short stories like "Il Pecorone", "The Book of Juliet" and "The Moor of Venice" could hardly have been available in English. A short story like "Il Pecorone" can only have been available in Italy. But W. Shakespeare never left England and did probably not know Italian. One who did know Italian was Thomas Kyd, the author of the most successful "The Spanish Tragedy", the first blood-curdling horror drama, which instantly turned Thomas Kyd into Marlowe's most dangerous competitor. Kyd's dramas are often spiced with Italian. If Kyd knew Italian it is probable that also Marlowe did, or got the ambition to learn it, linguistically talented as he was; and if he went to Italy after some time in France, which seems probable that he did, he must have gorged in thrilling modern Italian short novels and stories in order to gratefully use them for material to practise on as a playwright.

Thomas Kyd is intimately connected with Marlowe's fate. They worked together and vied with each other and were probably both good friends and hearty enemies, as great stage personalities often are. Lying on the rack, Kyd denounced Marlowe. Agents of Her Majesty's government had ransacked Kyd's apartment for pamphlets against Flemish immigrants, found nothing of that kind but found the more other interesting things, like deeply compromising atheistic writings, for which Kyd was arrested. These extremely daring and religiously challenging writings Kyd blamed on Marlowe and made a full statement implicating Marlowe completely, being forced to any unwilling confessions by the most insensitive machinery of the rack. Kyd was released but later on died from the after-effects of his torture. Marlowe might have felt some guilt for Kyd's undeserved fate, since Marlowe really was much guiltier of religious speculations than Kyd, who never had any interest in politics or religion. Like Michelangelo destroyed his own frescoes in the municipality of Florence when his competitor Leonardo's frescoes were ruined from sheer bad luck, so Marlowe might have decided to never again appear under his own name as a playwright after the most brutal rape of Thomas Kyd's muse.

There are more implications. One of the strangest is the secret contents in "As You Like It". Not only do we here find the strange character of Jacques, who many believe to be a self-portrait of the poet, and which is convincing as such. Two other characters reveal even more than Jacques: Touchstone and the preposterous priest Sir Oliver Martext, who really has nothing to do with the play. The knave Touchstone has several interesting quarrels with exciting import if you are familiar with the case of Marlowe. In one place Touchstone scolds the churl William, whom he calls a humbug and falsification while he himself is genuine. This is irrelevant and incomprehensible nonsense to each one who knows nothing of the Marlowe case, since the only possible interpretation is that Marlowe in this disguise unmask William Shakespeare.

Sir Oliver Martext is as a mere character even more irrelevant. This is the only instance in the whole Shakespeare production where a superfluous character has been introduced to just utter a few insignificant lines and vanish. There is no explanation to his total misplacement. But in the First Folio the name is written Mar-text, and his only line of any meaning is his last: "...ne'er a fantastical knave of them all shall flout me out of my calling." The visiting appearance of Mar-text can only be explained in one way: he is the abbreviation of the clandestine message of *Marlowe's text*. This of course appears as a somewhat roundabout explanation, but let us remember the great pamphlet war in Canterbury in the 1580's. The author of seven pamphlets causing great religious controversy was a certain pseudonym who has never been found out calling himself *Martin Marprelate*. Now, Canterbury, from whence the pamphlets proceeded, was the hometown of Christopher Marlowe. This, of course, proves nothing, but might be the

only possible explanation to that pamphlet war, which the spurious name of *Sir Oliver Martext* might be a last distant echo of.

These are but small links in a long chain of Marlowe indications in the play. But just such small hints so well disguised might have proved too much. Just before the play was to be printed in 1600 it was withdrawn from the presses, someone apparently had found it too risky and dangerous, and it was never printed until in *The First Folio* 23 years later.

These are but small trivialities in the overwhelming concordance between Shakespeare and Marlowe, as if Shakespeare had been Marlowe's double. The great circumstantial evidence is the style of Marlowe and Shakespeare, which is identical like finger-prints of the same person but in different ages. Scholars have always recognized traits of Marlowe's hand in early Shakespeare plays like "Titus Andronicus", "The Taming of the Shrew", "King John" and "Henry VI". Characters like Richard III, King Lear, Macbeth, Coriolanus and Timon of Athens are like aggrandized developments of such early heaven-storming Marlowe characters as Tamburlaine, doctor Faustus and the Jew Barabbas of Malta. The only chronicle play of Marlowe's, "Edward II", is a clear prototype to all the chronicles of Shakespeare. Concerning "Henry VI" there is a fragment by Marlowe called "Richard, Duke of York", which clearly is an earlier version of the third part of "Henry VI". The strange thing about this early version is, that everything is already there: the whole tragedy is developed, the ultimate personality of Richard III is already finished, even the horrible war scenes with the father who has killed his son and the son who has killed his father are complete *in Marlowe's version*.

We must not forget the Shakespeare apocrypha. There were six additional plays to which this name was attached as the author: "Lochrine", "Sir John Oldcastle", "The True Chronicle History of Thomas Lord Cromwell", "The London Prodigal", "The Puritan" and "A Yorkshire Tragedy". These six were sorted out as *The First Folio* was compiled as not on the level with the other 37 plays. But these six were printed in Shakespeare's name while he lived. It's quite possible that they were actually written by him - but not by Marlowe.

### *The Sun-Spots of the Poet.*

The first one is the most famous: Hamlet's folly. Hamlet is on the point of losing his head as he visits Ofelia with torn clothes and later on violates all limits to the correctness of behaviour for an heir to the throne in the violent scene against her. And the height in this disturbing middle part of the play, which always has caused so much concern and difficulties to actors and directors, is of course the suicide monologue.

All this folly, which is not to be found in the original story of Saxo Grammaticus, where Hamlet's folly finds completely different expressions, is singular to the author. Therefore there is only one interpretation: here is a personal self confession. Hamlet is such an extremely idiosyncratic individualist, that it can only be a self-portrait - and as such a unique expression of the poet. The problem is just, that this intricate irrational distracted playacting is completely ununderstandable.

Is it then possible to place such a torn personality in connection with William Stanley, the 6th earl of Derby, the candidate to the throne of the Catholics, a highly educated jurist with responsibility for a county, and with additional responsibility as the governor and owner of the Isle of Man, happily married with three sons and two castles, an established man of the world in the highest possible social position with a wife well seen at court? Lord Stanley, the proposed candidate of many scholars to the authorship of Shakespeare's works, is a far too well-balanced man to have drawn a self-

portrait in the madness and tragic nature of Hamlet. There is no evidence that he ever would have written a single play himself, although George Fenner, a Catholic agent, wrote to Catholics abroad, that the earl of Derby "was far too busy writing plays to show any interest in the Catholic party". He would rather have been too busy governing the Isle of Man and Lancashire, bringing up his sons, maintaining his castles and properties, managing the administration of his theatre companies, keeping up his law duties and entertaining his wife to be able to write any of the Shakespeare plays. After all, these are not mere entertainments but rather part of the most advanced and difficult literature in the world. No one surpasses Shakespeare except Dante, and not even Dante surpasses the beauty of the Shakespearean sonnets.

Let's study Kit Marlowe, who at the age of 29 has to break off his career and go underground for the rest of his life to become a ghost writer to others and never again appear in public life, who always has had problems with women, who in "Edward II" describes relationships between men much more convincingly and intimately than between the sexes, and who also previously, like in "As You Like It", has shown an inclination to surreptitiously reveal self-confessions masked in mysteries. The extremely strained relationship between Hamlet and Ofelia fits perfectly to the case of Marlowe. It just couldn't fit more perfectly, because here we have glaringly clear the most characteristic of all symptoms of Marlowe: a bad relationship between man and women (Hamlet-Ofelia) but the best possible relationship between men (Hamlet-Horatio) - but please note: without any sign of homosexuality. That's Marlowe's sexual earmark: all his sexual relationships are bad, whether they are between the sexes or the same sex, while all his asexual relationships or Platonic friendships are perfect. And nothing would suit better into a case like Marlowe's than Hamlet's suicide monologue. Such a case would if anything give frequent occasions to reflections upon suicide, and in a character like Hamlet he would have had the ideal opportunity to give vent to such broodings in artistic expression. It would be nothing less than the perfect self therapy. The distracted Hamlet could very well be regarded as the painful self-portrait of Marlowe - and then suddenly Hamlet starts to make sense.

Even greater expressions the sickly spots of the poet find in "King Lear", where the bitter disillusionments of the central figure find cosmic expressions in a tragic madness that goes beyond everything. King Lear is no more than a consequence and development of the first cautious steps into Hamlet's folly. In "Hamlet" the sickly melancholy of bitterness carefully suggests itself in a daring effort to intimate an expression. In "King Lear" the poet goes the whole line and dares to cry out his universal pain much more than just sufficiently - there is no more need for any further madness after that. Lear is the last lunatic in the canon.

Two spots remain - "Coriolanus" and "Timon of Athens". Coriolanus is the total public enemy, who takes the consequences of the injustice he suffers from the state he has served. Also Coriolanus is a complex character, who from sheer nobility of spirit can't apply the populist methods demanded of a civil servant if he is to get any support from the common mob. He just can't lower himself to show the vulgarity needed to become popular. As a consequence he is misunderstood and becomes unpopular and is frozen out by the more popular politicians whose positions depend on the favours of the common mob, whereupon he, being a completely honest man, takes the consequences in full and joins the enemies to the state to take up arms against his own home country: his logic makes him a traitor. This character is also a most personal invention of the author: Plutarch has not the slightest indication of the profound political psychology which is so predominant in the drama. Thus we can guess a self-portrait here as well. Of Lord Stanley? Impossible. He never wavered in his loyalty to

the Crown, and king James did himself intervene for Lord Stanley in his great family trial of many years. He was loyalty impersonated.

Kit Marlowe was in the 1580's in the secret service of Sir Francis Walsingham spying on Catholics in France. Associating with them in Rheims, he knew the psychology and reason of traitors, like Dostoyevsky learned to understand the psychology of criminals in the prisons of Siberia. We have already suggested Marlowe's increasing bitterness during the years. Here again Coriolanus suits perfectly into the pattern as a self-therapeutic expression of a volcanically deep resentment against the British Crown, who probably failed Christopher Marlowe when it should have protected him, considering his earlier services to the state.

Finally the total misanthropist Timon of Athens - again a perfectly personal expression of a deep disappointment in humanity and in life itself. The only woman parts in the whole play are two harlots appearing drunk with Alcibiades. Never was woman given a more bitter jibe in any play by this playwright. It's his maximum insult against the weaker sex. Also this would fit perfectly into the case of Christopher Marlowe - and nowhere else.

Finally an authentic document (somewhat shortened), the critical moment in Marlowe's life, which compels him to his most extraordinary fate - to be able to survive only by officially ceasing to exist. It's the royal agent Richard Baines' report on Marlowe to the Privy Council and the Queen:

"Containing the opinion of Christopher Marlowe concerning his damnable opinions and judgement of religion and scorn of God's word.

That the Indians and many Authors of antiquity have assuredly written of above 16 thousand years ago, whereas Adam is proved to have lived within 6 thousand years.

He affirms that Moses was but a Juggler and that one Harriot, being Sir Walter Raleigh's man, can do more than he.

That Moses made the Jews travel 11 years in the wilderness, which journey to the promised land might have been done in less than one year, to the intent that those who were privy to most of his subtleties might perish and so an everlasting superstition remain in the hearts of the people.

That the first beginning of Religion was only to keep men in awe.

That Christ was the son of a carpenter and that, if the Jews among whom he was born did crucify him, they best knew him and whence he came.

That Christ deserved to die better than Barabbas, and that the Jews made a good choice, though Barabbas was both a thief and a murderer.

That if there be any God or good Religion, then it is the Papists', because the service of God is performed with more ceremonies, as elevation of the mass, organs, singing men, shaven crowns, etc.

That all Protestants are hypocritical asses.

That if he were put to write a new religion, he would undertake a both more excellent and Admirable method.

That all they that love not Tobacco and Boys were fools.

That all the apostles were fishermen and base fellows, neither of wit nor worth, that Paul only had wit, but he was a timorous fellow in bidding men to be subject to magistrates against his conscience.

That he had as good a right to coin as the Queen of England, and that he was acquainted with one Poole, a prisoner in Newgate, who has great skill in mixture of metals, and having learned some things from him, he meant, through help of a cunning stamp-maker, to coin French crowns, pistolets, and English shillings.

That Richard Cholmeley has confessed that he was persuaded by Marlowe's reasons to become an Atheist.

That this Marlowe does not only hold these opinions himself, but almost into every company he comes he persuades men to Atheism, utterly scorning both God and His ministers, wherefore I, Richard Baines, think all men in Christianity ought to endeavour that the mouth of so dangerous a member may be stopped."

This document is received by the Privy Council of the Queen on May 29th 1593. Marlowe's protector Sir Thomas Walsingham was in touch with the Queen and Council and probably had immediate knowledge of the report, the only serious charge of which was Marlowe's knowledge of coining money. The Queen could forgive anything but that someone interfered in her national economy.

So Marlowe's life as a successful dramatist is put at the stake, and he has no alternative to have his career disrupted than to anticipate the authorities and interrupt it himself, which he doesn't hesitate to do the very following day. And instead of the successful playwright and national poet Marlowe we had the most difficult case in theatre history, a much worse and more tragic and complicated case than the naïve simpleton Oscar Wilde, who was not strong enough to cope with his own case. Not until 1895, the very year when Oscar Wilde was put to trial, it started to be observed that Marlowe and Shakespeare could be the same author, the theory was published in California by the lawyer William G. Ziegler, who had found out that Shakespeare's and Marlowe's style were identical. The coroner's report on Marlowe's death was discovered 30 years later in 1925, and 30 years later again Calvin Hoffman published his book "The Man Who Was Shakespeare" where he exposes the sensational results of 19 years of research, an extremely concentrated and substantial book containing enough circumstantial evidence to show that Marlowe himself staged his death to be able to continue developing his art in spite of the "vulgar scandal stamped upon his brow" (Sonnet 112) but under the name of his colleague, the most reliable actor and stage director William Shakespeare.

The problem of the Puritans seems to have been the Nemesis not only of Marlowe but of the entire Elizabethan age. The important key figure to the Shakespeare mystery William Stanley, earl of Derby, died 81 years old in 1642. Around the same time the civil war broke out, and all the theatres closed in all England for 18 years ahead. Later on in the civil war, the Puritans burned the castle and home of Lord Stanley including his invaluable library, where all the original manuscripts of the Shakespeare plays might have been kept.

*"My dear Shakespeare reader,*

Many thanks for sending me the Richard Baines report in full. As I had not read it before, it appeared to me as a stunning revelation. I am now prepared to reconsider the Shakespeare problem and to alter my position more in favour of Christopher Marlowe. In fact, this report could both be regarded as an explanation of the case and as close to clear evidence of Marlowe's authorship of the Shakespeare works as you can get.

The stunning thing about this report is the evil of it. Of course it is biased. Mr Richard Baines must have hated Christopher Marlowe. I see him as a petty official drudging on in obscurity with sordid paper work and with little chance of advancement in life. So he becomes a police spy specializing on informing against people. His motivation can't just have been safe-guarding the security of the state. Something about the successful genius of Christopher Marlowe must have revolted him, maybe Marlowe's audacity combined with some arrogance and insolence, but most probably Marlowe's clearcut and ruthless freedom of conscience. Mr Richard Baines must have been a complete Puritan, a bigot of the very worst kind, reacting against Marlowe's preposterous free-thinking as destructively as he possibly could. Mr

Baines must have been fully aware, that his report was the complete devastation of Marlowe's career and life, and he must have written it in the very intention of effectively ruining the playwright's life.

Of course, the Queen, being the highest sponsor and lover of the Theatre in England, must have seen through Mr Baines' bias and vile intentions and been shocked. She could not have sanctioned the arrest of Marlowe and his execution. She could not have taken such a prejudiced Puritan report seriously. At the same time, she could not disregard the fact that Marlowe's knowledge of coining was a latent security risk which had to be dealt with. She probably summoned Sir Thomas Walsingham, Marlowe's benefactor, promptly and commanded him to do something about it, to dispose of the problem without disrupting Marlowe's most promising career as a playwright and poet. Walsingham, who was knighted a few years later, must have solved the problem to the Queen's satisfaction. Instead of Marlowe she got Shakespeare, the protégé of Henry Wriothesley, the earl of Southampton, and, more important, in the theatre company of Will Stanley, the sixth earl of Derby, perhaps the most influential political key person in England beside the Queen, being the leader of the Catholics with diplomatic connections all over Europe, if anything an international figure and the perfect underground diplomat to be able to advocate new plays in the untarnished and completely non-controversial name of William Shakespeare.

I am with you, Christian, in your rehabilitation push for Christopher Marlowe.

*Yours, John Bede."*

### *The Revelation of the Sonnets.*

Peter Quennell characterizes the sonnets as "a much visited cave with an infinite number of footprints outside the entrance, which show that many explorers have entered across its threshold but that none of them yet has come out of the cave." The 154 sonnets constitute the most difficult riddle in world literature. They tell a story, which no one has been able to interpret, and each effort to an interpretation has only made the interpretation more difficult. As a riddle it can perhaps only be compared with the prophecies of Nostradamus, which have caused as much speculation, but which have been interpreted with much greater ease than the Shakespearean sonnets.

But if you use the case of Christopher Marlowe for a mould and try to suit it into the hardly discernible pattern of the mysteries it is almost frighteningly much that fits, but still far from all. The extremely private and personal drama of the sonnets becomes visible but only faintly in the outlines.

Is it then at least possible from the sonnets to have a clear answer to our main question, namely who the poet really is? Let's have a look.

The first sonnets are the simplest. The poet loves a young man, whose beauty he wants him to preserve for the future by begetting a son. It's the purest and most beautiful thinkable expression of Platonic love when it is at its most constructive.

Sonnet 16 reveals there is a portrait of the man. This information inspired Oscar Wilde to write his most initiated speculation "The Portrait of Mr W.H." in 1888, a story which shows that Oscar Wilde perhaps deeper than anyone else tried to understand the sonnets but as a result only missed his shot more grossly than anyone else: He wants Mr W.H. to be a fair actor called Will Hughes, who is supposed to have been an expert on playing female parts. The idea is good although it remains 100% speculation.

In sonnet 20, Woman enters but so far without devastating consequences. But with sonnet 25 the self-confessions start to deepen and increase the reader's interest for the

increasing mystery. This sonnet is especially interesting to our research, as it seems to definitely exclude William Stanley as a candidate to the authorship of Shakespeare's works, for here the poet's social position appears rather definite: He has no position, no titles, no public respect and is willingly detached from things like that, not with scorn but rather with some melancholy, as if he was well aware of his being excluded from all such possibilities in life.

In sonnet 29 he goes further and confesses to be in disgrace with Fortune and cries in self pity for his outcast state.

In sonnet 50 he is exiled. This theme of exile is remarkable and reoccurs constantly in the Shakespeare canon and is maybe the heaviest of all arguments for Marlowe. The exile theme appears already in the early comedy "The Two Gentlemen of Verona" and dominates also the comedies "As You Like It", "The Winter's Tale" and "The Tempest" and haunts most of the tragedies. The exile is always experienced and expressed as an extremely painful suffering but also with a kind of masochistic lust and pathos, as if the poet wallowed in that kind of suffering. The exile theme is driven to extremes in "King Lear", where the central part is driven to the highest degree of mental disorder by being driven into exile by his own family. Neither Shakespeare nor Stanley ever experienced being driven into exile.

In several sonnets he thinks of himself as a dead man, for example in 71 and 72, but in 73 we have another obvious indication. The only known portrait of Marlowe in Corpus Christi College in Cambridge has a text in the upper left-hand corner which says in Latin: "*Quod nutrit me destruit,*" ("That which nourishes me destroys me,") which the portrayed person himself wanted inscribed on the painting, as some sort of motto. It was painted in 1585 as Marlowe was 21 years old. This very statement and phrase reoccurs constantly throughout the works of Shakespeare in many varied forms, like in sonnet 73:

"In me thou seest the glowing of such fire  
That on the ashes of his youth doth lie,  
As the death-bed whereon it must expire,  
Consum'd with that which it was nourish'd by."

That Shakespeare or Stanley would copy and imitate Marlowe so directly or unawares in such extremely personal self-effusing poems as the sonnets, which all through breathe only the purest honesty, seems improbable to the highest possible degree. You can steal of others, but you can't copy another's spirit and publish it as your own. Here speaks the very same spirit that put the signature on the portrait.

In sonnet 74 he goes even farther in reflections over himself as dead:

"So then thou hast but lost the dregs of life,  
The prey of worms, my body being dead;  
The coward conquest of a wretch's knife,  
Too base of thee to be remembered."

Lines like these are completely incomprehensible and inexplicable unless you put them in context with Marlowe's staged death. Also in sonnet 112 he speaks of having had a "vulgar scandal" stamped upon his brow.

In sonnet 125 he speaks straight out:

"Hence, thou suborn'd informer! A true soul,  
When most impeach'd, stands least in thy control."

This sonnet is clearly one of the most autobiographical, where he also confesses himself "poor but free". This also is not compatible with neither Shakespeare nor Lord Stanley.

In sonnet 127 appears the dark lady with devouringly destructive passions for a result (sonnet 129), the most typical of all Marlowe syndromes: Platonic love is perfect, but sexual love is only devastating.

This is merely a sketch of the top of the iceberg. 90% of the real contents of the sonnets will perhaps always remain hopelessly unexplainable even with Marlowe for a guide. The fact remains, however, that with both Shakespeare and Stanley for guides even less of the sonnets can be grasped and explained.

We mentioned the exile theme in so many of the Shakespeare plays. Almost all the greatest writers of Europe have created their masterworks in exile, starting with Dante, who was exiled from Florence and wrote most of his Comedy in exile. Victor Hugo wrote his three unsurpassed novels "Les Miserables", "Workers of the Sea" and "The Laughing Man" in exile from France on the isle of Guernsey in the English Channel. Dostoyevsky was not allowed for many years to live in his city of St. Petersburg and wrote "The Idiot" and "The Possessed" in Germany. Ibsen wrote most of his plays in voluntary exile in Rome. Stefan Zweig wrote all his greatest books after the exile from Austria in 1934. Already Ovid, the Latin poet who is most frequently remembered and quoted in the works of Marlowe and Shakespeare, (Marlowe actually translated him,) used his art in for instance "Tristia" in his exile from Rome as a kind of therapy to handle his anguished desperation. There is much to indicate that Marlowe in his enforced exile from England the more was motivated to create the more sublime masterpieces to fight and withstand the utter desperation of his loneliness. There are many indications in the sonnets that his love was telepathic.

Echoes of Marlowe occur not only in Oscar Wilde. Keats and Shelley were also exiled from England on different grounds, wrote their masterpieces and found their deaths in exile. Of all poets in England after Shakespeare, these two come the closest to the spirit and poetical ideal of Shakespeare.

By his fate Marlowe would find himself in the company of Beethoven, who by his deafness received the cruellest possible fate for his profession, and Dostoyevsky, who was condemned to death and had his life ruined by his political involvements in the writings of his youth. The last Shakespeare plays have often been compared with the last works of Beethoven. All these three, Marlowe, Beethoven and Dostoyevsky, were forced by their destinies to an extra effort of life and to a deeper not to say maximal concentration on their work, which luckier and happier artists never found.

### *The Controversies of Timon, Pericles and Henry VIII.*

They have been treated with some doubt as to their genuineness. "Timon of Athens", "Pericles" and "Henry VIII" separate themselves from the usual mannerisms of the poet and almost fall outside the frames of his art: *Timon* is rather a philosophical drama and unique as such in his production; *Pericles* is neither a comedy nor a tragedy but rather some kind of an entertainment almost like a vaudeville of rather an equivocal nature; and also *Henry VIII* is completely detached from all the previous chronicles by its almost documentary realism. Arguments have been raised that these plays might not have been written entirely by our poet.

We dare refute such arguments. There is only one scene in *Timon* which is doubtful, act III scene 5 in the Senate with Alcibiades and the senators, which honestly speaking seems to be manufactured in subsequence by some clot.

*Pericles* is a remarkable limbo play which doesn't seem to belong anywhere. It was excluded from *The First Folio* but was taken in later on, since some scenes unmistakably bear the imprint of our genius, especially the scene with the fishermen. The drama recounts the strange story of how prince Pericles of Tyre proposes to a lovely princess, who has an incestuous relationship with her father. In order to win her, Pericles must explain an impossible enigma, the answer to which is the very matter of incest, which answer Pericles is clever enough to discern, whereupon the father to the princess is taken by such a fear, that he has no option than to dispose of Pericles just because he has solved the riddle, in the same way that he disposed of all the previous suitors for not having solved the riddle. It's the old Turandot story all over again but in a more poignant version. Pericles has to flee to save his life, is wrecked in a storm and encounters lots of adventures, until he finds another princess, woos her and marries her and has a daughter; but in the difficult delivery on board of a ship and in the middle of a new wrecking storm his wife dies, whereupon she is buried at sea in a coffin. This coffin floats ashore and falls into the hands of a king who knows the art of resurrecting the dead: He brings the Queen back to life, who in her sense of being lost in life chooses to serve as a priestess in a temple until time will explain her life to her.

In the meanwhile the small girl, who in the storm is separated from her father, faces many strange adventures. She grows up and is taken care of by a bawdy-woman, who in vain tries to exploit her and offer her to clients: the girl is utterly impossible as a whore, since she only preaches virtue and threatens the whole brothel business with bankruptcy. This is dramatically and psychologically the most interesting part of the play.

Pericles is himself totally inconsolable without his wife and daughter and allows his beard and hair to grow for years, until one day through a miracle he suddenly regains his Queen, daughter and his senses with even the whole of his old kingdom. Thus everything ends very well.

The drama is rather short and something like a parenthesis in the production but a most important missing link: It is obvious that the poet here experiments with new possibilities after having tired of the great tragedies and left them behind. *Pericles* is in fact the introduction to the last fairy plays, which all have the same form as *Pericles* but higher developed: the most impossible, difficult and complicated embroilments and disasters are turned by the unfathomable mechanisms of fate into bright redemption and triumphing human happiness.

*Henry VIII* is almost pedantic in its careful reconstruction of the falls of the Duke of Buckingham, Catherine of Aragon and Cardinal Wolsey. The play is very extensive, and nothing much happens really: people just talk and complain.

The representation of the case of Cardinal Wolsey, however, is of the greatest interest. He is in fact one of the poet's greatest and most impressive characters. It's difficult to imagine that this corrupt and ambitious cardinal might have been so interesting a person in reality.

We bring these plays to light here since they seem to have special bearings on Marlowe. In *Pericles* we have one of the very obvious: in Act II scene 2 six suitors to the lovely princess Thaisa parade. The fourth of them carries a torch upside down with the device: *Quod me alit, me extinguit*, ("What keeps me burning consumes me"), a variation of the motto of Marlowe *Quod nutrit me destruit*, or, as the Sonnet 73 renders it:

*Consumed with that which it was nourished by.* Also the salacious intrigues of *Pericles* smell very much of the early Marlowe: such tendencies are evident in for instance "Dido, Queen of Carthage". None of the dramas in the name of Shakespeare reminds you so much of the early sexually liberated Marlowe as *Pericles* does.

We mentioned somewhere that Marlowe probably was the man behind the great theological war of pamphlets made by the pseudonym *Martin Marprelate* from Marlowe's hometown Canterbury. In the dramas under the name of Marlowe preceding his fall there is very much theology. In the Shakespeare dramas there is almost none whatsoever until suddenly in *Henry VIII* in the case of Wolsey. All of a sudden this poet speaks of God, which he has never done before. Robert Greene, one of Marlowe's colleagues, who is charged with having denounced and denigrated Shakespeare, appears to have had some admiration of Marlowe, since Greene publicly expressed that Marlowe had a prophetic spirit. Indeed, such a prophetic spirit permeates the whole of *Henry VIII* maybe more than any of the plays.

The Shakespeare connoisseur Carl O. Nordling has suggested that the poet of the dramas very well later might have written the great work published in the name of Robert Burton, the very meticulous and learned treatise called "*The Anatomy of Melancholy*", one of the favourite books of Doctor Johnson's. Our opinion was that neither Shakespeare nor Stanley were probable as authors of this work, while indeed it could fit into the picture of Marlowe. If Marlowe anonymously wrote the pamphlets under the name of Martin Marprelate, he might also very well have written "The Anatomy of Melancholy" and used Robert Burton as he used Shakespeare, being obliged to never again use his own name after the terrible denouncement of Richard Baines.

In view of this possibility you can see the Wolsey character as a missing link - a transition into a new phase of the poet's life: he abandons the theatre to return to where he started: in theology. We have admitted to Carl O. Nordling that "*The Anatomy of Melancholy*" in language and style perfectly fits as a natural continuation and development of the idea-world of the dramas, especially in view of the last great dramatical character in the poet's output, the unforgettable Cardinal Wolsey in his abyssal fall from wordliness and power to purest spirituality.

### *The Method of Doctor Mendenhall*

In 1901 a strange experiment was conducted in Boston, Massachusetts, by a certain doctor Thomas Corwin Mendenhall. He had in 1887 elaborated a method to analyze the literary "fingerprints" of an author's style by means of a very simple but extremely tedious system of summoning up some hundreds of thousands of words from an author's writings and grouping these in words of one syllable, two syllables, three syllables, four syllables, etc, adding the sums in a diagram. The more words counted, the more precise the literary "fingerprint". The method appeared to work out well, since the stylistic "fingerprint" of the investigated author always was the same, no matter from what works of his you took the vast collections of words.

In 1901 he was engaged by the rich mr Augustus Heminway for *his* purpose of trying to prove that the works of Shakespeare had been written by Francis Bacon. Doctor Mendenhall meticulously carried out his investigation but came to the decisive result that the literary "fingerprints" of Shakespeare and Bacon did not match. The great Bacon admirer mr Heminway's purpose had failed.

However, doctor Mendenhall had also made his test on other contemporary authors like Ben Jonson, Francis Beaumont, John Fletcher, Christopher Marlowe and others. It

appeared, that the literary "fingerprints" of Christopher Marlowe matched with Shakespeare as perfectly as those of Shakespeare matched with himself.

This could be regarded as an undeniable evidence of that Marlowe is the true author of the works of Shakespeare, since the method in all its simplicity can be carried out by anyone and is 100% objective.

The Shakespeare research has six authentic autographs of Shakespeare to compare, and they are variously spelt Shaksper and Shakspe. Others spell his name Shaxper, Shagsper or Shackspere. It has never been spelt Shakespeare by anyone before *The First Folio* seven years after the man's death. The different spellings of his name by himself and others might indicate, that he had some difficulty in spelling it himself. That would explain why nobody else could spell it properly. One of his daughters couldn't spell at all, she was illiterate, and on his departure from life all his property did not include one single book, so maybe also the father was illiterate. His will was obviously dictated. The more you close in on this Stratford man, the more improbable becomes his authorship to the greatest dramatic works of world literature, while as a reliable theatre man of good faith and common sense he could very well have served as the ideal cover-up for one harassed by the authorities with threats to his life like Christopher Marlowe.

### *The Unfathomable Melancholy of Robert Burton.*

You can't deny it - Robert Burton's "The Anatomy of Melancholy" is a most impressive masterpiece and one of the very profoundest works of English literature in its strange disguise of scientific casualness. There is, however, much that speaks against Marlowe to stress the authorship of Burton to this work, since he so clearly emerges personally as an individual of idiosyncrasies. He is wholly an Oxford man (while Marlowe was all Cambridge,) he speaks in his work about his parents in a way which only a good son is capable of - with reverential criticism - and also includes in his work a translation from Latin which his younger brother Ralph has construed. (He had three brothers, and the oldest one, William, raised a monument on Robert after his death in 1640.) His great life's work, "*The Anatomy of Melancholy*", saw five editions during his lifetime (between 1621 and 1638), and each new edition was provided with new footnotes, additions and alterations. He is also a most circumstantial pedant, something that the author of the Shakespeare dramas never could afford to be. Burton is more a scientist than a poet, he often repeats himself and enjoys it, and although he can be very spiritual and entertaining he is never a creative artist but just a wise old priest with very much wisdom and knowledge of life but hopelessly a monologist, giving the impression of a preacher standing in his pulpit giving a universal sermon for all eternity.

There are some striking common denominators with Marlowe-Shakespeare however. He quotes Marlowe twice as often as Shakespeare, (only this is a matter of interest,) and the idea-world is principally the same. In the last play "Henry VIII" there are clear inclinations towards circumstantiality and pedantry, where the leading part is a priest who for the first time in Shakespearean drama pays any attention to the importance of God. And why would a comfortably established country clergyman of Segrave in Leicestershire, who hardly ever travelled outside his own county during his lifetime, commit his soul into lines like these:

"I was once so mad to bustle abroad and seek about for preferment, tire myself and trouble all my friends; but all my labour was unprofitable; for while death took off some of my friends, to others I was unknown; little liked by some, others made large promises; some pleaded strongly on my behalf, others fed me with vain hopes; while paying court to some, getting into favour with others, getting known to others, my best

days were going, the years gliding by, my friends tired of my applications to them, and myself the worse for wear; so now, sick of the world and glutted with the falseness of human nature, I resign myself. I have had some bountiful patrons and noble benefactors, and I do thankfully acknowledge it; I have received some kindness, which may God repay, if not according to their wishes, yet according to their deserts, more peradventure than I deserve, though not to my desire, more of them that I did expect, yet not of others to my desert; neither am I ambitious or covetous all this while; what I have said, without prejudice or alteration shall stand. And now as a mired horse, that struggles at first with all his might and main to get out, but when he sees no remedy, that his beating will not serve, lies still, I have laboured in vain, rest now satisfied, and

Mine haven's found, fortune and hope, adieu!  
Mock others now, for I have done with you. (*Prudentius*)"  
(part 2, sect.3, mem.6)

Such words sound as coming directly out of the innermost depths of the anguished soul of Marlowe which was so profoundly wounded for life so early in its beginning, and he doesn't write them all in English but in significant parts in Latin. They hardly fit into the monotonous and narrow life of Robert Burton in his vicarage, who certainly never "bustled abroad", nor into the stable bourgeois life of Shakespeare with his very English small town life of means and property enough to be more than well contented, nor into the powerful aristocrat Lord Stanley, who certainly never had to write "applications"; while they fit almost too well into the self-confessions of the Sonnets and the sordid fate of Marlowe. Lines like these must provide fuel for the theory, that Marlowe's fate as a born poet was after Richard Baines' scandalizing denouncement to never again be able to write or publish anything in his own name but only under the cover of others', like Shakespeare's and Robert Burton's, and that he accepted this fate just to be able to at all continue to write, not entirely though without discreet protests in the almost surreptitious form of extremely carefully measured and guarded stealth.

The whole work is written to a large extent in Latin, and the text is constantly interrupted by Latin quotations, but also Greek appears occasionally. The author apparently also has a great penchant for Ovid (in remarkable similarity with Marlowe and Shakespeare) who is quoted more frequently than any other Latin writer including Cicero.

Such curious reminiscences of and clues to Marlowe-Shakespeare can't be ignored. The Marlowe chits in Burton are exactly of the same character as in Shakespeare: sudden flashes disappearing at once.

You get the same impression of Burton as of Marlowe-Shakespeare: here is a man who spends his life hard at work with only writing because he can't do anything else. Like Shakespeare ought to have been occupied with the practical work at his theatre for almost the entirety of his life, Burton would have been constantly busy with his pastoral duties; but "The Anatomy of Melancholy" shows an author who has read everything and knows the whole world literature by heart. He could hardly have done anything in his life but reading and writing. At the same time you find in Burton the same vast knowledge of the world and human nature as with Shakespeare, of which none ever placed their foot outside the soil of England. None of them ever "bustled abroad".

We can't decide the matter. We content ourselves with stating that it is possible, that Marlowe as a good and experienced actor on the stage of life, just as he dressed up in all the characters of Shakespeare as well as Shakespeare's own, he also could have entered into the character of the pedantic Oxonian Robert Burton in perhaps a vain effort to hide and forget himself: "Look now! I am neither Marlowe nor Shakespeare but the

clergyman Robert Burton, and I prove it by telling you everything about myself, naming my parents and my brother and never mentioning Cambridge with one word!"

It's just a theory. The Marlowe theories are constantly whisked away by the fact that there is no evidence. It's true that we have no evidence, but there is also not a single piece of evidence to prove that Shakespeare or Stanley was the dramatic author, while there is more circumstantial evidence pointing towards Marlowe than to anyone else.

Most of the high quality of nobility, the dramatic tensivity and elegance not to speak of all the magnificent sense of humour which characterize the Shakespeare dramas have fallen out with Burton, who instead displays a higher developed universalism and greater concentration on the deepest of all human problems, which also the Shakespeare works indefatigably grapple with: the spiritual abysses of man.

### *The Contribution of David Rhys Williams.*

His work "*Shakespeare, Thy Name is Marlowe*" (1966) doesn't really offer anything new. He sums up and confirms all the research results of Calvin Hoffman's in "*The Man Who Was Shakespeare*" (1955) and adds a few new ones, above all the method of doctor Mendenhall. Everything seems to lead away from William Shakespeare for an author of the great Elizabethan plays to instead indicate Christopher Marlowe, "*who stands alone, gloriously accused*" (Calvin Hoffman). The strange thing is that all these remarkable results of research conducted since 1895 have not in any way made the Shakespeare authorities question their constantly less tenable position as maintainers of the Stratford man as author of the dramas. This can only be explained in one way: they don't want to, since they dare not risk the imagined security of their blind faith in authority.

Of course it isn't certain that Marlowe wrote everything in the dramas. We have pointed out a few weaknesses, for instance in "*Timon*", that could be later additions. But you can't escape the fact that Marlowe was the creator of the Elizabethan blank verse drama and that he already in "*Edward II*" brought this to perfection. You can't escape the fact that he alone had a motive for his death in Richard Baines' devastating denouncement of him to the Queen's Privy Council. He couldn't have continued to concentrate on dramatic poetry under such a threat. He had all the reasons in the world to free himself from all disturbances by disappearing as Marlowe to be able to concentrate on the main thing without interruptions. And you can't escape the fact that William Shakespeare does not exist as a poet until Marlowe has gone under ground.

But why Shakespeare? Here it is important to remember a few other things. Marlowe was not the only poet. Thomas Kyd was dead, but many others worked with the theatre. We must never forget the splendid and illustrious couple the Earl of Oxford and his son-in-law Lord Stanley, who according to witnesses both wrote dramas which no one knows where they have gone. Beaumont and Fletcher produced dramas unremittingly. Ben Jonson arrived later, but there were others. The Earl of Oxford had a *Shake-Speare*, a man shaking a spear in his coat-of-arms, and this heraldic symbol seems to have been prevalent here and there. The *Time International Magazine* points out quite correctly that the life of Edward de Vere was much more Shakespearian than any other contemporary person's: almost all the most dramatic episodes of the Shakespeare dramas occurred in de Vere's life. But such a colourful and self-centred Don Juan character doesn't write the world's most beautiful poetry, and those poems which have come down to us by de Vere's hand fall very far from the beauty of the Shakespearian language. De Vere may stand in the spotlight, but the observer thereof is somebody else. His son-in-law, theatrical collaborator and fellow enthusiast for the stage William

Stanley must by this come under grave suspicion. Both the Stanley brothers held theatre companies, and William Shakespeare was on their payroll as an actor.

It is most probable that Shakespeare was selected as a gathering symbol for a comprehensive dramatic activity involving perhaps more people than the already mentioned. It's impossible that one man wrote everything in *"The First Folio"*. There is a poem for example which we know for certain that was partly written by Marlowe and partly by Sir Walter Raleigh, (*"The Passionate Shepherd to his Love"* in the collection of *"The Passionate Pilgrim"*). *"The First Folio"* is a magnificent collection of the finest drama and poetry during the period 1593-1613, and we can't guess what number of poets might be guilty thereof. But Christopher Marlowe had once and for all created the form and was probably the only master thereof. All the others could have provided him with infinite material and ideas, he might have edited any number of works by others, but the stamp of the editor is his own.

The same perfection of form pervades Robert Burton's impressive work of erudition *"The Anatomy of Melancholy"*, his only work, which is constructed with the same clarity of form as any Shakespeare drama. This overwhelming purity of form is impossible not to relate with the architecture of the dramas in *The First Folio*. Certain covert confessions in Burton's work must also cast a suspicion on the underground Marlowe.

Then we have the poems on the relatives of William Stanley, written 1632-33, which directly remind you of the Sonnets in *The First Folio*. Here they are:

"Ask who lies here, but do not weep.  
He is not dead; he doth but sleep.  
This stony register is for his bones,  
his fame is more perpetual than these stones;  
and his own goodness, with himself being gone,  
shall live when earthly monument is none.  
Not monumental stone preserves our fame,  
nor sky-aspiring pyramids our name.  
The memory of him for whom this stands  
shall outlive marble and defacers' hands.  
When all to times consumption shall be given,  
Stanley, for whom this stands, shall stand in heaven."

- epitaph on the Stanley monument in Tong Church off Birmingham.  
Buried are William Stanley's uncle Thomas Stanley with wife and son.

"To say a Stanley lies here, that alone  
were epitaph enough. No brass, no stone,  
no glorious tomb, no monumental hearse,  
no gilded trophy or lamp-laboured verse  
can dignify his grave or set it forth  
like the immortal fame of his own worth.  
Then, reader, fix not here, but quit this room  
and fly to Abram's bosom: there's his tomb,  
there rests his soul, and for his other parts  
they are embalmed and lodged in good men's hearts.  
A braver monument of stone or lime,  
no art can raise, for this shall outlast time."

- epitaph on the Stanley monument in Chelsea Old Church.

*Buried are William Stanley's son Edward with his two small children.*

According to popular legend, these two poems were written by Shakespeare. But the tombs are from 1633. Could Marlowe have lived that long? He would then have been 69 years old. Connected to the English stage since 50 years he might very well have been motivated to celebrate the name of its greatest protector and benefactor so beautifully as is done in these remarkable obituaries, which once again remind you more of Shakespeare than Shakespeare does himself.

The son-in-law of the Earl of Oxford Edward de Vere, William Stanley himself, the sixth Earl of Derby, perhaps the most important key figure in the whole mystery, died in 1642 at the age of 81 years, a very advanced age for those times; and with him died the English theatre, which was banned and closed by the puritans, who had extolled and written outrageous lampoons on the news of Marlowe's death, this Marlowe, whom a bishop of Canterbury gave an education at Cambridge to make him a theologian, who probably was the theological pamphleteer pseudonym *Martin Marprelate* of Canterbury, Marlowe's home town, who always remained a name of controversy to the pious party, and who after his heydays probably returned to theology under the name of Robert Burton.

(A small parenthesis in connection with Shakespearian mysticism: *The Tempest* has a clear occult touch with obvious glimpses of the occultism *à la mode* in the 1610s, but already *Pericles* contains a ritual which was practised by the first freemasons, still Rosicrucians at that stage: Act III scene 2, when the presumably dead Thaisa is resurrected from the coffin thrown into the sea. Did the Rosicrucians adopt this mysterious scene from the play, or was it the other way around?)

All circumstantial evidence indicates Marlowe. Shakespeare was the name he chose as a collective pseudonym for all the theatre enthusiasts and their united efforts to turn the English theatre into something as big and marvellous as the Greek theatre of Athens had once been. Marlowe's own sacrifice for this cause was his own good name and reputation. The sacrifice couldn't have been greater, - but he probably felt the cause was worth it: the "Shakespeare" art of the theatre has never been surpassed.

The last word has not been said yet in this Shakespeare debate, which probably never will be concluded.

### *The William Shakeshafte Mystery.*

In this the obscurest topic of all ages you are grateful for the least ray of light enlightening us in the dense darkness surrounding the mystery of the Shakespeare dramas. Such a ray of light is the case of William Shakeshafte.

It appears from several of the plays that their author was initiated in Catholic thought and consequently would have had Catholicism for a base in his education if he wasn't a Catholic himself. In 1757 was found in the Shakespeare family house of Stratford a secret document in which John Shakespeare, father of the actor, committed himself to Catholicism. The man who seems to have won John Shakespeare over for the Catholic cause was a certain Edmund Campion from Lancaster, the Catholic heartland of England, which person appears to have surrounded himself with a circle of Catholics in Stratford. Four of the five tutors that might have educated William Shakespeare were Catholics from Lancaster belonging to this circle.

Towards the end of the 1570's there was a young actor up in Lancaster called William Shakeshafte. In 1937 the theory was presented, that this William Shakeshafte would have been William Shakespeare himself, since the name of William

Shakespeare's grandfather was Richard Shakeshafte. According to this theory, John the father would have sent his son up to Lancaster to have him educated in general but also in theatre and Catholic thought, for which purpose he was given an incognito name, that of his own father, for the sake of safety. This very young actor William Shakeshafte must have been a Catholic, since he stayed within the circle of the arch-catholic family Hoghton of Hoghton Tower in Lancaster, which family would have trusted the young actor's solidarity and protected him with anonymity. We mustn't forget, that Queen Elizabeth actually executed 200 Catholics during her reign. Two of these were the brothers John and Thomas Cottom, the former a teacher in Stratford 1579-81. Edmund Campion, John Shakespeare's Catholic friend, brought them both to Lancaster and Hoghton Tower in 1580, and two years later they were decapitated in the London Tower as suspects of high treason in the name of Catholicism.

This theory would explain certain things. Above all it would explain why the Shakespearean language is so full of idioms, words and expressions typical of northern England. It would also make the link between W. Shakespeare and the enigmatical William Stanley, 6th earl of Derby, leader of the Catholics and their candidate for the throne, and also the owner of Shakespeare's theatre companies, clearer.

William Shakespeare would then by his father early have been confirmed as a Catholic, sent up by his father and his teachers to the Catholic centre of intrigue in Lancaster, early have learned to act incognito, entered the theatre world at an early stage and found this disguise a good means to protect himself and survive. He would then early have learned to avoid the mistake of Christopher Marlowe to expose himself in the middle of the stage to the envy and intrigue of the establishment with their jealousy for power sacrificing anyone who challenged their position. Christopher Marlowe exposed himself totally from the beginning hiding nothing of his sympathies and taking clear and dangerous stands, while William Shakespeare never exposed himself but remained carefully hidden all his life - and not only survived but became the wealthiest man of Stratford.

What these theories can't explain are the Shakespearian epitaphs from 1633 belonging to graves of the Stanley family, which couldn't have been written earlier. Neither can these theories explain the fact established by doctor Mendenhall, that the literary styles of Marlowe and Shakespeare are absolutely identical.

The greatest argument against that Marlowe was Shakespeare has been the Preface of *The First Folio* (of 1623, the year of Anne Hathaway's passing away,) in which a long row of the colleagues of Shakespeare, above all Ben Jonson, testify to Shakespeare's genuineness. Calvin Hoffman, the foremost champion of the Marlowe theory, who recently passed away but to the last claimed he was in possession of evidence that Marlowe was Shakespeare, explains these Shakespeare testimonies, that Ben Jonson wrote anything for money. It might appear more difficult, however, to explain how eventually Christopher Marlowe from Canterbury would have learned the north English dialects.

There is still no binding evidence, and the questions are more troublesome than ever: Are any of the documents in the William Shakeshafte case falsifications? Could the Catholic confession of John Shakespeare, not found until 1757, be a forgery? Could Ben Jonson really have written lies in *The First Folio* about his deceased colleague in so convincing a complimentary manner? And why does the poet's dark period of despairing tragedies coincide so exactly with the revolting process of William Stanley against his family, so that even the poet's last period of harmonious fairy comedies commences exactly as this process finally is agreeably settled?

A colleague of ours in England wrote, that it would be a relief if William Shakespeare was the only guilty one of Shakespeare's works, because then nothing

would have to be changed. We could only assure him, that so far neither Shakespeare, Marlowe nor Stanley could be excluded as suspects in the case.

Finally the question always remains, which all three of them undoubtedly would have posed to a stupid future world of curiosity: What matter is it who wrote the plays? The only important thing is that they are alive!

*Gothenburg, November 1999.*

### *The Shakespeare Debate - A Temporary Summary.*

After 3 1/2 years' discussions we find it suitable to sum up the efforts of our research so far.

We have four major candidates: 1) William Shakespeare, actually a historical person, 2) William Stanley, the leader of the Catholics in England, jurist, a cousin of the Queen's, composer, world traveller and a theatre enthusiast and director, 3) Christopher Marlowe, the creator of the Elizabethan drama, the predecessor and greatest competitor of Shakespeare, whose sudden death in a woman's establishment in Deptford, reputedly in a brawl, clearly appears to have been a set-up, and 4) Francis Bacon, politician, jurist and philosopher.

The weakest candidate is Shakespeare himself. He appears to have been no more than an ordinary theatre amateur with a striking talent for business though, who managed to make himself a considerable fortune out of anything except the theatre. He didn't possess a single book when he died and seems to have been almost illiterate.

The strongest candidate is Christopher Marlowe. It is all but proved that he staged his "death" himself to be able to quit the scene of his career, since he by his frankness and challenging way of life with very revolutionary views had made himself increasingly powerful enemies. When he disappeared he was threatened by an indictment for forgery of coins through a false denunciation of a Puritan informer and had possibly nothing better to expect in life than torture with consequent decapitation, which process his colleague Thomas Kyd already had passed and would die of. None of the other candidates for the authorship of Shakespeare's works had stronger motives to suppress his own name and person - in order to be able to continue working.

Francis Bacon can't be excluded from the investigation. During the 20th century the amassment of myths around his person has become too conspicuous to be ignored. Among other theories there is the supposition that he would have been a bastard son of Queen Elizabeth. This is proved wrong by the medical fact that the Virgin Queen died a virgin. Certain is, that Francis Bacon was a most talented and ambitious gentleman. It's not impossible that the progress of the Rosicrucians and the Freemasons originally was his responsibility. His device was that, he lived well who kept himself secret. He was probably the most manipulative power in British politics, until his ambitions fell short in 1621 when he was completely disgraced and had to resign as Lord Protector, second in power only to the Crown, commanded by his king to plead guilty of having taken bribes. Although he died most naturally (at the age of 65, when he stuffed chickens with snow in the first deep-freeze experiment and caught a deadly cold), his person has assembled more myths than any of his contemporaries for his Masonic and Rosicrucian influence. In one version even he would have survived his own staged death in order to be able to continue to work in peace. The strongest argument against his possible Shakespeare authorship is, that his style is completely alien from Shakespeare's. He is a dry philosopher concentrating on pure science and common sense, while the author of

"The First Folio" is anything but dry and scientific. There is nothing less Baconian than the Shakespeare Sonnets.

Finally there is William Stanley, the sixth Earl of Derby, related with both Queen Elizabeth and Mary Stuart and as close an heir to the throne as King James. He also would have had perfect motives to bury himself in anonymity to be able to act at all, since he was not only the leader of the Catholics but their candidate for the throne. He owned the theatre company of Shakespeare and was related with Francis Bacon, he composed music himself which was published in his days, as a young man he travelled widely all around Europe and was familiar with parts such as the Hellespont, Constantinople and Cyprus, Denmark and Wittenberg besides Italy, Navarra and practically all Europe. Two epitaphs for members of his family created in 1631-32 are more obviously in the style of Shakespeare than are many of the Sonnets. When he died in 1642 at the age of 81 all the theatres of England were closed and there was civil war. This is a coincidence too curious to exclude any suspicion that the destiny of "Lord Strange" was not intimately connected with that of England. There is nothing to contradict that he could be the secret author of Shakespeare's works.

The problem is complicated further by the method of doctor Mendenhall. This American doctor in the end of the 19th century construed a method to analyse the styles of different authors in order to reveal pseudonyms. The method was 100% objective and showed clearly, that Francis Bacon could not have been the author of Shakespeare's works, while the different styles of Shakespeare and Marlowe were perfectly identical with each other. The probable fact that the same author wrote both Marlowe's and Shakespeare's works does not exclude the possibility that a third person could have written it all.

Thus far we have reached. The research continues.

### *Ventilating the Theories,*

*by Laila Roth.*

In your Free Thinker Shakespeare Debate you seem to concentrate on two things: establishing 'waterproof' candidates and disproving all other candidates. I wouldn't occupy myself with either.

Instead I would like to present arguments for all four candidates, since there are arguments for all four, and in the name of justice all arguments should be investigated.

One theory remains for you to approach. It's the theory that the main characters in the Sonnets would have been the Earl of Essex and Mrs William Stanley, whom W. Stanley was jealous of since he suspected her of having an affair with Essex, which she well might have had, he being constantly encircled by beautiful bewitched women, until the equally jealous Queen Elizabeth beheaded him for having called her a living carcass. If the chief characters of the Sonnets are Essex and Lord Burghley's granddaughter, that is Mrs Stanley, the author then would of course have to be Stanley, whose love-hatred of his wife would match perfectly the sharp sonnets against "the Dark Lady", his "mistress", ending with reconciliation and resignation, just as Stanley's own life, just as the Shakespeare dramas end with the melancholy and ambiguous fairy tale comedies.

There are weaknesses in the theory of Essex and Mrs Stanley, I agree, but the theory makes sense in the context, and above all, the rank, age and character of Essex fits perfectly the Loved One in the Sonnets.

Of course, this character fits the Earl of Southampton equally well, Henry Wriothesley, "Mr W.H.", which has been the traditional interpretation of the main character; but in that case, who was 'the Dark Lady'? In my opinion, the Shakespeare theory falls on the terribly manifested jealousy in the Sonnets and certain dramas, a symptom known to have been William Stanley's but lacking in the stable family conditions of William Shakespeare. Thereby I wish in no way to disparage the Shakespeare theory. He is as good a candidate as all the others.

But John is perfectly right in finding the strongest motivation for writing under a pseudonym in Marlowe. That theory holds. As a successful dramatist he had aroused so much controversy and ire in puritan circles, that he was libelled with terrible slander about "homosexuality, blasphemy and atheism" and finally even of coining money, which must have resulted in his execution if he were brought to trial, wherefore he had every reason in the world to go underground and remain there. The gross slander has even survived until our time, so that there are even today Puritans who in the name of the only proper faith, that is loyalty to the Shakespeare orthodoxy, still love to dismiss the Marlowe theory by stating that "he was just a homosexual atheist who died in a drunken brawl". I find that surprisingly prejudicial of serious Shakespeare scholars imagining themselves to defend a proper cause.

On the other hand, I quite agree with John Bede, that the author of the Sonnets actually answers to the name of 'Will'. The last line of Sonnet 136 could hardly be interpreted in any other way.

Concerning Francis Bacon, I would like to present an objection to the reliability in the method of Doctor Mendenhall. Shakespeare and Marlowe only wrote poetry, while Bacon only wrote prose. According to the method of Doctor Mendenhall, Francis Bacon can't have written the works of Shakespeare, since his prose doesn't agree with the poetry of Shakespeare. Don't exclude Francis Bacon from the investigation on such ridiculous grounds, please.

I am looking forward to the continued development of your investigation with great interest.

- Laila Roth.

### *Scrutinizing the Sonnets.*

The most typical problem about the Sonnets is, that the deeper you try to analyse and solve their problem, the more inaccessible and difficult the problem becomes. Here is a sketch of the palpable outlines:

The sonnets 1-19 express love of a younger man, and their message is a continuous: "Save thy beauty by begetting a son." Four fifths of all the sonnets express the same honest and self-effacing love of the same young man.

In sonnet 20 the young man is rather explicitly characterized: he has the face of a woman and the ability to attract both ladies and gentlemen. So he is rather androgynous and possesses the best traits of both sexes: he lacks female falseness and capriciousness and as a man is like "created for a woman".

In the sonnets 25-26 he humbles himself like to a lord, and these sonnets would indicate that the poet is without rank lacking "honour and proud titles", while the loved one is a lord. This would fit perfectly into Shakespeare and the dashing Earl Henry Wriothesley of Southampton, to whom the poet's two epic poems were dedicated. As is well known, the sonnets are dedicated to "Mr W.H." (Henry Wriothesley?), but a lord could never be called 'Mr'.

Then there is a crisis. In sonnet 29 the poet is hit hard by calamity, in 32 he speculates in his own death, in 34-35 he accuses the loved one for what's happened, in 41-42 there is a triangle drama between the poet, the loved one and a lady (the latter's wife?), and in 44-45 we have evidently a separation between the poet and the loved one with long distance and waters between, in 48 he leaves his most important legacy with his friend, in 50 the separation is definite: "My grief lies onward, and my joy behind", and in 56 there is even an ocean between them. All this seems to indicate a catastrophe of some kind with an exile, which would well fit in the picture of Christopher Marlowe's fate, his relationship with Sir Thomas Walsingham and Mrs Audrey Walsingham.

Sonnet 62 differs from all the others by its sudden self-love. Everywhere else, when the poet is occupied with himself, the theme is death and extinction.

69 is the first sonnet to criticize the loved one. Sonnets 71-74 are perhaps the most interesting ones in relation to Marlowe. He speaks about himself as a dead man, 73 contains the famous Marlowe signature ("consumed with that which it was nourished by"), and 74 seems directly to describe Marlowe's case, ("my body being dead, the coward conquest of a wretch's knife").

In sonnet 80 the poet suddenly has some competition: another worships the loved one, which puts our poet into the shade. Here is another constantly recurring theme in the sonnets: the poet's humility and denigration of himself unto self-effacement. In 81 he speaks again of his own death. In 83 the rival appears again and even more manifestly in 86. This has been interpreted as Shakespeare's attitude towards Marlowe, but the competitor could also be Spenser. And the object might even be Queen Elizabeth. Many candidates are possible in all the roles.

The sonnets 94-95 sound new tunes of disappointment and disillusion. In 104 the relationship has lasted for three years - and nothing has changed.

111 is a key poem and is clear evidence of the poet's social standing - he lives "on public means", which appears to illustrate the almost disgraceful social status of an actor. An even stronger expression of the poet's insecure social position is expressed in 112, where he confesses to have "a vulgar scandal stamped upon his brow".

The disillusion increases in 118-119. 125 indicates a settlement: "Hence, thou suborn'd informer! A true soul, when most impeach'd, stands least in your control."

In 127 the Dark Lady appears, who introduces a completely new development in the sonnets marked by passionate love-hatred of a most complicated kind. In 128 we learn that the loved one also is a musician. In 133 both the poet and the lover are at the Dark Lady's mercy. Then we have the 'Will'-poems, of which 136 is the only important one, where the poet actually signs himself 'Will'.

In 137 the poet sobers up, he seems to detach himself from love's cruel pranks with him, but its harassments climax in 141-143, and in 144 he makes a summary.

In 146 he has vanquished death by his love, in 147 his delusion is complete, in 152 he kills his love, but in 153-154 he resigns to the incurability of love.

That's in brief the main contents of the 154 well-composed sonnets of unequalled beauty, each one written in exactly the same form. They reveal the innermost heart feelings of an utterly sincere lover, who in his self-effacement almost degrades himself in his fervent loyalty to a beloved androgynously beautiful young man with a dark lady on the other side.

Who might this lover be then, who so passionately could be so desperately sincere in his ruthlessly self-revealing poems of unsurpassed beauty during so many years in perfect faithfulness? There is no doubt that it's the same poet who wrote all the dramas in 'The First Folio'. There is much in support of that the same author wrote all the works published in the name of Christopher Marlowe. Most of the practical contents in the

sonnets seem to fit well into the puzzle of the reconstructed fate of Marlowe. But why then does he expressly state in sonnet 136 that his name is Will, that is William?

Or is it William Stanley, the sixth Earl of Derby, who hides behind all this? But nothing at all in the sonnets seems to have any bearing on any of the known facts of Will Derby's life. There is not one single reference to any geographical location, while Derby travelled extensively all over the world. Derby had a happy marriage with one single wife for more than 30 years and three sons. He was a lawyer with vast responsibilities. His known life hardly admits any spare time for a most considerable production of plays and poems, a lengthy love affair with a younger man, disasters and personal tragedies, and above all, as a peer of England and one of its richest men he totally lacked the low social position which definitely marks the author of the Sonnets.

Could it then in spite of everything be Shakespeare himself? That possibility can in no way be eliminated. The sonnet 111 clearly suggests exactly that abject social position in this period of an actor, which must have been exactly the position of William Shakespeare. It couldn't have been Will Derby's. Could it have been Marlowe's? Yes, that's also possible.

Was then the loved one Thomas Walsingham, married to Audrey, or Shakespeare's sponsor Henry Wriothesley or somebody else? In his indisputable genius, Oscar Wilde concluded that the loved one must have been an actor, and that is also a very plausible guess.

We leave our investigation for the time being at that. The reader must draw his own conclusions from our insufficient presentation of too few known facts. The Marlowe pleaders are as cock-sure as the Stanley advocates, and the Shakespeare intercessors will constantly be the greatest lot. If a fourth candidate would appear he would be most welcome. The only certain thing about Marlowe, Shakespeare and Stanley is that they all three must have been involved in the case. The name of Shakespeare is inalienably united with the dramas as a theatre man and actor, Marlowe's background as a theologian is of unmeasurable importance to the whole problem, since theology clearly dominates all the works of Marlowe and certain of Shakespeare's; and although William Stanley neither was an actor nor a theologian his importance as a theatre owner and sponsor, protector and probably financier of the whole 'First Folio' can't be ignored.

So let's not exclude anyone of these three until there is evidence enough to justify such a procedure.

### *John Michell's Solution to the Problem.*

"*Who Wrote Shakespeare?*" by John Michell appeared in 1996 and is perhaps the most entertaining book written on the subject while at the same time it offers a magnificent survey of the whole problem. John Michell follows the popular path of Laila Roth in not viewing any candidate as out of the question. In his book he presents all the 63 candidates, of which at least 24 are to be considered seriously as possible sole authors of the works of Shakespeare.

His explanation to the phenomenon is briefly as follows. The brain behind it all was of course Francis Bacon, whose life program was to reform humanity by philosophy, science, law and a fourth unknown means, which then would have been the theatre, the dominating mass media of the time with its irresistible power to manipulate people's minds and ways of thinking. To that purpose he would have manufactured the Shakespeare plays. His candidature is strengthened by the fact that he was homosexual, why he had the best reason in the world to hide from it, which he publicly declared was a good thing to do.

But Francis Bacon was an official bore sitting in London all the time, while the Shakespeare dramas are brightly coloured by country life with very much sport, which is very difficult to find any trace of in the life of the bureaucrat Francis Bacon. Enter the Earl of Oxford, Edward de Vere, a hot-tempered adventurer who had spent much of his life abroad and favoured things Italian, a passionate nature who was a master of the Sonnet, who lost his father at an early stage, why his mother immediately remarried a worthless villain; and who gladly fought duels and killed a servant in the house of his guardian, Prime Minister Lord Burghley, wishing the servant had been Lord Burghley himself. Here we have the authentic Hamlet in reality dangerously raving in the corridors of the supreme power. In the 1590's he retired grieving about the injustice and persecution he had to endure and then probably wrote the embittered sonnets, which clearly are stamped by the scars of a deeply wounded and perfectly honest man's refined confessions out of extreme anguish. "Othello" and "King Lear" in the year of his death, 1604, match perfectly with the deep but noble desperation of the Earl of Oxford.

His son-in-law was William Stanley, the sixth Earl of Derby and of royal blood, who definitely can be connected with two of the dramas: "Love's Labour's Lost" and "The Tempest". "Love's Labour's Lost" occurs in Navarre at the court of king Henry IV and exposes secrets of what was practised there to such an extent, that the author must have spent some time there as an intimate resident at the court. William Stanley did this, and the play ridicules his tutor Richard Lloyd in the character of Holofernes: a silly show by Holofernes occurs as a play within the play, which in real life was a serious composition by the pretentious Richard Lloyd, William Stanley's chaperon during his journeys. The scenery in "The Tempest" is probably a small island outside the Isle of Man, which William Stanley ruled as a sovereign. Caliban is probably a characterization of the Manx people, the aborigines of Man, who had their own unintelligible language and naturally objected to the English occupation of their land. The arguments for William Stanley as the man behind "The Tempest" are overwhelming.

But still there are others. Roger Manners, the Earl of Rutland, visited Denmark, knew members of the families of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern and was one of few foreigners who were initiated in the routines at the Elsinore castle as they are presented in "Hamlet", which he consequently has to have had some share in. And then we have the remarkable genius Christopher Marlowe, for whose participation in the drama production there is binding evidence, since his and Shakespeare's style are scientifically identical, as if they had exactly the same fingerprint although two different people, which of course is absolutely impossible. The most remarkable thing is that the style of Shakespeare continues to be identical with Marlowe's long after the death of Marlowe and as long as the Shakespeare production continues. And let's not by any means forget our old friend William Shakespeare himself, the arch theatre trickster, who snatched anything from anyone and could produce a play out of anything and nothing. Whoever turned to Shakespeare with some obscure play could be certain that his identity would not be revealed: the name of the qualified manipulator Shakespeare was a warrant that the texts would pass the censorship unmolested. And let's not forget, that censorship in the reign of Queen Elizabeth I was more severe than under Stalin.

That's the solution offered by John Michell: everyone was guilty one way or another, co-operating, helping and depending on each other for the unique production of the plays. It's a very popular and amusing view which easily could be accepted by anyone. There is only one problem: it doesn't stand scrutiny.

The Shakespeare production of all the plays and poems stand widely apart from all other kinds of English literature. There were other authors and playwrights, like Edmund Spenser, Beaumont and Fletcher, Ben Jonson and later on John Milton. Even Francis Bacon wrote works under his own name which like all other works differ from

Shakespeare's by a less developed style and a smaller vocabulary. The Shakespeare language is at least 50% richer than anyone else's. This sole fact indicates that there must be a single person behind it all, which immediately excludes the verbally much poorer and more limited Francis Bacon.

It also excludes the Earl of Oxford, who died in 1604, while many important Shakespeare works were written later. It also excludes the earl of Rutland, who was born in 1576 and therefore far too young to have written the early Shakespeare plays. We are then left with only three candidates: William Shakespeare himself, William Stanley and Christopher Marlowe.

William Shakespeare was a great talker and fixer and very popular as such while at the same time he was very good at making business. Among his colleagues, especially Ben Jonson, he was well known and often pointed at as the perfect theatre freak and hustler who would stop at nothing. As an unscrupulous businessman he was the perfect terminal for cautious men of genius who had good enough reasons to avoid trouble and stay out of the public life, and he shamelessly took advantage of the state of things. There is evidence that parts of "Hamlet" have been added after Shakespeare's death for the final edition of 'The First Folio' in 1623. There is much to indicate that he didn't write one word of the Shakespeare canon himself, (*see next article,*) and least of all the anguished Sonnets.

So we are probably left with only William Stanley and Christopher Marlowe. Here the problem is getting difficult, but we will try to solve it in time.

### *All We Know About William Shakespeare,*

by Mark Twain.

"He was born on the 23rd of April, 1564.

Of good farmer-class parents who could not read, could not write, could not sign their names.

At Stratford, a small back settlement which in that day was shabby and unclean, and densely illiterate. Of the nineteen important men charged with the government of the town, thirteen had to 'make their mark' in attesting important documents, because they could not write their names.

Of the first eighteen years of his life, *nothing* is known. They are a blank.

On the 27th of November (1582) William Shakespeare took out a license to marry Anne Whateley.

Next day Shakespeare took out a license to marry Anne Hathaway. She was eight years his senior.

William Shakespeare married Anne Hathaway. In a hurry. By grace of a reluctantly granted dispensation there was but one publication of the banns.

Within six months the first child was born.

About two (blank) years followed, during which period *nothing at all happened to Shakespeare*, so far as anybody knows.

Then came twins - 1585. February.

Two blank years follow.

Then - 1587 - he makes a ten-year visit to London, leaving the family behind.

Five blank years follow. During this period *nothing happened to him*, as far as anybody actually knows.

Then - 1592 - there is mention of him as an actor.

Next year - 1593 - his name appears in the official list of players.

Next year - 1594 - he played before the Queen. A detail of no consequence: other obscurities did it every year of the forty-five of her reign. And remained obscure.

Three pretty full years follow. Full of play-acting.

Then - in 1597 - he bought New Place, Stratford.

Thirteen or fourteen busy years follow; years in which he accumulated money, and also reputation as actor and manager.

Meantime his name, liberally and variously spelt, had become associated with a number of great plays and poems, as (ostensibly) author of the same.

Some of these, in these years and later, were pirated, but he made no protest.

Then - 1610-11 - he returned to Stratford and settled down for good and all, and busied himself in lending money, trading in tithes, trading in land and houses; shirking a debt of forty-one shillings, borrowed by his wife during his long desertion of his family; suing debtors for shillings and coppers; being sued himself for shillings and coppers; and acting as a confederate to a neighbour who tried to rob the town of its rights to a certain common, and did not succeed.

He lived five or six years - till 1616 - in the joy of these elevated pursuits.

Then he made a will, and signed each of its three pages with his name.

A thorough-going business-man's will. It named in minute detail every item of property he owned in the world - houses, lands, sword, silver-gilt bowl, and so on - all the way down to his 'second-best bed' and its furniture.

It carefully and calculatingly distributed his riches among the members of his family, overlooking no individual of it. Not even his wife: the wife he had been enabled to marry in a hurry by urgent grace of a special dispensation before he was nineteen; the wife whom he had left husbandless so many years; the wife who had had to borrow forty-one shillings in her need, and which the lender was never able to collect of the properous husband, but died at last with the money still lacking. No, even this wife was remembered in Shakespeare's will.

He left her that 'second-best bed'.

And *not another thing*, not even a penny to bless her lucky widowhood with.

It was eminently and conspicuously a business-men's will, not a poet's.

It mentioned *not a single book*.

Books were much more precious than swords and silver-gilt bowls and second-best beds in those days, and when a departing person owned one he gave it a high place in his will.

The will mentioned *not a play, not a poem, not an unfinished literary work, not a scrap of manuscript of any kind*.

Many poets have died poor, but this is the only one in history that has died *this* poor; the others all left literary remains behind. Also a book. Maybe two.

If Shakespeare had owned a dog - but we need not go into that: we know he would have mentioned it in his will. If a good dog, Susannah would have got it; if an inferior one his wife would have got a dower interest in it. I wish he had had a dog, just so we could see how painstakingly he would have divided that dog among the family, in his careful business way.

He signed the will in three places.

In earlier years he signed two other official documents.

These five signatures still exist.

There are *no other specimens of his penmanship in existence*. Not a line.

Was he prejudiced against the art? His granddaughter, whom he loved, was eight years old when he died, yet she had had no teaching, he left no provision for her education although he was rich, and in her mature womanhood she could not write and

couldn't tell her husband's manuscript from anybody else's - she thought it was Shakespeare's.

When Shakespeare died in Stratford *it was not an event*. It made no more stir in England than the death of any other forgotten theatre-actor would have made. Nobody came down from London; there were no lamenting poems, no eulogies, no national tears - there was merely silence, and nothing more. A striking contrast with what happened when Ben Jonson, and Francis Bacon, and Spenser, and Raleigh, and the other distinguished literary folk of Shakespeare's time passed from life! No praiseful voice was lifted for the lost Bard of Avon; even Ben Jonson waited seven years before he lifted his.

*So far as anybody actually knows and can prove*, Shakespeare of Stratford-on-Avon never wrote a play in his life.

*So far as anybody knows and can prove*, he never wrote a letter to anybody in his life. *So far as any one knows*, he received only one letter during his life.

So far as any one *knows and can prove*, Shakespeare of Stratford wrote only one poem during his life. This one is authentic. He did write that one - a fact which stands undisputed; he wrote the whole of it; he wrote the whole of it out of his own head. He commanded that this work of art be engraved upon his tomb, and he was obeyed. There it abides to this day. This is it:

Good friend for Iesus sake forbear  
To digg the dust enclosed heare:  
Blest be ye man yt spares thes stones  
and curst be he yet moves my bones.

In the list as above set down, will be found *every positively known* fact of Shakespeare's life, lean and meagre as the invoice is. Beyond these details we know *not a thing* about him. All the rest of his vast history, as furnished by the biographers, is built up, course upon course, of guesses, inferences, theories, conjectures - an Eiffel Tower of artificialities rising sky-high from a very flat and very thin foundation of inconsequential facts."

This short Shakespeare biography by Mark Twain is a psychological masterpiece, though not entirely fair. The poor poem on Shakespeare's tomb was hardly written by himself, and the two named ladies of his youth were probably one and the same with different spellings, since people in Stratford at that time didn't well know how to spell - mistakes must have been common. But the interesting detail is the masterful analysis of the will. This document is the only existing writing by Shakespeare that is proven his - it can't be disproved, even if he only dictated it. Since the same William Shakespeare has been given the honour of having written the finest collection of dramas in world literature, this will must be of singular interest, which Mark Twain duly has observed and analyzed in that context. And what are his conclusions? His logically irrefutable conclusion is that the will is composed by a consummate business man with only trivialities on his mind, the consequence of which conclusion is that this banal, dry and materialistic business man hardly could have written the greatest plays in world literature.

Mark Twain's observations have never been opposed, and logically it's impossible to refute them. It's a fact that the will doesn't mention one single book or play or poem or manuscript while it carefully details only mundane items of no human interest at all.

And Mark Twain is right also in his other remarks: there are no other facts known about Shakesperare, and all the stories about him that reached later ages were invented

in the 18th century without grounds, like the ones that he was a poacher as a young man and therefore compelled to leave Stratford, that the Earl of Southampton, Henry Wriothesley, had given him £1000, that Shakespeare had played the Ghost in "Hamlet" and played it well, and that he would have fallen ill after a drinking bout with Ben Jonson visiting Stratford which would have resulted in his final illness and death, and all other spurious anecdotes. Not one of all the stories about Shakespeare which no Shakespeare biographer has forgotten to repeat has any bearing on reality. No evidence of Shakespeare's authorship to the works in his name has ever existed.

And he includes also the most suspicious circumstance of all, that no one reacted on Shakespeare's death. No one wrote any necrologue or dirge, no one came down to visit Stratford, no one broke the universal silence, as if everyone very well knew what an opportunistic freak and bad husband he had been. Only after seven years Ben Jonson broke the compact silence, who was well known for writing anything and extolling anyone if he only was paid well enough.

Mark Twain proves nothing, but his elucidation of the obvious probability that William Shakespeare surely was a good business man but hardly a poet can't be ignored. In fact, his will could be regarded as the one flaw in a perfect set-up for a phoney authorship. If William Shakespeare hadn't made that will, his authorship might never have been disputed, at least not by Mark Twain.

He was not only a splendid author of boys' books but also a prominent pioneer in the field of criminology, especially by his novel "*Pudd'nhead Wilson*", in which he stresses the importance of fingerprints long before they were criminologically used. His views therefore should be regarded with as much respect as if they had been presented by Sherlock Holmes. Mark Twain does not go any further, though, than to name only one person who he believed not to have written the works of Shakespeare.

We have asked John Bede for a comment, and here it is:

"Mr Samuel Clemens was unfortunately prejudiced against all things British, which bias most clearly shines through in "*A Yankee at the Court of King Arthur*", in which Americanisms are favoured in an almost inhumanly tasteless way while the English are ridiculed. If Mr Clemens was so prejudiced against England, naturally Shakespeare was included in that attitude, which his Shakespeare remarks could be regarded as rather obvious symptoms of.

Which doesn't mean that his views should be ignored. On the contrary, they should be considered with the highest respect, like all other views on the subject aiming at reaching a solution to the problem of who really wrote Shakespeare. One thing you never brought up in your debate, which I consider of the utmost importance, namely, that no Elizabethan poet could with any certainty be pinned down for any of the plays. Certain works are attributed to Christopher Marlowe, Ben Jonson, Thomas Kyd and others, but there is no evidence whatsoever as of who were the authors of what among at least 220 plays produced during the Elizabethan era in England."

### *The Secrets of Anthony Bacon.*

One of the obvious things about Shakespeare's will which Mark Twain didn't call enough attention to was the most important (and perhaps the decisive) detail, that the will is completely void of love, while, if there is anything in the plays and poems of the poet, it's nothing but love. Shakespeare is almost heartless towards his wife in a way which could be called outrageous, unless it was a joke, especially viewed against the

contents of a play like "*Romeo and Juliet*" and the unfathomable overwhelming flow of untiringly sustained love in the Sonnets.

There is another noteworthy thing concerning the candidates Shakespeare and Stanley. The world of Shakespeare drama displays a dramatically dynamic force without comparison, which thereby must have been a characteristic of its creator, who consequently must have been a rather dramatic and dynamic personality. There is no testimony whatever of such characteristics in the personalities of Shakespeare or Stanley. From the little we know about Shakespeare we get the picture of a petty bourgeois and colourless businessman, but very crafty as such, which is clearly stressed by the will. Of Stanley we have a very colourful and vivid poem about his journeys as a young man, the contours of which surely are most impressive; but not even this splendid odyssey bears any witness of any dynamic personality. He is very far from any Ulysses but appears rather like a passive tourist who is served everything since he can pay well. Stanley makes a fiery impression only in his marriage and then mostly through jealousy. About the rest of his personality we get nothing.

But the Elizabethans were among the most colourful set of people who ever wandered upon earth. They were adventurous and enterprising. Sir Francis Drake sailed around the world, Sir Walter Raleigh searched for Eldorado in South America, the Earl of Oxford had such a raving temperament that he would gladly have killed his protector, the Prime Minister of Queen Elizabeth, but killed his servant instead; as the favourite of Queen Elizabeth the Earl of Essex caused such emotional upsets and storms within the country that the whole society order was threatened and he had to be decapitated since he made life so uncertain and unsafe for everybody by his mere presence; and so on. England swarmed with dramatic personalities. Both Shakespeare and Stanley seem almost to have been peripheral exceptions to this rule.

But creative geniuses are generally never peripheral, and their activity is impossible without dynamics. For example, both Rembrandt and Sibelius worked mainly in strict isolation but found themselves nevertheless positions at the centre of the world's attention, and if they tried to exclude the world from their private universe, the world came and sought them out. Especially around the year 1600, when the Renaissance peaked and the Baroque started exploding, when the world was full of ecstatically creative artists, when a Caravaggio raved his wildest ways around Italy, Sicily and Malta, when a Rubens started spreading naked blondes all over Europe, when Giordano Bruno was burned at the stake for his maintenance of the right of science to objective thinking as more important than any religion, and when the Protestants in the North started to find freedom of conscience worth establishing as a universal ideal, the artists and their creative spirit was in their highest gear, and they were never ashamed of what they did, but rather naturally demonstrative about it.

This spirit you find no trace of in Shakespeare and Stanley, and no matter how much you look for it you only find nothing. They are void as wells of virility and spirit, except Stanley through his wealth, his marriage and his influence. There is absolutely no controversy about either of them as characters, which makes them very convenient as candidates.

Why, if all the others, and especially Essex and Sir Walter Raleigh, were so markedly volcanic and over-stimulated? It has been easy to see the Shakespeare dramas in context with both Raleigh and Essex and Oxford in view of their personal dynamics, but such associations with Shakespeare and Stanley are quite impossible to make.

Of course, Stanley had his very good reasons for absolute discretion after the fate of his elder brother Ferdinando Stanley, who was probably poisoned, and as a theatre manager with activities involving many men Shakespeare emanates a certain qualified shrewdness as well as perfect diplomacy; but they were also both young once upon a

time and should have marked themselves in at least one scandal or controversy, if either of them could write any of the plays of Shakespeare.

There is only one person who fits into the most fantastically dramatic costume of the Shakespeare dramatic art, and that is Christopher Marlowe. Because of his many controversies, he is the least convenient candidate of all. You find in him not only the dynamics represented by Oxford, Raleigh and Essex but also something more, which is the psychologically most interesting matter of all.

Marlowe had a magnetism which gave rise to mixed feelings. The same magnetism was found for example in Michelangelo, Beethoven, Tolstoy and Sibelius. Even Dostoevsky had the same strange emanation of magnetism, when he worked on "*Crime and Punishment*" and turned his hostess completely terror-struck as he wandered around the floor above her, talking aloud about a person he had murdered. It was a radiation of fearfulness. People easily get scared of such persons and that for no rational reason. Such individuals can look dangerous and inspire fear without being dangerous at all. It's the dynamics of creative power which invests them with a unique aura which almost infallibly causes terror to ordinary people without their realizing why. It can lead to terrible misunderstandings and not seldom to fatally unjust actions against those possessed by creativity, as in the case of Giordano Bruno. The Vatican executed him just because the Vatican was afraid of him and that for no reason.

These very volcanic dynamics, which people misinterpret as something dangerous, belonged to Christopher Marlowe, which there are several witnesses of. Poor Thomas Kyd was scared to death of him and denounced him for no other reason, and that denunciation (of heresy, blasphemy and atheism) was so fatal, that Marlowe had no other choice but to go underground for good.

In the last years an archive has been opened, which had remained sealed with all its secrets of the Elizabethan court for just about 400 years. The archive contains the papers of Anthony Bacon. He was the brother of Francis Bacon, and they worked together closely during the later period of Queen Elizabeth's reign.

Of the greatest interest to our research are certain documents relating to a certain agent in Her Majesty's Secret Service called Louis Le Doux in France, since this mysterious man at the court of King Henry IV presented a rather large-scale bill of no less than 56 books from England, which bill actually was paid in his absence. What makes this matter interesting is, that these books are mainly the literary sources to the plays of both Marlowe and Shakespeare. Among other interesting items in the list is a French dictionary, which hardly a Frenchman but rather an Englishman would use in France. Whoever might this Louis Le Doux have been?

After considerable research, such a person has been found in history. He was the son of a Huguenot refugee family in Canterbury at the time when Christopher Marlowe grew up there and was of about the same age as Christopher Marlowe and might have been his friend.

The most probable thing is that Christopher Marlowe would have remembered the name and used it. All those expensive books which the Bacon brothers paid for are probably the very books that Marlowe used in his exile from England after 1593, acquired in foreign countries for English money. That this bill was found in the papers of Anthony Bacon would imply that both Anthony and Francis Bacon were very well initiated in the troubles of Christopher Marlowe and that they stood up for him and helped him, most probably supported by Lord Burghley. (*Note these 56 expensive books in contrast to the fact that William Shakespeare at his death did not own one single book.*) Further, there are letters by this mysterious Louis Le Doux the handwriting of which probably is the same as that of Marlowe. Thus, at last, we get glimpses into the life of Christopher Marlowe after his well arranged death.

There was another agent of the same sort named La Faye, which meaning is almost synonymous with Le Doux. There was another agent of the same sort under the name of William Hall. Christopher Marlowe probably used a number of names and alter egos during his journeys in Europe and occasionally back to England. This William Hall is documented as an agent up to the year 1603. He was sent to Prague in autumn 1593 and to Denmark in 1601, that is neatly before the final compilation of 'Hamlet'. His initials remind you of a certain "Mr.W.H." to whom the Sonnets are dedicated, "*the only begetter of these ensuing sonnets*", which then might be an almost too clear cipher connotation for Christopher Marlowe.

Thereby we would have an established connection not only between the Bacon brothers and Christopher Marlowe but also between Lord Burleigh with son and Marlowe, since both Louis Le Doux and William Hall were in their secret service.

But in this debate we have also found clear evidence of the Earl of Derby being deeply involved. His share in the Shakespeare dramas is so evident, that many eminent authorities of literary history have claimed, that he must have been the Poet.

At the time when the Marlowe plays were enacted all over London, the company that staged his plays was no less than the theatre company of Lord Strange, whose theatre was the newly rediscovered and restored 'The Rose'. Lord Strange was the title of the heir to the Earl of Derby, in this particular case Ferdinando Stanley, elder brother to William Stanley. So Lord Strange, alias Ferdinando Stanley, was the producer of Marlowe's plays.

This is not the only connection. Marlowe was arrested a few times by the police in street quarrels and sometimes duels. On one of these occasions his trouble was with Richard Baines, the puritan who later tried to send him to the Star Chamber. The police released Marlowe after he had stated that he was under the protection of Lord Strange.

We have here several implications of a close collaboration between Marlowe and Ferdinando Stanley. Let's not forget, that 'Ferdinand' occurs twice in the Shakespeare plays: "Love's Labour's Lost", in which Ferdinand's name is given to the character who in real life was King Henry IV of Navarre and France, and in "The Tempest", where Ferdinand is an equally sympathetic main character. One easily gets the impression, that the author gave these two characters the name of Ferdinand out of love of someone with that name. In the first of these plays, the name of Ferdinand is even given to the best of the French kings.

This Lord Strange, that is Ferdinando Stanley, died suddenly under mysterious circumstances on April 16th 1594, whereupon William Stanley, his younger brother by two years, became the new Earl of Derby and owner of the very theatre company, 'the Lord Chamberlain's Men', which then had started to stage Shakespeare plays.

That's not all. When Richard Baines' libel against Marlowe was presented to the Privy Council in 1593, one of the men in the council was no one less than the Earl of Derby. It's impossible to imagine that he would not have reacted. The playwright who kept the theatres of London going, which the Court and the whole society regularly visited and enjoyed, was here denounced for heresy, atheism and coining of money and forsworn to the death penalty at least three times over. Still, Marlowe was not arrested but only told to keep in touch. Of course, the older Earl of Derby must have had some interest in that Marlowe could continue as a dramatist.

So evidently there are many long and close connections between Marlowe and the house of Derby.

The theory has been presented, that Derby would have written also the works of Marlowe except Shakespeare's. This theory falls on the fact, that some of Marlowe's works are autobiographical, especially '*The Massacre at Paris*', in which historical event Marlowe himself had had some interest as an agent and spy for England at Rheims,

which is illustrated in the play, which is Marlowe's most anti-Catholic; while Derby was the political leader of the Catholics in England and thereby hardly could be critical against the Catholic Church. Also the works of Marlowe are coloured by idiomatic expressions of the university language of Cambridge, which also marks Shakespeare's works, while William Stanley was entirely an Oxford man.

Speaking of Cambridge, an interesting thing to note is, that two other Cambridge students at this time, although younger, were the Earl of Rutland and the Earl of Southampton, the famous and beautiful Henry Wriothlesley, the almost certain object of the first seventeen Sonnets, since they evidently were commissioned by Lord Burghley with the intention to persuade Southampton to marry his granddaughter. It didn't come off, so the girl was married to William Stanley instead. The Earl of Rutland was the man who later on became familiar with the families of Rosencrantz and Guildenstern and the ways of the Danish court at Elsinore.

The deeper the research into the subject, the more and clearer appears the circumstantial evidence of Christopher Marlowe being the only one guilty of Shakespeare's works, and of that Shakespeare himself didn't write one word of them. The poems "*Hero and Leander*" and "*Venus and Adonis*" written approximately at the same time show by closer investigation that both poems were written as if both authors knew the other poem by heart. This is a practical impossibility, if they are by different authors, since "*Venus and Adonis*" was published after the supposed death of Marlowe. So they must have been written by the same man, since he only could have been as familiar with both poems as the poems show that 'both' the authors were.

Next we have the mystery of the name of 'Will'. There is evidence that Christopher Marlowe actually was called 'William' sometimes; and 'Will' at that time not only signified the 'willingness to love' but also direct sexual desire. If the author of the dramatic works of Shakespeare was anything at all, he was a lover. This could be an explanation why the poet in some of his Sonnets calls himself 'Will', since all the Sonnets are sonnets of love.

Finally we have the devastating denunciation of Marlowe by Richard Baines, here presented in excerpts:

"...Concerning his damnable judgement of Religion and scorn of God's word:

That the Indians and many authors of antiquity have assuredly written about 16 thousand years ago whereas Adam is proved to have lived within 6 thousand years.

He affirms that Moses was but a juggler and that one Harriot, being Sir Walter Raleigh's man, could do more than he.

That Moses made the Jews to travel 11 years in the wilderness (which journey might have been done in less than one year) to the intent that those who were privy to most of his subtilities might perish and so an everlasting superstition remain in the hearts of the people.

That the first beginning of religion was only to keep men in awe.

That Christ was the son of a carpenter, and that if the Jews among whom he was born did crucify him they best knew him and whence he came.

That Christ deserved better to die than Barabbas and that the Jews made a good choice, though Barabbas were both a thief and a murderer.

That if there be any God or any good Religion, then it is in the Papists, because the service of God is performed with more ceremonies, as elevation of the mass, organs, singing men, shaven crowns, etc.

That all Protestants are hypocritical asses.

That if he were put to write a new religion, he would undertake a both more excellent and admirable method.

That all they that love not tobacco and boys were fools.

That all the apostles were fishermen and base fellows neither of wit nor worth, that Paul only had wit but was a timorous fellow in bidding men to be subject to magistrates against his conscience.

That he had as good right to coin as the Queen of England, and that he was acquainted with one Poole, a prisoner in Newgate, who hath great skill in mixture of metals, and having learned some things of him he meant through the help of a cunning stamp-maker to coin French crowns, pistolets and English shillings.

That one Richard Cholmeley hath confessed that he was persuaded by Marlowe's reasons to become an atheist.

That this Marlowe almost into every company he cometh persuades men to atheism; as I think all men in Christianity ought to endeavour that the mouth of so dangerous a member may be stopped."

This is perhaps the most interesting document of the whole problem, since it is the most vivid portrait of Marlowe we have. It's like a map of his personality. This petty puritan tries his best in his hateful effort to annihilate Marlowe but succeeds in his ridiculous caricature only with the opposite. What we see is the envy of Richard Baines shining through every word against this superior talent, who so clearly discloses that he has looked through the whole of Christianity, and who is so wise and knowledgeable that he is fully aware that Indian history goes much farther back than that of the Bible. Richard Baines finds it the challenge of his life to match this superior personality whom he can't bear, why he tries his utmost to destroy him. Only one of the charges was serious in the eyes of the Queen: that of coining money. Everything could be forgiven Marlowe for the sake of his art, but it was quite impossible to allow any kind of coining or any publicity thereof. For that reason, and for his own safety, so that he could continue his much appreciated work, he had to disappear.

The initiative was probably Marlowe's own in joint deliberation with his closest sponsor and friend Thomas Walsingham, and the decisive factor was not the base libel of Richard Baines, but the denunciation by his friend and colleague Thomas Kyd. Marlowe and Kyd had lived together and worked together. In May the home of Kyd was searched by the police for forbidden pamphlets against illegal Flemish immigrants. The police found only atheistic writings. Thomas Kyd blamed them on Marlowe. Consequently Marlowe was arrested, who soon could prove that the papers were not by him. (These fatal documents still exist today and have proved to be written by no one else than Thomas Kyd himself.) But the fact that Thomas Kyd had informed against and betrayed his maybe closest friend and colleague must have given Marlowe very deep and hard feelings and a sense of having lost the ground under his feet, (the theme recurs often in the Shakespeare canon, for example in "*The Two Gentlemen of Verona*" from a few years after, and is the leading theme of evil in "*King Lear*",) and the matter was in no way easily disposed of. It was unavoidable that the police would undertake investigations into the forbidden, dangerous and illegal free-thinking activities of Marlowe, Raleigh, Harriot, the Bacons and many others. Marlowe's fate and disappearance must be viewed against the background of both Baines' and Kyd's betrayals and denunciations.

Another curious detail: Eleanor Bull, in whose house the disappearance of Marlowe was staged, had two interesting relatives: Blanche Parry, Queen Elizabeth's very closest chamber maid, and John Dee, the most famous occultist of the time. Through Blanche Perry, Eleanor Bull could at any time turn to the highest authorities of the country, that is Prime Minister Lord Burghley, who helped her with legal problems.

In relation to that we might note, that the great debut play of Marlowe's, *Tamburlaine the Great*, really isn't about the great Tamerlane at all but Ivan the Terrible of Russia. Marlowe's own relative, a certain Anthony Marlowe, had shares in *The Muscovy Company*, later on *The East India Company*, which had an agreement with Czar Ivan the Terrible providing them with a European monopoly on all the merchandise of all the Russias; and it was the house of that Company, owned by the merchant agent Richard Bull, husband of Eleanor Bull, which was chosen as the scene for Christopher Marlowe's extremely dramatic and well-staged exit from public life.

There was probably a ship to France with Marlowe on board on that very day, May 30th 1593, but probably the whole establishment of England knew about the operation, not only the Derby brothers and the Bacon brothers but all his friends, Prime Minister Lord Burghley with his son and most probably even the Queen, who by all means could do without Christopher Marlowe, his troubles and controversies, but not without his plays.

So we have now the possibility to ascertain Marlowe's continued existence after his death by comparing the hand-writing of Louis Le Doux with Marlowe's own. If they match each other as well as the language and style of the plays of Marlowe and Shakespeare match each other, that is perfectly, it will be very difficult to bring forth a candidate with a stronger case for the authorship of the Shakespeare poems and plays.

Research continues.

### *Comments on A. D. Wraight.*

At first sight of her book "*The Story that the Sonnets Tell*" you get some apprehension of her method. She has divided the sonnets of Shakespeare under different headings, one part dealing with Henry Wriothesley, another part with the poet's own fate, another with the dark lady, and so on, totally cutting up the unity of the collection to place the 154 sonnets under different labels. This almost gives an impression of sacrilege, especially since the order of the sonnets probably was arranged by the poet himself for the first edition of 1609, the order creating a wonderful art form almost like a five act play. There are reasons to suppose that the poet himself never dreamed of that his sonnets would be sorted up like this in different columns.

Eventually your misgivings disappear as you read her book and understand the meaning of the division. She has lived with the sonnets wondering about their mystery for 30 years and only gradually entered on the idea to divide them under different headings just to come closer to their secret. And the result of her methodology is, to say the least, wonderful.

Just her work-out attitude is enough to raise the greatest acclamation, being of the fullest sincerity. She approaches the problem in the same way as Heinrich Schliemann decided to deal with the problem of Troy: assuming that what the poet himself has written is as close to the truth as you can get. Following that principle Schliemann discovered Troy and has Mrs. A. D. Wraight solved the mystery of the Sonnets.

The basic mistake committed by all interpreters of the Sonnets is that they have assumed that there was only one man depicted in them. Dolly Wraight has found out that they are at least three, and she has successfully identified all three of them. The first one is of course Henry Wriothesley, to whose seventeenth birthday the first seventeen sonnets were commissioned by Lord Burghley to inspire him to marry his granddaughter. But the dashing earl nevertheless failed to swallow the bait, and the girl was later married to William Stanley instead. That was one of the reasons why there were not more than seventeen sonnets written to that earl.

The second young man of the Sonnets is a certain William Hatcliffe, one of two possible 'Mr. W.H.', who in real life actually was elected a sort of 'king of beauty' in a certain society, which implies that he really must have been of some handsomeness falling in the eye of not only the poet but also of the beautiful lady Lucy Morgan, a notorious beauty, who is the dark lady of the Sonnets. Apparently Hatcliffe and Miss Morgan played the poet false with each other.

The third man is Thomas Walsingham, Christopher Marlowe's sponsor, protector and truest friend, who stood him by as he unjustly dishonoured was forced into exile, for which constancy the poet was indebted to him for the rest of his life, which the most beautiful sonnets illustrate. The highlight of the entire book is the miraculous ways in which the author succeeds in proving this man's identity.

A.D.Wraight founds her arguments on the clearest basis of solidity, her research is the most painstakingly laborious and exact during almost an entire lifetime, and her work to solve the riddle of the Sonnets is unparalleled. At the same time she continues the work of a long row of predecessors, who have shown her the way, and also their research results from many decades is gloriously exposed and brought to fruition by her work.

So her hypotheses are really not even new. Most of them have been expressed before. Her main ideas were published already in the 1950s by Calvin Hoffman but unscientifically improvised in mainly conjectures without references. One can say that she has erected a completed cathedral on the sketches and ideas of amateur architects.

The scientific pregnancy and solid methodology of her work results in a definite breakthrough in Shakespeare research. She explains all the great mysteries quite satisfactorily, and all that's still missing is only occasional small pieces.

In a sequel called "*New Evidence*" she goes further, analyzing the results of discovering the secret archives of Anthony Bacon, which have remained sealed for 400 years. But here the clear scientific foundation and solid methodology, which is so impressing in the Sonnets book, is not of equal ripeness. She identifies the hand-writing of the secret agent Louis Le Doux with that of Marlowe but without being able to certify beyond any shadow of a doubt that their hand-writings really are identical: this verification she leaves to future experts. Of course, there are many positive arguments for their being the same person, but it's equally probable that Louis Le Doux in fact is that very Louis Le Doux of a Huguenot family in Canterbury who grew up there at the same time as Marlowe and who later on in life might have continued to have dealings with him. There are different possibilities. Louis Le Doux might have been a fellow agent with Marlowe in France and handled their papers, which one can assume was difficult for Marlowe to do himself, since his real identity could not be discovered without risking the security of several important persons in England. Another alternative, and perhaps the most plausible possibility of all, is that Marlowe "borrowed" the identity of Le Doux, like he "borrowed" that of W. Shakespeare, like a good playwright thus entering and impersonating their characters and playing their parts. There is very much to investigate in the archives of Anthony Bacon, which still might contain any number of secrets and wonderful or controversial discoveries.

Since we definitely seem to have slipped down along the Marlowe trace in this Shakespeare debate, we might as well present the whole case again from the beginning as concisely as possible:

### *The Marlowe Case - Another Presentation.*

It's not about Philip Marlowe, the magnificently hard-boiled detective of Raymond Chandler's, who never could solve a case so that his readers could follow or understand anything of it, since Mr. Chandler never wrote anything without considerable alcoholic preparations.

Neither is it about the severely tried partner of Scrooge's, that poor Mr. Marlowe, whom the relentless Charles Dickens condemned to walk around for ever carrying around the heaviest and direst iron chains as a warning to all living beings and especially to that poor old miser Mr. Scrooge.

Instead I will present facts in a much stranger case much further back in time, namely the case of Christopher Marlowe, born 23rd February 1564 in the same year as Galilei and Shakespeare, exactly two months before Shakespeare and five days after the birth of Galilei and the death of Michelangelo. Yes, Michelangelo died and Galilei was born on the very same day, and Christopher Marlowe was born the week after in Geoffrey Chaucer's old Canterbury as the son of a shoe-maker with interests in law; and also the mother of the poet was according to witnesses a remarkable personality. He was brought up in the shade of the cathedral and apparently proved so bright a pupil, that he was sent by the clerics of Canterbury with a scholarship to Cambridge, where as a young man he came in touch with all the leading intellectuals of the age at the court of Queen Elizabeth, first of all Sir Walter Raleigh, who searched for Eldorado in South America, and Sir Philip Sidney, whose friend was Giordano Bruno, who was burned at the stake for maintaining that earth orbited the sun instead of the contrary. Giordano Bruno's greatest challenge against his age was his insisting on the right of science to objective thinking as more important than any religion, and such thoughts were shared by all in the circles of Sir Philip Sidney and Sir Walter Raleigh, which included the free-thinker Marlowe.

He had been sent to Cambridge to become a cleric, but instead he became the first real dramatist of England creating the English verse drama, which later developed fully under the name of Shakespeare. Marlowe's first verse drama about the Albanian freedom fighter Scanderbeg is lost, but the major break-through of his art and of English drama was "Tamburlaine the Great", a titanic play in two parts and ten acts, which pretends to illustrate the great khan Tamerlane's life and deeds but which in fact is modelled on the brutal life of Ivan the Terrible. This was in 1588, the same year as the Great Armada sailed against England and met with its ruin and England was established as a major world power.

Marlowe then enjoyed five years of considerable success as a dramatist, especially with "Doctor Faustus", which two centuries later inspired Goethe to his life's work. He also wrote dramas about the massacre at Paris in 1572, about Dido and Aeneas, about the Turkish invasion of Malta, and introduced the great English chronicle plays with the impressive "Edward II", in which we already find the fully developed Shakespearean art brought to perfection. He also wrote poems of love.

In May 1593 he vanished without a trace. The story went about that he had been killed in a regular tavern brawl. His sudden disappearance was surrounded by whispers and rumours of scandals. It appeared he had been denounced to the English inquisition court, the Star Chamber, for heresy, blasphemies and homosexuality. His own closest associate, Thomas Kyd, also a dramatist, with whom he had collaborated and shared quarters, did himself accuse Marlowe of these crimes as he was tortured and ransacked, the police having found atheist writings at his place. Thomas Kyd claimed these belonged to Marlowe, who was arrested in the middle of May but released with instructions to keep in touch. It was to be expected, that if Marlowe was apprehended

by the inquisitional court, also his other free-thinking friends would be arrested, which included not only Sir Walter Raleigh but also the philosopher Francis Bacon and a whole company of England's leading intellectuals. So when Marlowe disappeared he couldn't have done so at a more suitable moment. After his disappearance the inquisitors had nothing more to work on.

As late as in 1925 the coroner's report in the case of Marlowe was found. It seemed very fishy indeed: nothing in it made any sense, and there was reason to suspect a set-up. According to the report, Marlowe would have spent an entire day in the company of three notorious fellows, they would have dined together and had a nice day and afternoon at a private house in Deptford, and then suddenly there would have risen a quarrel about the bill. Marlowe would then have rested on a bench behind the three companions seated at a table with their backs towards Marlowe, who suddenly would have assaulted the middle one from behind with a dagger, whereupon this man in the middle, squeezed in between the two others, would have defended himself and given Marlowe a deadly thrust above the eye, of which Marlowe would instantly have died. The cause of death as it is explained in this coroner's report is scientifically and medically impossible.

The corpse would then immediately have been shuffled down in an unknown grave somewhere abouts there in Deptford, so that no one could locate it. The three fishy companions were all acquitted and set free almost at once. They were all in the service of Thomas Walsingham, Marlowe's closest friend and protector, sponsor and employer, cousin of the late Sir Francis Walsingham, head of Queen Elizabeth's secret service, in which Marlowe himself had been an agent on missions to France. In brief, nothing in this murder case makes any sense.

That was in May 1593. The next month there is a debutant in English literature. A poem is published which immediately becomes popular and loved for its beautiful language and love story, and the poet is a certain totally unknown William Shakespeare from Stratford, recently arrived to London, an actor about whom no one knew anything. Later it would turn out that he had temporarily abandoned his much older wife and certain economical difficulties in Stratford to try his luck in London. He would make a fortune as a broker and house proprietor, actor and director and regular theatre business man with his hands full all the time. He died in 1616. Seven years later his complete works are published, 36 plays and a collection of poems, most of the works never published before and without Shakespeare actually ever having made any claims on them during his lifetime - those which had been printed before had generally been pirated.

I just present the problem. I will say nothing more at the moment.

### *The Difficult Case of Sir Francis Bacon.*

The only thing you can be quite sure of concerning the greatest philosopher of the Elizabethan age is that his case never can be appropriately investigated. It invites to speculation for ever.

And although he was a pioneer in so many fields, predominantly philosophy and science, in which he decisively stressed the precedence and right of lucidity and logic to religious thinking, supposition and superstition, he was remarkably inept at bringing any order and clarity into his own life in the eyes of the afterworld.

We have here one of the most complicated personalities of the Renaissance, a definite universal genius where something went wrong from the start, so that his entire life (apart from his brilliant career as a thinker and writer) became dominated by a

hopeless self-destructiveness. In this he demonstrates a striking resemblance with Leonardo da Vinci, another excellent genius who excelled everyone else in all fields but couldn't complete or finish anything, leaving his life's work behind him in an inextricable chaos of brilliance.

You would think that you could have expected better of Sir Francis Bacon, since he at least reached the very pinnacle of society with finally only the king above him. He worked himself up the long way in the government service as a lawyer and had generally a difficult time but came into some fortune by the relationship with the Duke of Essex, the Queen's favourite, who took Bacon under his wings from 1591. When Essex rebelled and was decapitated, Bacon was one of the leading parties of the prosecution. (Lytton Strachey has analysed and elucidated this case in his very readable work *"Elizabeth & Essex"*.) Bacon then rose to power under James I and got his hands full with government business from 1613, when the production of new Shakespeare plays suddenly ceased. He was made Lord Chancellor in 1618, the highest office of the realm next to the king's, in order to after only three years be completely dishonoured, bereft of all his duties and disappear from public life with his career and reputation ruined. But it was during his last five years that he wrote his most important works mainly in Latin. He died after catching a cold from a scientific experiment involving stuffing chickens with snow in order to preserve their meat: the first deep-freeze experiment.

Even during his lifetime there were some who believed he was the man behind the Shakespeare plays. There are striking similarities in their personalities and views: the same rational attitudes towards life, 1591-1613 Bacon had provedly very much spare time to be able to write any amount of extra literature, he was educated at Cambridge (which the Shakespeare plays indicate that their author was, and which William Shakespeare from Stratford wasn't,) and a number of Shakespeare key plays were first performed at Gray's Inn, where Bacon was at the centre of things.

At this point Bacon and Marlowe seem the strongest candidates in our Shakespeare debate, both having been educated at Cambridge, which several of the plays indicate that their author must have been, and which neither the Stratford man nor Derby was.

Bacon and Marlowe are also the most tragic candidates, but the fall of Bacon appears more titanic, as he at the top of his career at the age of 60 is suddenly publicly disgraced for having taken bribes as Lord Chancellor. His disgrace couldn't have been worse, and he has to survive it. He was fined £40,000, a more than astronomical amount at that time, which of course he could never pay. It was an impossible sum, and the king remitted most of it, but Bacon could never again show his face in public. His case is like a ghostly manifestation of both King Lear and Timon of Athens, although both plays were written much earlier.

This tragedy seems to have followed him into the Shakespeare debate. Towards the end of the 19th century people found out that Bacon must have been Shakespeare, and as advocates of this theory appeared great authorities like Mark Twain, Henry James, Bernard Shaw and Daphne du Maurier. But the Baconians gradually demonstrated the same self-destructiveness as Bacon himself. They lost themselves into cryptogram speculations, the belief that Bacon had left behind a lot of cipher writings, there were legends told about him of the very kind which he himself most of all had detached himself from, they tried to make him the great prophet of the freemasons in England, and all this made the Baconians appear more and more ridiculous. Other candidates, like Oxford, Derby and Marlowe, then appeared less ridiculous in comparison.

To all this comes the inevitable backstage life of Bacon. He was sickly in all his life, probably chronically neurotic and overstrung, he made himself socially impossible by his arrogant manners, (he was not at all a brilliant courtier like Leonardo da Vinci,) his

overbearing ambitions made him an intolerable careerist, and like his brother Anthony Bacon he was notorious for being a homosexual, for which he was even prosecuted as a young man, just like Leonardo da Vinci. All his life he kept a small court of young men around him, mostly servants, clerks and pages, whom he shared beds with. In his forties he married a rich heiress of 14, which improved his economy while the marriage was without issue.

This backstage life, which gives us a less attractive picture of Bacon as an opportunist, egoist and materialist, is difficult to join with the exalted and self-effacing art of Shakespeare. At the most it's possible to assume that Bacon could have been the final editor of "*The First Folio*" 1623, but it's very difficult to turn him into the sole author of all the plays and poems. He appears as something like the Joker of the business, whose importance to the whole deck of cards is unoverstimable but at the same time undefinable.

### *Fact and Speculation in the Case of John Penry.*

*(the complete and unabridged version)*

John Penry was hanged on May 29th 1593. He was no ordinary criminal but highly educated at Cambridge and Oxford with contacts among the highest in intellectual society, notably among free-thinkers like Francis Bacon and the Earl of Essex. He was a Presbyterian of honest faith and is still regarded in his home area of north Wales as a martyr. But strangest of all about this execution was, that he was not allowed to say farewell to his wife or his four daughters. He was hanged suddenly and in secret and was actually fetched without warning directly from his dinner to his scaffold. Neither was he honoured with any funeral, but his body disappeared without a trace, and no grave of his has ever become known. What heinous crime could deserve such a dishonourable dismissal? He had been too outspoken. He had dared to criticize highly honoured bishops and archbishops, and these had taken their revenge by having him libelled as a revolutionary and a dangerous traitor. One person especially had good motives for getting even with the pious John Penry, namely the Archbishop of Canterbury John Whitgift, notoriously well known as the leading witch-hunter of free-thinkers. Also John Penry had studied at Cambridge at the same time as Marlowe, they were about the same age and of the same intellectual capacity. One who fully shared John Penry's criticism of the ecclesiastical authorities was 'Martin Marprelate', a notorious and unknown writer of pamphlets, whose identity remains a mystery to this day. This Martin Marprelate could, in his pamphlets, call the Archbishop of Canterbury names like "Beelzebub of Canterbury", "Canterbury Caiphas", "monstrous anti-Christ", "bloody tyrant" and things like that. This Marprelate affair is an entirely local phenomenon in Canterbury 1588-89, where Christopher Marlowe's family had its home and where John Penry was busy at the time. The caustic mockery of the Marprelate pamphlets is shatteringly ironic and has been compared with Jonathan Swift and Mark Twain. So they are actually funny. The essence of his argument is: NO MORE BISHOPS! He calls all the bishops of England, Wales and Ireland 'petty popes' and 'petty Anti-Christ's' and doesn't hesitate to name them all. The chief target for this poison was the Archbishop of Canterbury, John Whitgift, who tried to answer with the full solemnity of his high office, whereupon Marprelate used his (i.e. Whitgift's) own words to ridicule him even more. The provocative unorthodoxy of John Penry was well known, since he preached in public, so it was logical to suspect him of being 'Martin Marprelate',

especially since his writings provedly came from the same printing-press as the Marprelate pamphlets. But John Penry denied with firmness that he even knew who Martin Marprelate was, and this is accepted today as the truth, since John Penry, a solemn preacher, didn't demonstrate much sense of humour, while the mocking ironies of 'Marprelate' are those of a clown.

It falls easier to combine the character of Marprelate with that of Marlowe. (Compare also 'Oliver Martext' in "As You Like It".) The Marprelate mocking style is identical with what we find in Marlowe's most maliciously ironic plays like 'Doctor Faustus', wherein he transcends all limits of decorum and decency. Marlowe might very well have been the man behind Martin Marprelate's ruthless chaffing of the Anglican establishment; but he must have been aware of John Penry's criticism of the episcopal authorities, which might have served as inspiration to Marprelate's boldness. But John Penry got all the blame.

His house was searched and his writings confiscated and, if he had not managed to escape to Scotland in disguise, he would have been arrested. But his trials had only started. The Queen demanded of King James of Scotland that he be extradited, but King James said he could not be found. Yet he returned to England after two years and was arrested on March 22nd 1593. They tried to convert him from the heresies of Wycliffe and Luther, but he remained firm in his Separatist convictions. On May 21st he was put to trial for "rebellion and insurrection", and his own confiscated writings were used as evidence against him, just like the writings found in the quarters of Thomas Kyd were used against that unfortunate playwright together with torture to extort confessions of heresy and conspiracy. Although nothing could be proved against John Penry, he was condemned to death for treason. He protested his loyalty to the Prime Minister Lord Burghley and the Earl of Essex, but May 25th was fixed as the day of execution. But when his family and friends came on that day to witness the execution it was postponed, and they had to return home. Instead he was executed in secret four days later without any witnesses. Perhaps the authorities feared the effects of a public execution of such a famous and revered person. It was one of the worst judicial murders of the time and, after the Mary Stuart affair, perhaps the darkest stain on the glorious reign of Queen Elizabeth.

This strange business coincides almost exactly with the arrest and 'murder' of Christopher Marlowe, officially 'murdered' the day after John Penry. This remarkable coincidence must give rise to suspicions. As a well-informed government spy, Marlowe must have been aware of the arrest of Penry since March and maybe even of his sentence to death. David A. More presents a theory that the body inspected by coroner Danby on June 2nd actually was that of John Penry, which during the night darkness would have been smuggled into Deptford only four miles from where John Penry had been executed on the road to Canterbury. Psychologically the theory would fit, although it seems too far-fetched to be credible: any body could have been used, and during these days of the plague there were bodies galore. A connection between John Penry and Christopher Marlowe has never been established, but if Marlowe was 'Martin Marprelate' (and there is hardly any other candidate who would fit that clown's measure) it would be very unlikely that two secret pamphleteers using the same printing-press would know nothing about each other. Dave More's theory suggests other theories, one of them being that Marlowe as a dramatic genius actually staged his own death, although there is no proof of it, but it's not unthinkable. Another one is that Marlowe allowed his brother of destiny, John Penry, to depart as a martyr under his (Marlowe's) name. We can't here present all the various possibilities of Marlowe's own attitudes to his situation and what he made of it at this point. All we can do is to try to consider all possibilities. If Marlowe knew about Penry's trial and sentence, it must have

motivated him to abandon the scene. This suggests that Marlowe was part in the strange staging of the set-up at Eleanor Bull's. All that was needed to fool the coroner's 16 witnesses was to inflict an extra deep wound in the head of a fresh corpse. Since John Penry was presented fully dressed, if it was he, or any hanged corpse, the jurors would not have noticed any noose marks round the victim's neck and even less bothered to look for any such thing. There was no need to be particular, fresh corpses were common in those days, they appeared everywhere in Queen Elizabeth's London, especially in the days of the Plague, and only in rare cases were investigations carried out and then without any exaggerated meticulousness. Further, Coroner Danby must have had access to any number of fresh corpses and, if he was in the plot, could easily have produced one. But circumstances actually point to that the dead body of 'Marlowe' could very well have been John Penry.

Thus Marlowe, his past settled, especially his problematic associations with Penry and Kyd, could, like a phoenix, be born anew and continue his work but under completely different names than Christopher Marlowe. For he was now officially dead and liberated from the risk and burden of ever again being an embarrassment to anyone.

Although Dave More's theory can't be proven, it certainly invites investigation.

### *A Shakespeare Apology,*

by John Bede

Dear Anti-Stratfordians,

With all due respect to all your candidates like Bacon, Rutland, Derby, Marlowe, Heywood, Oxford and others, but wouldn't William Shakespeare at least deserve a place in the sun along with them? After all, he has nothing else. Marlowe is credited with the invention of the Elizabethan drama in blank verse, and no honour is greater than that. Both Derby, Rutland and Oxford were Earls and couldn't get any more established nor more honourable positions in life. They got all the good things out of life without having to bother to write any ever-living poetry, which their titles and honours hardly motivated them to aspire to. As for Bacon, he rose to become the richest and most powerful man in England at that time, and more than that: of Ireland and Scotland as well, so why would he have bothered to foster ambitions to become the greatest of poets as well? It doesn't make sense. All his writings breathe unilaterally of only worldly not to say materialistic ambitions. When he blundered and lost everything all the Shakespeare tragedies were long ago written, and why would he have felt like writing such dark tragedies while being only and entirely successful?

Thomas Heywood had his own speciality of domestic plays and, like Rutland, was too young to have been capable of for instance the great Henry VI tragedies. Of course, let's give credit where it is due: Thomas Heywood continued after Jonson and Shakespeare and kept the stage going and did a marvellous lot of editing as well, probably, since he confessed to having been meddling with at least 220 Elizabethan plays. That's a confession to respect, and there is nothing to disprove it. But he did not confess to having composed any of the Shakespeare plays.

So who is left? William Shakespeare. He has nothing left without his plays. Rob him of his authorship, and exactly nothing remains. Who can be so cruel? Especially since he actually might have written them, since there is nothing to disprove it.

I admit, there is no evidence of his authorship. His canon was published long after he was dead, and no one attended his funeral. No one praised him as a playwright

before "The First Folio" seven years after his death. But all the poems and compliments of "The First Folio" can not be disproved. There is nothing, absolutely nothing to argue against their authenticity and honesty. Shakespeare *might* have been the sole author of the 36 plays and probably some more, and he was the first one to be acknowledged as such.

And you must admit, that there is a grain of convincing authenticity in John Aubrey's anecdotes, how Shakespeare held speeches at the death of his father's, the butcher's cattle. He was handsome and of a stately figure, prerequisites for a good actor. No one has ever questioned him as an actor. Can you find a single professional actor among all the other candidates? And who but an actor could have written so perfectly for the voice?

Please grant William Shakespeare what hasn't been denied him since 1623. Why start harassing and dishonouring him now? None of the others needed the glory of William Shakespeare. They had their own glories. William Shakespeare's sole glory is his plays. Don't take them away from him, please, if you are gentlemen.

Yours truly,

*John Bede.*

### *Presenting a Baconian problem.*

During the years 1594-96 Sir Francis Bacon made some notes in a book which he called "The Promus of Formularies and Elegancies", usually called just "Promus". For 200 years it was unknown, and it wasn't published until 1883. Since then it has been the strongest argument of the Baconians that Bacon wrote all of Shakespeare's works, since this diary happens to contain a great number of Shakespeare quotations from plays that in 1596 had not yet been written.

Of course this was an unbearable insult to all Stratfordians. It was the first great hit under the waterline in the bulk of Shakespeare orthodoxy, the acknowledged and self-evident fact since 1623 that the works of Shakespeare could have no other author than William Shakespeare. And there was no lack of arguments against the testimony of the Promus. Such quotations that were found in Bacon's diary, Stratfordians said, were daily expressions of that time used by anyone and no idiosyncratic expressions of Shakespeare's at all. And those Shakespeare quotations from the Promus which matched exactly with expressions used in the plays were less than a few. Someone else, who had been close to Bacon, might have used the Promus and its smart formulations. If you examine closely the details of the Promus you can explain away almost every indication that Bacon would have been Shakespeare.

But you can't explain everything away. Certain things are too obvious to be ignored. The Promus is written in all those languages mastered by Bacon, that is English, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish and French. It's exactly those languages that the writings of Shakespeare bear witness of that their author must have known. The first Stratfordian never entered a university, remained at home among the illiterates of Stratford until he was almost thirty, whiled away his time in Stratford mostly on petty processes and quarrels about money with his neighbours being otherwise busy only with his much older wife and their three children, and concerned himself in London as a practical theatre business man only with making money. He never went abroad and didn't leave to posterity one single letter or book. His own daughter couldn't even write her own name. In brief, everything speaks loudly about his being totally uneducated but having a good nose for making money.

Strangest in the Promus are all the quotations from "King Lear", which wasn't written until ten years after the Promus was penned down. There are also other links between Bacon and King Lear. The play is founded on an earlier play, "King Leir", with a difference. In "King Leir" the king does not go mad, and his daughters do not try to declare him incapacitated. Shortly before "King Lear" was written, a strange case had its course in the courts of Bacon and his colleagues: an old servant to the crown was getting soft-headed, and his two eldest daughters tried to have him declared insane, so that they could take over his property. His third daughter appealed as far as possible, trying in vain to prevent the tragedy of Sir Brian Annesley, who had served the Queen well in all his life, ending up as a publicly pronounced madman. In the height of this controversy, Sir Brian died. The name of his youngest daughter happened to be Cordell.

How many could have been familiar with this peculiar law case? Very few outside court. Most of Shakespeare's plays betray a professional familiarity with court proceedings, while William Shakespeare was just an actor and theatre business man with no legal training at all.

If Bacon really wrote Shakespeare's plays, he must have been extremely careful about hiding this authorship, since that's what he succeeded in to perfection: still today it is impossible to bind him to any of the plays and poems, although many have tried in various ways. But we can't neglect the possibility. In view of all the other things that Bacon wrote, highbrow philosophy in Latin with ambitions to reform the world, he could have amused himself with writing intriguing plays off-hand, which he then would have had every reason to keep separate from his more serious authorship. Whoever wrote them, (and the more we learn, the more the improbability appears that it was Shakespeare,) he had every reason to hide that authorship. William Shakespeare was probably the ideal play-broker who knew to keep silent about secrets that fattened his pockets.

At least it is evident that Sir Francis Bacon must have had something decisive to do with at least the final edition of Shakespeare's works. The problem is to have his part in the set-up defined - if he acted as an author or editor, partly or wholly.

"There's more to it than meets the eye."

### *The Perfect Set-Up.*

#### A Summary of the (lack of) Evidence.

There is no proof that Shakespeare wrote the works of Shakespeare, and there never was. But by "The First Folio" in 1623 it was established that Shakespeare had written them, and no one objected to it. It was very safe to establish Shakespeare as the sole author in 1623 since he had been dead for seven years. No one bothered about the fact that the texts in "The First Folio" did not correspond to the quarto texts issued while Shakespeare had been alive. The first objections were raised when it was far too late to raise any objections, was the main argument of the established Shakespeare academicians. No matter how overwhelmingly logical the arguments are against Shakespeare as the author, the established Shakespeare academicians can always point at the authentic texts of "The First Folio" and say: "There you are. As long as you can't prove these texts to be wrong you have no argument. Evidence, please!" And complacently they can continue acting as established Shakespeare academicians.

But their position is untenable, and gradually they find it more difficult to defend their case. The circumstantial evidence against Shakespeare in favour of Bacon, Oxford,

Derby or Marlowe is constantly getting more attention and on their nerves. The Bacon case is clear: everything points to him as the editor of "The First Folio" with the assistance of Ben Jonson, who made his career getting paid for writing lies. But there is one flaw in the Bacon case - the Sonnets, which can't be fitted into Bacon's life. Concerning Oxford, no one fits the Shakespeare personality better, and "Hamlet" could be Oxford's autobiography. But there is one problem with Oxford: by 1604 he was already dead. But he had a son-in-law, a theatre maniac like himself, William Stanley, one of the most mysterious characters among the Elizabethans, who has left no trace of himself in history except some printed music, a handful of letters, some quarrels with his wife suggesting the character of Othello, a long poem about his journeys all over Europe including Turkey and Russia as a youth, the fact that Richard Lloyd (the man behind Holofernes in "Love's Labour's Lost") was his tutor and chaperon on his journeys, a fabulous position as governor of the Isle of Man, the important ownership of some London theatre companies, and three sons. His brother and predecessor as Earl of Derby, Ferdinando, was one of the leading theatre enthusiasts and free-thinkers until he was poisoned by Catholics in April 1594 because he wouldn't take on their cause although he was a Catholic and cousin to the Queen. They wanted him for a candidate to the crown, and after his death they also investigated William's possible candidature but found him too busy writing comedies. No one knows what happened to those comedies, nor have they ever been identified. The Stanley brothers also had a cousin called William Stanley in Spain who was a traitor. So Will Stanley had every reason to keep as low a profile as possible, his elder brother being poisoned and his cousin (with his own name) being a traitor. And his name always has a startling effect in Shakespeare discussions: whenever the 6<sup>th</sup> Earl of Derby is mentioned, all Shakespeare arguments fall silent. The fact that after his death in September 1642 all the theatres of England were closed down by the Puritans and the civil war started, adds to his mystery. Many high academicians and experts of literature have believed him to be the real Shakespeare, but the Sonnets don't quite fit into his life either.

Finally we have Christopher Marlowe, the main creator of the Elizabethan blank verse drama, who officially was done away with under suspicious circumstances around Pentecost in 1593. In 1905 an accidental scientific investigation conducted by Doctor Mendenhall in Boston of texts by Bacon, Shakespeare and Marlowe indicated with overwhelming clarity that Shakespeare and Marlowe used identical language and word techniques. In 1925 Leslie Hotson discovered Coroner Danby's report on the murder of Christopher Marlowe, a report which in 1925 didn't fool anyone any more, since it could scientifically be proved a fake. In 1955 Calvin Hoffman launched the theory that the murder of Christopher Marlowe had been a set-up to save Marlowe's life, and he produced a body of work of 700 pages to prove it. Of course, it was only circumstantial evidence. The Stratfordians could remain calm as usual and neglect it as "no evidence". In 1995 A.D. Wraight published "The Story that the Sonnets Tell", the most thorough study of the Sonnets ever made and the only one successfully explaining the mysteries of most of them. Her work clearly shows that the Sonnets fit Christopher Marlowe perfectly and no one else.

So it all points to Marlowe having continued his work as a dramatist under the cover of William Shakespeare, maybe also under the cover of others like John Webster, perhaps collaborating with Beaumont & Fletcher, perhaps borrowing even other occasional names. If it was he, he most probably spent some years up in Lancashire under the protection of Derby, where he learnt much Lancashire expressions demonstrated in plays like "Hamlet". And most probably, Francis Bacon must have been one of his associates and maybe his protector. Bacon and Derby had much legal business together.

But the Stratfordians can remain calm. There is still no proof against Mr. Shakespeare being the sole author of the entire First Folio. Shakespeare's name remains established since 1623, and things like "The Story that the Sonnets Tell", Calvin Hoffman's findings, Doctor Mendenhall's accidental research with its astonishing results that no one expected, Coroner Danby's fabrication, "Hamlet", the Sonnets, the strange fate of Marlowe - they are just stories.

25.10.2001

The Agincourt and Balaclava day.

### *Melancholy.*

The first great dramatic play of the English Renaissance is 'The Spanish Tragedy', after his death attributed to Thomas Kyd. It's a very melancholy work about grief, injustice, madness and revenge, a perfect prelude to the great Elizabethan tragedies, offering even ghosts and a play in the play. Already here Elizabethan tragedy is ripe. But who wrote it?

Thomas Kyd himself only put his name under translations. He shared quarters with Marlowe, and most scholars believe they collaborated, for instance in 'The Spanish Tragedy', 'Arden of Feversham' and 'The Murder of John Brewen'. It is certain that Kyd did no dramatic work after the success of 'Tamburlaine' in 1588. Marlowe was the star, and Kyd did not challenge him. That fact makes it quite possible that Marlowe wrote all the works of Kyd except the translations. The strong melancholy of 'The Spanish Tragedy' also dominates many if not most of the plays under the names of Marlowe and Shakespeare, culminating in the Sonnets, the tetralogy of Henry VI and the great tragedies.

'The Winter's Tale' is the last instance, but then it suddenly reappears in the works of John Webster and Robert Burton - after Shakespeare had retired from the stage.

There are many startling reminiscences of Marlowe in Webster's three greatest plays, 'The White Devil', 'The Duchess of Malfi' and 'The Devil's Law-Case'. Like 'Henry VIII', 'The White Devil' has the ambition to be true to reality - and succeeds very well. It's a shattering drama about a Venetian courtesan unaware of the havoc she creates in the lives of her lovers, ruining them all; but the main character is the knave Flamineo, a clown in wit comparable with Hamlet and Falstaff, recalling the early villains of Marlowe. Already 'Pericles' has a melancholy scent of Marlovian nostalgia - not to speak of 'As You Like It' and other comedies.

But from where did John Webster get the story of the Duke of Bracchiano with its intimate shocking details? There is a story that Marlowe served the Bracchiano family, the duke of Orsino, whom he gives the leading part in 'Twelfth Night' to honour him during his visit to England in 1600. This story would explain the expert knowledge 'from inside the family' about the fatal whore of Venice in an earlier generation.

In his preface to 'The White Devil', John Webster explicitly states, that he wishes to be read in the lights of Chapman, Jonson, Beaumont, Fletcher, Shakespeare, Dekker and Heywood. Why does he not mention Marlowe in this context, the one dramatist he resembles the most? Maybe because he was Marlowe in disguise, a Marlowe already a professional in hiding. The one obvious characteristic of the author behind all the Shakespeare works is a complete self-effacement. Nothing is known about this 'John Webster', not even when he was born or when he died, and it was a name common enough.

Both the Webster tragedies also bring up Portia, from 'The Merchant of Venice' and the wife of Brutus. In early Kyd-Marlowe literature the Portia character is mentioned as a future project. The court scene in 'The White Devil' is in direct continuity from all the court scenes in Shakespeare - there is another even greater one in 'The Devil's Law-Case', - and there are obvious parallels between the character of Vittoria Corombona and the Dark Lady of the Sonnets. Both the Webster tragedies also treat the most typical Marlowe theme of all - banishment and exile.

'The Duchess of Malfi' is even more melancholy than 'The White Devil'; but the most melancholy work of all is Robert Burton's deeply religious 'The Anatomy of Melancholy', a giant work of perfection, in architecture very much reminiscent of the Kyd-Marlowe-Shakespeare-Webster drama.

If Marlowe wrote this work in his old age (quoting all the Marlowe-Shakespeare sources, especially Ovid, but Marlowe more than Shakespeare,) it would explain why he left off writing plays - he grew religious. There is an old saying, that 'when the devil comes of age he becomes religious.'

My point is the reflection that all this overwhelming flow of eloquent melancholy in great Elizabethan literature could come from one and the same source.

If Marlowe survived 1593, he had reasons enough for melancholy. It's more difficult to find any depths of melancholy in Derby with his settled family life. Oxford did of course have reasons for melancholy, but he died in 1604, while the melancholy literature continued and grew greater without him.

I am not stating this theory as a fact. But since there are other 'super' theories, like the 'super-Oxford-theory', the 'super-Bacon-theory' and the 'super-Derby-theory', a 'super-Marlowe-theory' deserves equal attention and consideration.

### *The Mystery*

Oxford - the vain bully, turning his theatre company into a street gang, boasting his vanity, killing his guardian's servant for nothing, ridiculed but tolerated and given a pension of £1000 a year by the Queen - for what? For his Sonnets, that merely precluded those that followed, or for all his lost plays, finished off by others? We shall never know. But the end of his 54 years saw the Advent of Hamlet, Othello and King Lear.

Bacon - the snob, the ambitious universal genius, England's Leonardo da Vinci, scientist, lawyer and politician, but playwright? Hardly. He was too aloof for that and too busy about political intrigue against Essex, his benefactor, the romantic Earl, the embodiment of all Shakespearean heroes and the extreme opposite of all that was Sir Francis Bacon.

Derby - the stealthy Earl with the initials W.S. and the given name of Will, the owner of various theatre companies, maybe even of the Lord Camberlain's men, who staged most of Shakespeare's plays, mad with jealousy about his beautiful but wanton wife, king of the Isle of Man, the universal traveller and perfect diplomat, who left no trace of himself to posterity and whose home and library were destroyed by the Puritans - for what? For sealing the Shakespeare secret for ever?

Marlowe - the rebellious pioneer, the dramatic genius, the dynamic creator of effects, on stage and backstage, in social life and in society, who somehow got stuck in his problem with Doctor Faustus' pact with the Devil and never got out of the Devil's clutches himself.

Shakespeare - the honest business man from the country, who knew all about delivering and transacting speeches, who brought the seeds of Marlowe into the world's

most lasting and beautiful winter garden, perhaps the most English of Englishmen, leaving behind him an unfathomable enigma of a perfect poker face on stage for ever.

Webster - the final dramatist, mainly interested in court cases, making a lot of fuss about women, perhaps having some difficulty with their essence, leaving behind him the deepest mystery of all - a perfected English drama of neither tragedy nor comedy but only of ambiguity, mocking posterity more than all his predecessors did, by not leaving behind him a single known fact about his life - as if he never existed.

What shall we think? Six characters, but one mystery? And what name has that mystery? Marlowe was the first to die, if he died. Oxford died at the peak of the English drama. Shakespeare died before its decline. Bacon died dishonoured in loneliness after having been the most powerful man in England. We shall never know when Webster died or if he died. And when Derby died, all the theatres of England closed down, and the final civil war broke out, destroying all evidence of who really wrote the works of Shakespeare.

*Laila Roth*

### *More Marlowe Theories.*

Of course I would never exclude Shakspeare completely from any share in the honour of the excellent work of the First Folio. On the contrary, I would grant him any honour in it - except the exclusive authorship, which, mark well, he never even claimed himself.

Yes, his name was used for the plays and poems, but in those days it was common among the players to "own" the plays they acted, occasionally selling them to publishers when they needed some extra money. That's probably how all the Quartos were published, which also accounts for their many corruptions and truncations, one example being "Richard Duke of York" published anonymously in 1595 and not published again until about 30 years later in the FF as "Henry VI part 3" by William Shakespeare. But "Richard Duke of York" is considered by experts like John Bakeless, Edward Thomas, Tucker Brooke and Allison Gaw among others to be by Marlowe, Thomas giving good reasons for his natural assumption, there being so many reminiscences of "Edward II" and the language of Marlowe. In fact, the language of Marlowe's last and Shakspeare's first works are so like each other as to be almost identical. For instance, "Venus and Adonis" and "Hero and Leander" are both written as if both authors knew the other poem by heart, which is pointed out by Charles Norman, who does not (in 1948) suggest they were written by the same man.

But that idea is irrejectable, since there are so many curiosities and phenomena pointing in that direction. If Shakspeare wrote "Henry VI part 3" and not Marlowe, he must have stolen the entire idea and all the central scenes from Marlowe, which would make him a thief. Few would accept that. The other idea is that there must have been a singular collaboration between Marlowe and Shakspeare, which possibility many would support, including myself.

But what would the nature of this collaboration have been? It would be very difficult to reconstruct and define, but it must have been very special. My theory is that it must have been one of those extremely rare coincidences of destiny, when two fates met at a crisis and joined hands to save each other from a mutual dilemma but of two very different natures.

I think a certain pseudonym called 'Benedict' hit the point when he depicted the situation in a theatrical scene, which shows publishers brooding over the already completed printing of "Venus and Adonis", realizing they can't publish it in the author's name, since he has been totally scandalized, his name having become anathema,

branded forever by Puritans as Atheist, the worst libel of all. The realism of the situation is that if they publish it in his name they won't succeed in selling a single copy.

At that moment a certain Stratford man comes to London trying his luck, having been forced to leave Stratford for its desperate unemployment situation in these difficult times of the Plague, coming to London for the sole purpose of making money in order to support himself and his family. He has done some acting, so he looks for something to do at the theatre in the precise moment when the news is spread that the great Marlowe of "Tamburlaine the Great" is dead, the whole free-thinking upper class giving a sigh of relief, since they all knew he had been under threat of arrest and torture for Atheism, Thomas Kyd having already been racked and made to confess. With the ensured total silence of Marlowe, the safety of the Walsinghams, the Cecils, the Bacons, the Catholics Oxford and Derby, Sir Walter Raleigh, Northumberland and many others was also ensured.

But who was this fresh country actor from Stratford? He was found to be a decent chap of good humour and honesty, with a nice flow of speech, a reliable actor of some talent and stability of mind. Why don't we help him along? What about using that untarnished unknown name for that exquisite poem, unpublishable in the name of Marlowe? He might need some money, Marlowe has left us so he won't object, and Sir Thomas Walsingham will surely agree. Let's give Will Shakspeare a chance of making an honest career. And Will Shakspeare, needing some money rather badly, was not so stupid as to decline the offer. The publishers contributed some convincing dedicatory epistle in flattery of the young earl of Southampton for his covering some of the costs - and it all turned out a greater success than expected. This started the triumphant victory path of the trademark William Shakespeare, and the honest man who had appeared on the right spot at the right moment did not object but knew how to play his part and sustain it, since his livelihood was saved.

Meanwhile Marlowe kept away most probably in Italy for many years, keeping busy writing new Italian plays in Verona and later making friends with the Duke Orsino di Bracciano, for whom he wrote "Twelfth Night" to be staged in London to welcome the Duke at the court of Queen Elizabeth for a few days around Twelfth Night in 1600. It's quite possible and even probable that Marlowe and Shakspeare never met each other. The business between them was wholly transacted by agents, through Sir Thomas Walsingham and through Sir Francis Bacon and his brother Anthony, who kept up the network of all English agents around Europe. No one else needed to know except those very few who were needed to arrange delivery and production. For Shakspeare, it was purely a business matter - no questions asked, since there was nothing to complain about. Mum was the only word needed to keep up business.

Enter Ben Jonson, who being so much younger knew nothing about the Marlowe crisis. So he would suspect nothing if he was told nothing. His admiration of Shakspeare was totally unreserved and sincere, and there is no reason to suspect any conscious falsity on his part. He knew Shakspeare from his fellow actor's best side, and he did not bother about what he did not know. His style is totally alien from the Marlovian-Shakespearean romanticism, which fact marks the Marlowe-Shakespeare style more sharply as unique and united.

But of course, the show could not go on forever, and in the end Shakspeare was satisfied enough to pull out of business and enjoy his last years at home without having to put on any acts any more. He had made enough money to be the richest citizen of Stratford, so he had nothing to complain of and just continued to keep his silence about the best deal of his life. He retired, and Marlowe suddenly found himself without a reliable nom de plume agent.

Will Shakspeare was a most common name in those days, and it had done well enough as a trademark. Why not repeat the successful formula? Enter John Webster.

Nothing is known about John Webster. It's an even more common name than Will Shakspeare, a thousand John Websters have been found from that time and many of them studied law, so it was a perfect name to use for continued concealment.

In some respects, John Webster differs from Marlowe and Shakspeare. His pen doesn't flow easily, he complains himself about the slowness of his invention, his intrigues are more morbid and melancholy, and his clowns aren't funny. They are just melancholy. There is a dark shadow growing ever darker on John Webster, and he hasn't left us many plays, only one handful: "The White Devil", "The Duchess of Malfi", "The Devil's Law-Case", "The Fair Maid of the Inn" and "Appius and Virginia", every single one of them set in Italy, the last one being a Roman complement to "The Rape of Lucrece". Every one of them fights with the devil and melancholy, and in most of them you find the classical Marlowe-Shakespeare arguments of the problems of exile and injustice, the dominant theme of the Sonnets. All of them dramatize trials and court-cases very much reminding of those in Shakespeare, and "The White Devil" is like a dramatization of the 'black lady incident' in the Sonnets: you recognize her at once.

So John Webster is entirely within the Marlowe-Shakespeare romantic tradition, and they have all three exactly the same human outlook, which only Jonson differs from. Webster continues harping on the old Marlowe-Shakespeare themes, he loves Montaigne and Philip Sidney (long ago dead), and there are some stunning direct reminiscences of Marlowe here and there. In his only foreword his main argument is against ignorance, thus echoing the program of Marlowe: "I hold there is no sin but ignorance," and you find everywhere in his writings that same self-destructive tendency which marks all of Marlowe's and Shakespeare's heroes. The "Rhymer" Webster characterizes thus:

"A rhymer is a fellow whose face is thatched all over with impudence, and should he be hanged or pillored, it is armed for it. He is a juggler with words, yet practises the art with most uncleanly conveyance. He doth boggle very often, and because himself winks at it, thinks it is not perceived: the main thing that ever he did was the tune he sang to. There is nothing in the earth so pitiful, no, not an ape-carrier, he is not worth thinking of, and therefore I must leave him as nature left him: a Dunghill not well laid together."

And this is the very Finale of his 32 "Characters", anonymously published in 1615. Whose voice is this? Haven't we heard it before? Yes, it's the dying Greene, cursing his own profession, entreating his "prophet Marlin" to abandon it, scolding all actors universally for their conceit. There were more echoes of it in Thomas Kyd as he denounced Marlowe to the authorities, trying to avoid further strain in show-business himself, cowardly betraying his own calling. It's the suicide monologue of Hamlet and the "tomorrows" of Macbeth. And the author is still harping on that dismal tune of total doubt through the empty name of John Webster. The disillusion is still as total as when Greene and Kyd denounced him and Baines informed against him, forcing him to renounce his own name, career and character in order to save others:

"Thus men must slight their wrongs, or else conceal them,  
when general safety wills us not reveal them."

- John Webster, Appius and Virginia, act II scene 2,

which could stand as a motto for the life's work of this romantic Marlowe-Shakespeare-Webster poet.

Another typical Marlowe reminder in Webster: in his one preface he explicitly honours all the theatre poets of his day, in whose light he wishes to be read: Chapman, Jonson, Beaumont, Fletcher, Shake-speare, Dekker and Heywood - in that order. Only Marlowe was left out, and yet no one resembles Marlowe more than Webster. The corollary is of course that Webster could have left out Marlowe because he was Marlowe.

Of course there is a lot more to it than that. This was only an introduction to the puzzle, and I have tried to make it as simple as possible, sticking only to the basics in the case. Let me just give you one more mystery.

One of the first and greatest Elizabethan plays was "The Spanish Tragedy" attributed to Thomas Kyd, who lived and worked together with Marlowe. Kyd died in 1594, and some ten years later "The Spanish Tragedy" was supplied with many extra lines. It has been assumed that they were written by Jonson, but they are contrary to the style of Jonson, who never wrote anything like them. They are rather like the fury of king Lear; but why would Shakspeare have added extra highly inspired lines to a play by a dead poet whom he never knew? But many found these extra lines very Websterian in nature. So of course it was Webster. But again: why would Webster have added so mighty inspired lines to a classical play by a dead poet who died before Webster even had come of age? There is no connection, and there is no possibility to solve the riddle of those extra lines entirely in the high romantic Marlowe-Shakespeare-Webster tradition, unless you include Marlowe himself in the picture, who lived and worked with Thomas Kyd and must have loved him, no matter how much Tom Kyd later cowardly betrayed him.

This is all of course just a theory, but as a theory it will stand in the name of Marlowe against all anti-Marlovians until it is proven false.

### *The Gothenburg Shakespeare Symposium, May 2002.*

#### *The Shakespeare case.*

1) The "Apology for Shakespeare" by John Bede was given to the audience in English and Swedish. It was considered an emotional product of wishful thinking.

2) The question was raised why Shakespeare retired so early at only 47, producing nothing at all during his last five years, in answer to which

3) the Hammerschmidt-Hummel investigation of the Shakespeare portraits was presented, which established the Chandos and the Flower portraits as genuine while the Droeshout engraving was a copy of the Flower portrait. Professor Hildegard Hammerschmidt-Hummel discovered on both the authentic portraits a swelling on the left eyelid, suggesting a problem with the tear glands, which could have been a sign of a potentially fatal cancer. A small caruncle tumour was found in the inner corner of the left eye, and finally in the Flower portrait (the later one) a lump above the left eyebrow, which a dermatologist diagnosed as a permanent inflammation while a pathologist diagnosed a probable bone tumour. All these signs of cancer problems were accentuated by the same obvious symptoms on the death-mask, once bought in London by a German and brought to Darmstadt in Germany. This would explain Shakespeare's early retirement and death.

4) Mark Twain's Shakespeare biography was presented to the audience in the original English version and in Swedish translation. No comments.

5) The case of John Shakespeare's proved Catholicism was presented including the inconsistency of the anti-Catholic pathos of "The Troublesome Reign of King John" and "King John" - how could a member of a Catholic family rave against the persecuted church of his own family and present that argument on a public stage while he had himself reached an important and affluent social position? The argument was considered weak.

6) The brutal statistics of Pat Dooley was presented, showing ample documentary evidence of the professional authorship of 20 Leading poets of Shakespeare's day but none at all of William Shakespeare. Statistics were shown to be easily manipulated by its manufacturer in whatever direction and for whatever means he would please.

7) Finally Sonnet 23 was presented as perhaps the most personal and self-revealing of them, showing the author to be least of all a central figure commanding the stage and his fellows but rather a timid backstage figure with no capacity for expressing himself except by writing, a man whose love was too great to be capable of being expressed - a sad case of inadequacy, not at all fitting any "Shake-Scene" or successful business man.

8) On the question of who was the first to doubt the authorship of Shakespeare, was presented the case of Rev. James Wilmot, (later half of 18th century) who investigated Warwickshire for materials about Shakespeare for the purpose of writing the first scientifically researched biography and found nothing and finally reached the conclusion that the author of Shakespeare was not at all from Warwickshire. As a result, the Rev. James Wilmot became the first Baconian.

#### *The Bacon case*

1) The speaker compared Francis Bacon with the Portuguese author Pessoa, who used a number of pseudonyms to express himself in writing. On his death-bed he revealed his alter egos and so was posthumously recognized. Bacon never revealed his alter egos but took them all with him in his grave. A few of them were suggested as Marlowe, Lyly, Shakespeare, Spenser, some of the works of Ben Jonson, and others.

2) The "Gesta Grayorum", "The Shepherd's Calender", "Colin Clouts" and other famous anonymous works (ascribed to Spenser and others) the speaker attributed to Bacon, whom he described as conducting a writer's workshop engaging a number of secretaries, like Kyd, Marlowe, Lyly and other servants and agents of the theatre like Shakespeare.

3) "Love's Labour's Lost" with its Navarre settings and court mysteries the speaker attributed to Bacon's years in France, describing the play as an autobiography, especially the love incident in which Jack didn't get his Jill, like Bacon didn't get Marguerite Valois ('The Lady of the Glen'). Also the Ophelia incident could be traced to Bacon's French experiences in his youth, so he was not a homosexual or even bisexual but had had a very unlucky royal love affair. A member of the audience asked about the Holofernes character modelled on Richard Lloyd. The speaker claimed there was evidence of Bacon having been to Navarre but no evidence of any association of his with Richard Lloyd.

4) Bacon was presented as the bastard son of Queen Elizabeth and the Earl of Essex as his half-brother, another bastard son of the Queen, whom Bacon was the first to call 'Gloriana'.

5) There is only one contemporary detailed illustration to Shakespeare's poem "Venus and Adonis". It was not found in Stratford but in St. Albans, Bacon's home place, not far from his home, a fresco on the wall of the tavern 'The White Hart'.

6) Bacon's strange dress in purple on his wedding was explained. Only royalty were allowed to dress in purple, and if anyone of lesser rank did he would risk his life for

that. When James Stuart of Scotland inherited the throne, Bacon offered him a bargain and suggested that he would leave England's 'concealed' poets alone. The implication was that Bacon, as the bastard son of Queen Elizabeth, was willing to relinquish all claims to the throne to James on condition that Bacon would be allowed to continue producing whatever plays in perfect freedom of speech and conscience. James countered with another condition: that Bacon would marry a lady without rank, so that he would never be able to inherit the throne. Bacon accepted the condition - but married in purple.

7) It was well known during his life-time that Bacon produced plays clandestinely under various pen names, which is proved by the title page of "*Cryptomenytices et Cryptographiae*" by Gustavus Selenus 1624.

8) The greatest influence on Shakespeare's Sonnets was exerted by the French poet Étienne Jodelle, who only published one of the six volumes of his works, which volume Bacon studied in France in the 1570s.

9) In Bacon's private notebook "The Promus" not discovered until the 1880s are found a great number of quotations from Shakespeare plays that had not yet been written when the "Promus" was penned down 1594-96.

10) The Ariel character can only have been borrowed from the work "*Steganographiae*" which John Dee, the Queen's astrologer, owned a rare copy of, whom Bacon visited before John Dee's library burned down. Oxford and Derby were also guests of John Dee's but after the fire.

11) Ben Jonson complained about another stealing his ideas before he had had time to fulfil them. At that time Ben Jonson lived in Bacon's house, and no other writer could have stolen Jonson's ideas and fulfilled them than Bacon, for instance "Volpone" and other plays.

12) Two different styles are found in Jonson, one fluent and one crabbed, the fluent one being Bacon's hand and the more laborious being Jonson's own.

13) Ben Jonson testified unofficially that Bacon's writings surpassed all the literature of Greece and Rome.

14) The plot of "King Lear", considerably altered from the original version "King Leir", is built on the case of Sir Brian Annesley, a loyal servant of the crown whom his elder daughters tried to have pronounced publicly mad, which only his youngest daughter tried to counteract. The case of Sir Brian Annesley could only have been known to Bacon among the Shakespeare candidates, since he was the only lawyer of them in London, where the case was tried.

#### *The Oxford case.*

1) The chief Oxford authorities are Thomas Looney (pronounced Loney) 1923 and Carlton Ogburn 1984. Thomas Looney, a teacher of Shakespeare and literature in Wales, found the Shakespeare case as presented in the plays incompatible with the known Stratford character, while he only found it compatible with Edward de Vere, the 17th Earl of Oxford, a child prodigy who early produced poems and plays *en masse* and made himself universally acknowledged as a leading poet before 1576, especially in his art of composing sonnets - there are some 30-40 pre-Shakespearian sonnets by him and other poems, among which one of the most notable is "*Women*", which is an early genuine echo of Shakespeare long before the Shakespeare authorship had started. Gabriel Harvey wrote in a poem to Oxford: "Thy countenance shakes a spear..." The authorship Shakespeare is always spelt with a hyphen, which never had occurred in the Stratford Shakespeare family.

2) The Shakespeare plays represent throughout a very careless attitude to money, while the Stratford man was a perfect business man. Oxford was the opposite: he wasted his inheritance and couldn't have cared less about money. The Queen gave him a life pension taxfree of £1000 a year, which today is almost £270,000, for unknown reasons, maybe just because he was a dramatic poet who pleased her with his dashing romanticism, being also of the oldest nobility in the country.

3) Both Bertram in "*All's Well that Ends Well*" and "*Hamlet*" are obvious autobiographies of Oxford.

4) One Earl of Oxford was a favourite homosexual of King Richard II's, but he is excluded from the play.

5) The Oxford family had good reasons for hard feelings against King Henry VII, so there is no Shakespeare play with that title.

6) Oxford wrote "*Romeus and Juliet*" already in 1583, the first version of the famous Verona play.

7) In 1594-1604, during which period all the greatest Shakespeare works were written, Oxford lived in almost total seclusion, which was a prerequisite for these plays to be concentrated on and written with such a consummate dramatic intensity, while the Stratman at the same time worked as an actor all day and only could have written plays by candlelight at night, which would have been a very slow and troublesome work indeed, especially after long hard days of stressful work on the stage. Writing the Shakespeare works must have demanded total liberty and leisure, which was least of all available to the Stratman.

#### *The Derby case.*

1) There are evident elements of the Northern Dialect, as spoken in Lancashire, Yorkshire and Cheshire, in the Shakespeare plays. About 85% of Shakespeare's dialectal words and expressions pertain to the Northern Dialect, and about 10% more can be traced to even more northern dialects in for instance Scotland, while only very few of Shakespeare's dialectal expressions come from the Midlands, like Warwickshire, and the south of England. Derby was the only one of the Shakespeare candidates to come from the north of England. He was the son-in-law of the Earl of Oxford and like him an ardent theatre enthusiast. Also like Oxford, he had Catholic inclinations and was politically involved with the Catholic party, since they wanted him to be their candidate for the throne - he was a no more distant relative of the Queen's than King James of Scotland. His elder brother Ferdinando, the fifth Earl of Derby, was probably poisoned by Catholics in April 1594 for refusing to take any part in their political intrigues against Queen Elizabeth. This means, that William Stanley, the 6th Earl of Derby, had extreme motives to keep a low profile and avoid a public name. Among the three candidates Bacon, Oxford and Derby, the last had the most pregnant motives to conceal an authorship like Shakespeare's.

2) "*A Midsummer-Night's Dream*" was written and produced for the Earl of Derby's wedding January 26th 1595, and no one was more motivated to write it than himself. Theseus is a portrait of himself, and the astronomical particulars of the play binds the play to his wedding.

3) In "*Love's Labour's Lost*" the character Holofernes is modelled on Richard Lloyd, Derby's tutor and chaperon on his grand European tour through also France and Navarre. No one was more motivated to ridicule Richard Lloyd as Holofernes than the young Derby, who suffered from this tedious pedant's over-protection.

4) Derby travelled through all the countries and places described in the plays with geographic expert local knowledge. Only Oxford also nearly visited all those places.

5) The first night of "Hamlet" took place at Elsinore June 13th 1585, and the first version was written in German by an Englishman. Present at the performance were among others the actors Kemp, Bryan and Pope, the kernel of all the Shakespeare theatre companies, from Lord Strange's men to the Lord Chamberlain's Men, which produced nearly all the plays of Marlowe and Shakespeare. The "Ur-Hamlet" demonstrates perfect intimate knowledge of Danish procedures at court in 1585, so it must have been written on the spot for the occasion of the inauguration of the Kronborg Castle at Elsinore. Oxford, Bacon and Shakespeare were all in England at the time, Marlowe was possibly at Rheims, while Derby was in Germany and could have visited Denmark for that period.

6) The constantly more noble character of the Shakespeare plays demonstrate ostensibly that their author must have been a nobleman. In "Richard III" one earl of Derby offers the crown to the Earl of Richmond, later Henry VII. There is no record of this in history. Only Oxford was equal in nobility with the Earl of Derby.

7) The poem "The Phoenix and the Turtle" written not later than 1591 is about members of the Derby family, namely William's half-sister Ursula Halsall and her husband Sir John Salusbury of Llewenni in Denbighshire, a poet and patron of other poets like Jonson and Chapman. The poem could have been composed already 1586 for their wedding.

8) There are no Shakespeare, Marlowe, Oxford or Bacon connections with Lancashire. There is a theory that Shakespeare was sent up there as a youth under the name of William Shakeshafte to protect him against Catholic persecutions in Warwickshire, but there is no evidence whatsoever for this. It's just a convulsive effort to explain Shakespeare's Lancashire dialectal idiosyncracies.

9) The poet explicitly states in sonnet 136: "my name is Will". Only Will Stanley (W.S.) had that name among the candidates except Shakespeare.

10) When William Stanley, the 6th Earl of Derby died, all theatres of England were closed, and the civil war broke out, which swept away all that remained of the glorious Elizabethan period with its unsurpassed theatre culture.

#### *The Marlowe case.*

The third and last day was dedicated entirely to Marlowe. The first lecture concerned the mystery and phenomenon of Monsieur Le Doulx, one of the agents of Anthony Bacon, Francis Bacon's brother and in charge of the national intelligence service. In the Lambeth Palace Archives have been found the Anthony Bacon papers, a vast and intact collection of historical documents that once belonged to Anthony Bacon. Among these were found the documents of the agent Le Doulx, which among other items contained a startling bill for the purchase of books. These books were language books, religious books and historical books, which on closer scrutiny proved to constitute the basis for most of Shakespeare's plays. Among them were the original stories for Othello, Cymbeline, Macbeth, Measure for Measure, All's Well That Ends Well, The Tempest, King Lear, Hamlet, Coriolanus, Titus Andronicus, Julius Caesar, Henry IV, Henry V, Henry VI, Richard III, Love's Labour's Lost, The Comedy of Errors, Much Ado About Nothing, A Midsummer-Night's Dream, The Taming of the Shrew, The Merchant of Venice, Twelfth Night, The Merry Wives of Windsor, The Winter's Tale, Timon of Athens, Troilus and Cressida, Antony and Cleopatra, that is all except King John, Richard II, Henry VIII, Two Gentlemen of Verona, As You Like It, Romeo and Juliet and Pericles, or perhaps they were there also. Included in this purchased library were also the original stories for Venus and Adonis, The Jew of Malta, Tamburlaine the Great, and even Edward III, plays attributed to Marlowe or Shakespeare. In brief, the books

procured by Monsieur Le Doulx were practically all the sources for the plays and poems of both Shakespeare and Marlowe. This could be regarded as a definite evidence of that Marlowe and Shakespeare were the same author and that he acted under the code name of Le Doulx.

We know that Marlowe in the 1580s worked as a confidential agent for the government and had been skilful and rewarded as such. On May 30th 1593 he was officially done away with under very suspicious circumstances, which lends credence to the story that it was a set-up to let him escape his arrest and trial by the Star Chamber, the English inquisition, which already had tortured and destroyed the life of Thomas Kyd. He would then have left England on a ship from Deptford, the scene of the "Marlowe murder", and continued his activities as agent and playwright from the continent, particularly from Italy.

In supporting evidence of that Le Doulx was Marlowe were demonstrated samples of Marlowe's and Le Doulx' handwritings. The two examples had been enlarged considerably and were shown together on a transparency, so that the audience could see and decide about likenesses and differences. Some letters were found to correspond, like g, y and h, while there was a difference in the leaning and character of the Le Doulx hand from Marlowe's: the handwriting of Le Doulx demonstrated a more definite leaning to the right and stronger elements of self-confidence than the Marlowe hand. No definite identification with the two handwritings as one of the same could be certified. A person's handwriting changes with time, and between these two handwritings were 3-4 years.

The second lecture was an exposition of the Marlowe case and story as reconstructed and demonstrated by Calvin Hoffman and A.D. Wraight in her book "*The Story that the Sonnets Tell*", illustrated by those Shakespeare sonnets dealing with exile and moods of death. The lecture was delivered with considerable empathy and excellent configuration so as to convince anyone of the human pathos of the drama, and was considered the best lecture of the whole symposium.

After that there was nothing more to add for the moment, and the symposium was concluded after three days of sessions of altogether 17 hours. The lecturers were C. Lanciai (host), Anders Ekman (for Bacon), Don Mahan, Massachusetts (for Oxford) and Peter & Frieda Barker (England) for Marlowe. Other authorities used for the occasion were John Bede from Northern Ireland, Laila Roth (England) and Carl Nordling (Stockholm) for Derby and various other writers from literature and from the Internet.

The chief objection against Shakespeare were all the items and arguments brought up by Mark Twain in his 'Shakespeare biography', that is Shakespeare's businessman's life and complete lack of any education.

Against Bacon's authority were brought as witnesses the cases of Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir Henry Wriothesley. Bacon helped King James in ruining and committing the judicial murder of Raleigh without any justifiable reason; while no documents could be produced in support of the statement that Henry Wriothesley was the chief architect in the prosecution against Bacon in 1621, which ruined his career, although it was well known that Wriothesley turned Bacon's enemy after the fall of Essex. Too little is known about the judicial history of Bacon, and it has very little relevance to his literary works.

Against Oxford was brought the usual argument that he died already in 1604. No argument has been found against Derby's possible authorship of Shakespeare, so together Oxford and Derby could make a very strong case for being the Shakespeare writers together. Against this stands the fact that the Sonnets, published in 1609, could only have been written by one single person, and that this person has also left his singular touch in all of the plays.

No argument has been brought to cast doubts on the suggested Marlowe case for Shakespeare, since it can neither be proved that Marlowe died in 1593 nor that he survived the Deptford incident, although the Le Doulx case could provide the evidence for Marlowe's survival, if an expert graphologist could identify Le Doulx' handwriting as identical with Marlowe's. But some Marlovians claim that the nature and contents of Le Doulx's coffre (the books of the materials for Marlowe's and Shakespeare's works) are evidence enough for the Marlowe-Shakespeare authorship and that the identification of their handwritings with each other is unnecessary.

The standard of the lectures was generally considered better than that of the Marlowe Symposium, April 27th 2002, at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, by those who were there.

### *Comments to Arden of Feversham*

This wonderful play has a unique position in early English drama by its very thorough and extremely vivid realism. Almost the only other plays to reach the vicinity of its juicy and palpable trueness to life are "*A Yorkshire Tragedy*" and "*The Merry Wives of Windsor*". The eyebrow-raising description of exact localities, like Rainham Down, the inns of "*Nag's Head*" in London and the "*Flower-de-Luce*" in Feversham and the characterization of the ferry station in act IV scene 2 together with striking characterizations of secondary personages like Dick Greene and John Reede, victims both to Arden, the tailor and his sister, the simplicity of the stall-boy Michael and even the short episode with lord Cheiny endows the drama with a sense of reality so strong and authentic, that you can't resist the impression that the author must have experienced the whole story himself or at least had some very authentic eyewitnesses to recount it for him. The crime was quite sensational in its time in Canterbury and thereabouts, it was the dominating scandal of Kent at the time, and the play displays a very convincing rendering of the whole story almost to exactitude in its description of the events. Most remarkable of all, though, are the characterizations of the main protagonists, Alice Arden and the murderer Black Will. The personality of Alice is depicted with an almost lyrical empathy, she stands for the literary highlights of the play and is the psychologically most elaborated portrait. You feel with her all the way and understand her completely no matter how sharply she turns from one extreme sentiment to another in the opposite direction, from shameless criminality to humble softness, hypersensitive hesitancy and real female sentimentality and capriciousness. Her manoeuvres are so genuinely female that it's difficult to imagine her part being played by a male actor.

Black Will is the contrast: a thorough villain of such dimensions, that he glories in his villainy. But worst of all is that he is intelligent and witty, he is constantly funny, and you understand his original personality from his background that he was brought up to be a professional murderer by his practical experiences in the war. The glory he made his own in the war he carries on in peacetime as a professional murderer, as if killing people in war or in peace made no difference. Together, these two are an irresistible couple.

Who, then, is the author of this uniquely social-realistic play about events around Canterbury in 1550? My conviction is that it could only be Christopher Marlowe, born and raised in Canterbury, where these events must have been the topic of ever recurring discussions by his parents and their generation during his childhood, since the scandal happened when they were in their best age, and where Alice Arden herself was burned at the stake. Richard Greene was hanged in Ospringe, from which place

Marlowe's father came only 10 miles from Canterbury and which today is part of Faversham, where the groom Michael and Bradshaw were publicly executed. The play bears obvious marks of having been next to self-experienced, and the closest you can get is childhood impressions of authentic testimonies. All this would fit with Marlowe but hardly with any other contemporary English dramatist.

The play also raises other discussions. The main character Mr Arden himself carries the same family name as William Shakespeare's mother. It's almost impossible, though, that Shakespeare could have written the play, since he had no connections whatever with Kent. There is the well-known theory, though, that Marlowe could have been forced underground from the persecution against free-thinkers by the government, so that he could continue his poetical activities but under the cover of William Shakespeare. Marlowe's personality, as we know it from other plays in his name, fits well into the character of 'Black Will'. It's easy to guess that Marlowe could have acted that part on stage. That personality is so original that it must have made a deep impression on the audience, and Marlowe himself as its author and perhaps actor on stage could have identified himself with him. Since after the crisis of May 1593 he no longer could show in public with his real name but might have continued writing under the name of Shakespeare, he could also have identified himself with the name of 'Will' in for example the sonnets. That could explain the sonnets 134-36 with their wordplay on the name of 'Will'.

That the play is Shakespearean is undeniable. The sustained lyricism, the marvellous music of the language, the luscious humour, the striking characterizations - everything points to an early Shakespeare, who probably was Marlowe.

*Gothenburg, February 9th, 2004.*

### *Main Traits of the Marlowe Theory*

The theory that Marlowe wrote Shakespeare did not appear in print until 1895 and then in America. The Bacon theory had already flourished for some 80 years while the Oxford- and Derby theories would come later.

The Marlowe theory was immediately denounced as an absurdity by the Stratford league on the grounds that Marlowe was dead and buried already in 1593. Eventually the coroner's report on the death of Marlowe was discovered in 1925, which since then has been debated endlessly mainly since it rather obfuscates than clears up what really happened. In 1955 Calvin Hoffman, a journalist from America, proposed in a spectacular book the idea that this coroner's report must have been constructed as a smokescreen solely to put an end to all further questions about Marlowe, since the details of this report appear more or less preposterous, especially the story of the mortal wound above one eye, which is exactly described and defined in the report but which experts agree on that no man would have died of.

Long before the Marlowe theory was established many had paid attention to the obvious connections and similarities between the texts of Marlowe and Shakespeare in their style and language. Today all Baconians, Oxfordians, Derbyites and Marlovians agree that Marlowe and Shakespeare must have been written by the same person, while only the Stratford league still claim that the differences outweigh the similarities. The differences are easily explained by the fact that the Shakespeare works came later and therefore are more mature.

Many claim though that the greatest argument for Marlowe and Shakespeare being the same person is in their very difference. While Marlowe is continuously boldly experimenting and tries new ways in every play, Shakespeare is fully fledged and well

adjusted and seems to have found his own perfect form from the beginning. However, this very mature, perfected, highly developed and very polyphonic form is already found in the last play under Marlowe's name, "Edward II". In Marlowe's works you find the whole developing process to this final form while in Shakespeare you can't find a trace of that development which must have preceded that maturity. No one is born fully educated, and this is perhaps the most valid argument against that William Shakspeare from Stratford could have written Shakespeare.

Could then William Shakspeare from Stratford have written Marlowe? This possibility is out of the question, since we know too much about Marlowe binding him to his works while we know nothing of Shakspeare binding him to his. Marlowe appears quite early a very dynamic, controversial and gifted person, who though a shoe-maker's son is sent with scholarship to Cambridge to be launched on a theological career, which he interrupts to instead embark on adventure in the secret service of Sir Francis Walsingham, landing almost directly in the highest free-thinking circles of England with Sir Philip Sidney, Sir Walter Raleigh and Sir Francis Bacon in the middle. He lives with Thomas Kyd, they succeed almost simultaneously as the leading dramatists of their country, Kyd with "The Spanish Tragedy" and Marlowe with "Tamburlaine the Great", establishing the English drama in blank verse in a flamboyant theatrical style which never has been surpassed. Both dramas are extremely cruel and bloody, but while Marlowe continues to write new plays, Kyd never gets any further. Here you can trace a natural source of envy in Kyd against Marlowe, which could explain Kyd's later treason against his colleague.

Marlowe is frequently in trouble with people, since Kyd is not his only antagonist. On one occasion he is involved in a deadly duel with William Bradley. No one knows who started the fight or how it started, but Bradley's real enemy was Marlowe's colleague Thomas Watson, who interferes in the fight to separate the combatants (according to his own testimony afterwards), which makes Bradley concentrate on Watson, his true enemy, by whom he is killed. Both Watson and Marlowe have to stand trial for this, but they are acquitted on the grounds of self-defence. Bradley appears to have been a somewhat problematic person, he felt his life was threatened by a number of people, and it's not far-fetched to be reminded of Tybalt in "Romeo and Juliet", where you find a similar triple duel.

But the most serious assault on Marlowe is the denouncement of him by Richard Baines to the Queen's Privy Council, where Marlowe is accused of atheism, homosexuality and coining. Richard Baines worked with Marlowe in France as an agent spying on the English Catholics in Rheims and divulged on one occasion to Marlowe a plan to dispose of all the nuns of a convent by poisoning their drinking water. This intrigue was used by Marlowe in "The Jew of Malta", which might have infuriated Baines enough to motivate him to revenge and treason.

At the same time, Thomas Kyd is arrested for the possession of atheistic pamphlets, which he claims were written by Marlowe. Kyd is tortured and blames Marlowe. Later on he reiterates this even in writing, blaming all he has been accused of on Marlowe.

Another colleague and school fellow of Marlowe's is John Penry, an outspoken presbyterian who dares to criticise the church. He is accused of being the author of the 'Martin Marprelate' pamphlets, criticising the church and causing tremendous uproar, outrage and controversy within the church. The real author has never been found out, but their tendency and style are not far from Marlowe's. John Penry is sentenced to death for his free-thinking in May 1593.

At the same time Marlowe is called on by the authorities as a result of Kyd's and Baines' accusations. He is required to keep in touch daily and keep himself available for questioning, which means he could expect at any time to be brought by the 'Star

Chamber', that is the English inquisition, to stand trial. The only possible punishment for atheism was to be burnt at the stake.

John Penry is hanged, and the day after occurs that most mysterious tavern brawl in Deptford between Marlowe and three servants of his protector's, that is Sir Thomas Walsingham, cousin to his former employer, the powerful Sir Francis Walsingham. These four men have a private conference in the house of a certain widow Eleanor Bull (with court connections) which ends up in a quarrel about a small bill, in which Marlowe is killed. The Queen's own coroner comes to investigate the matter and produces that strange report, which then vanishes until 1925, according to which Marlowe died of a wound by a knife above the eye. The corpse vanishes into an unknown grave, which no one ever learns anything about.

So here you find almost any number of motives for Marlowe to vanish 'underground' preferably in a manner to avoid having any questions asked. One clique makes itself noteworthy by triumphing on the death of Marlowe, the puritan clique of bigots, who later on are to close all the theatres in England under the established dictatorship of Oliver Cromwell.

Both Kyd and Baines died the following year, reportedly in poverty, illness and disgrace. Thomas Watson died already in 1592 together with Robert Greene, another of the most important dramatists preceding Marlowe and Kyd. Immediately after the published death of Marlowe, in June 1593, appears a poem, "Venus and Adonis", by a certain William Shakespeare, whose name here appears in print for the first time. The poem has been lying waiting to be published since April. Another poem, "Hero and Leander" by Marlowe, is left unfinished at this time. Careful studies of these poems have resulted in the remark by Richard Norman 1947, who never even touched on the Marlowe theory, that "both poems were written as if both poets knew the other's poem by heart". They are twin poems and yet another argument that Marlowe wrote Shakespeare.

These are the main traits of the Marlowe theory: that Marlowe was forced by circumstances with some help from his influential friends to vanish 'underground' by the means of an extreme intrigue, since the only alternative would have been execution by the English inquisition for atheism, the worst conceivable crime at the period.

The main counter argument is that by his official end he disappears completely without a trace, as if he really was dead. The works published under his name "posthumously" never fail to point out that he is dead. The argument is answered by the explanation that he had no choice but to remain officially dead, since the least hint that he could have got away would have put the friends that helped him at risk of their lives, for instance Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Francis Bacon, the Derby brothers Ferdinando and William Stanley (5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> earl of Derby), Sir Thomas Walsingham, Sir Henry Wriothesley (the earl of Southampton) and many others. Most of these ended up in trouble anyway, while Sir Thomas Walsingham and Sir William Stanley really were the only ones who managed to avoid it – both were extremely cautious and discreet persons.

There has been considerable speculation as to where Marlowe would have gone after his "getaway". According to many, he would most likely have been sent under an agent's name to France, Italy and Spain, while it is equally probable that he would have found a safe haven with the Derby brothers in Lancashire – Sir Ferdinando, another of his school fellows, produced his plays, and after his death in 1594 (probably from poisoning by dissatisfied Catholics who couldn't forgive him his refusal as a cousin of the Queen's to be their Catholic candidate for the throne,) his brother Sir William Stanley was probably the main producer of all the Shakespeare plays, since Shakspeare's theatre company 'The Lord Chamberlain's Men' mainly consisted of the players from

Ferdinando's company. In his last letter about Marlowe (which is still extant) Thomas Kyd tells that Marlowe had an intention to go north to Scotland.

The only sign of any life in Marlowe after May 1593 is a strange letter by his publisher Thomas Thorpe, (also the publisher of Shakespeare's Sonnets,) to one of Marlowe's friends, in which he ambiguously drops a hint that Marlowe had been seen among the sellers of books in Saint Paul's Churchyard, as if he had returned.

In brief, this story is in its marvellous web of intricate intrigue such a good one, that it would be pity if Marlowe was not the man. So far though nothing has been able to disprove it.

Christian Lanciai, April 2005

### *John Bede's Doubts about Bacon*

For two hundred years [Bacon] has been accused of three major anomalies:

1) his treason against Essex first of all, which, however, can be excused, since Essex did his utmost himself to put his head under the axe as a most injudicious top politician. Bacon has constantly been freed from that charge.

2) The second is his own downfall, when he was charged by the corrupt king of corruption and proved guilty of about 30 accusations. This mess has never been satisfactorily sorted out. He was hardly guilty of more than minor omissions, his petty offences were certainly not intentional, and his faults in this case might even be attributed to the human factor of his increasing age - he was already 60 at the time.

But the most probable explanation is that the king himself doctored his end by conspiracies through his incompetent favourite the duke of Buckingham. The corrupt king certainly had every motive to get rid of "the cleverest man in the country" who threatened his monopolies. The king was as corrupt as Bacon probably was not.

3) The third charge is the more serious one. In the case of Sir Walter Raleigh, imprisoned in the Tower since 15 years, the corrupt king asked Bacon to make a case against Raleigh so that the king could be rid of him once and for all, and Bacon actually did this. The only defence for Bacon in this case that I have found consists of disparagements of Raleigh, that he was an incorrigible pirate and other objections against his romantic character. The fact remains that he was never proved guilty in 1603 of high treason, for which he was sentenced to death, which death sentence Bacon helped the king to carry through 15 years later.

This forms my own greatest doubt about Bacon. There is a stunning likeness between the character and poetry of Raleigh and Shakespeare, the poetry of Raleigh sometimes reaches the same kind of abysmal depths as Shakespeare's sonnets, while Bacon's character is more like the opposite to Raleigh's: he was cold, sly, premeditating and cautious, while Raleigh never hid anything, stood for everything, was clearcut in his honesty and forthrightness and naïve in his good-natured trust in any man. Bacon's support of the screaming injustice of the corrupt king appears to me as the only stain on Bacon's honour and credibility and blocks my faith in him as Shakespeare.

The hoards of circumstantial evidence remain, though, and even if Bacon never can be proved to have written Shakespeare, this evidence clearly indicates at least that he must have been the man next to Shakespeare. Also Ben Jonson was very close to Bacon, and through Jonson's hands it's almost obvious that Bacon's hand was at hand in the publishing of "The First Folio", if indeed that hand was not the leading one.

The problem about Raleigh as a poet is he never wrote or published anything under his name. There is plenty of excellent poetry by him, for instance the classical ones "The Lie", "The Passionate Man's Pilgrimage", "The Wood, the Weed, the Wag", "His Epitaph"

and the nymph's reply to Marlowe's shepherd, his poetry being often so surprisingly excellent, that it is to be presumed that there is much anonymous things by him that we are not aware of or published under the names of others. Oxfordians tend to confuse Raleigh's poetry with Oxford's, while there is evidence for neither, for instance "The Ocean to Cynthia". We only have to observe the magniloquence of his World History, published in twice as many editions during the 17th century as The First Folio, only the first third part having been finished, to get an idea of Raleigh's qualifications as a writer.

The fact that he had many enemies, who objected to his superior personality, was not a valid reason to commit judicial murder against him, which the king did aided by Bacon the man of law, which contaminates his reputation forever much more than both the Essex and his own case in 1621. Raleigh's guilt in the Arabella Stuart conspiracy could never be proven, the only witness against him being Cobham, a most irrational and unreliable fellow, who never gave any testimony in that affair without withdrawing it afterwards.

*(partial quote)*

"Significantly, modern historical research - including a close examination of historical records in Madrid - has not uncovered a shred of evidence to support the allegations against Raleigh. Yet, even during Raleigh's lifetime, the case against him was thoroughly exposed as the invention which it plainly was. Following his conviction, and after 13 years in the Tower, Raleigh was released to conduct an expedition to Guiana, in the course of which a Spanish settlement - San Thomé on the banks of the Orinoco River, in modern-day Venezuela - was attacked. Though Raleigh claimed self-defence against an unprovoked Spanish attack, the Spanish bayed for Raleigh's blood: especially the formidable Spanish Ambassador, the Conde de Gondomar. In a written Apologia sent by Raleigh to King James, Raleigh made the telling point that, if the Spanish Ambassador sought to prove Raleigh's perfidy, nothing could be easier for the Spanish than to produce evidence of Raleigh's alleged conspiracy with them, 15 years earlier. Needless to say, no such evidence was forthcoming." *(unquote)*

This seems to support the legend that Raleigh was sacrificed by James I, who was confronted with a France-Spain catholic alliance threatening invasion, restoration of the Catholic Church, and a catholic monarchy. Understandably, Spain was angry about failure of its invasion fleet, plus accumulated loss of capital and self-image from state supported piracy attacks on ships and colonies by the likes of Drake and Raleigh.

"bookburn"

*John Bede:*

Coke was his prosecutor and made the worst of it. The king wanted Raleigh executed, but Coke's prosecution was such a disaster there would have been riots and maybe a revolution if the king had had his way. He had to spare Raleigh (and the others, like Nicholas I in Russia with Dostoyevsky and others, granting a pardon and life imprisonment instead in the last moment before the execution, like a very sadistic practical joke).

Bacon had nothing at all to do with the 1603 trial.

Coke had learnt from his mistakes in the first 1603 trial and insisted on a public trial in 1618 and almost appeared in Raleigh's defence. When the king ordered a secret trial, Coke stepped down and would have nothing to do with it. Bacon also wanted an open trial but did not step down when the king insisted on sacrificing Raleigh.

The king might have blackmailed Bacon into carrying through the process, or Bacon might have had no choice but to co-operate. During his Elizabethan heydays Raleigh often rallied against Bacon and made a fool of him, but during Raleigh's time in the

Tower Bacon was maybe his best friend. The more wonder that he assisted the king in sacrificing him.

*Chris:*

There are a number of question marks in this matter. King James expressly sent out Raleigh on his Guiana mission on the condition that he would not disturb the peace with Spain, especially not in South America. We still don't know who disturbed that peace, if the British attacked San Tomé or if the Spaniards attacked the British. Raleigh was not involved in that fight. He stayed behind while the expedition up the river Orinoco was led by his trusted old time friend Laurence Keymis, an Oxford scientist, and his son young Wat Raleigh. At that time this area lawfully belonged to Britain, since Sir Walter Raleigh had claimed it for Britain on his previous journey. As they sailed up the Orinoco they were surprised to find a Spanish settlement there, from which they were attacked from behind - or which they could not pass without attacking it. The result was the devastation of that Spanish settlement and the death of young Wat Raleigh. But in the quarters of the Spanish governor of San Tomé Laurence Keymis found letters from the Spanish king in which he told his governor all the information King James of England had furnished him with to be able to settle with Raleigh's expedition. It was a kind of Hamlet case: king James sent Raleigh out on his death expedition giving the Spanish king the means to kill him on the way by betraying the whole enterprise. Instead, Raleigh's son was killed, and Laurence Keymis brought the Spanish evidence of the English king's betrayal back to Raleigh.

He was of course devastated by his son's death and held Keymis responsible for the failure. This Keymis took so hard that he shot himself. The bullet stuck in his rib and didn't kill him, so he completed the suicide by stabbing himself to death, locked up in his cabin, where he was found dead by the cabin boy half an hour later.

After the complete failure of his great Guiana expedition, Raleigh knew very well that James would not receive him well back in England. He had many options. He could have gone to America (Virginia, the colony that he had founded,) or he could have gone to France. He would have been welcome anywhere except in England. But he had given his word to his business colleagues to return, and he kept his word. Even back in England, imprisoned with a death sentence, he could have escaped to France but refrained from doing so, preferring to meet his destiny as a man of honour, refusing to spend his old age in exile and dishonour.

One of his business colleagues was Bacon, who had promised him that his death sentence from 1603 would be annulled after his expedition, whether it was successful or not. If Bacon really gave that word, he did not keep it. Evidence is lacking, but it is probable that Bacon upon Raleigh's pathetic return had forgotten all that had been said before.

## *The Tibet File*

A Short History of Tibet in Modern Times

Tibetan Chapter, *after Michel Peissel*

Documents from the Darjeeling Conference

John's Letter

The Darjeeling Conference : Aftermath

Heroes of Tibet

Later Heroes of Tibet

Tibetan Letters (*John Westerberg, Kim, Doctor Sandy, Doctor Sun*)  
     The Panchen Lama  
         The Tibetan Problem - a concise summary  
 What Is To Be Done About China? - *by Doctor Sun*  
     Talks in Kathmandu  
     It Happens in Lhasa  
     Concerning Buddhism  
     Letter from Calcutta  
     Concerning Hinduism  
     The Rules of the Buddhistic Order  
     The Ten Precepts  
     Peter Fleming and the Great Game  
     The Murder of Panchen Lama  
     A Political Reflection  
     Problems in East Turkestan  
     Whatever Happened in Mongolia?  
     Heinrich Harrer's Return to Tibet  
     Successful Pilgrimage to Kailash  
     A Foreigner's View on Kashmir  
     Voices from China  
     Doctor Sun Concerning the Hongkong Issue  
     The Tragedy of Tibet  
     Concerning Genocide  
 Violence or Non-Violence? - a Tibetan Question of Destiny  
     Comments to Karmapa  
     Tibetan Seminar in Gothenburg, Sweden, May 6th 2000  
     Letter from Bihar  
     The Leh Conference  
 Tibetan Attitude Toward Death Not Mystical (Satori Foundation)  
     A Note of Warning, by Doctor Sun  
     The Situation  
     A Bureaucrat's Diary, by S. Shankar Menon: *Road to Lhasa*  
 Forced Abortion and Forced Sterilization (*Human Rights Watch, Asia*)  
     Remember Lithang! - *by John B. Westerberg*  
     Greetings from Darjeeling - *by John B. Westerberg*  
     Raoul Wallenberg and Tibet  
 The 27th Gothenburg Film festival - "The Cry of the Snow Lion"  
     The Himalayas Updated  
     The Defence for China  
     An Apology from China  
     China's Zombie Countries Bringing Dictators Back to Life  
     Anatomy of Political Communism

### *A Short History of Tibet in Modern Times*

In 1912, Tibet officially declared itself independent from China after the fall of the Manchu dynasty in 1911. One of the few nations to acknowledge and respect this independence was Britain. China refused to accept it, which resulted in the serious complications that for 38 years Chinese people could only travel to Tibet by India with a British visa. In 1947 India liberated herself from Britain and thereby took upon herself to maintain the British connections and responsibilities towards Tibet. When the People's Republic of China was proclaimed in October 1949, one of its primary objects was to lay hands on Tibet; a program for its annexation had already been made. In 1950 the projected invasion took place, and Lhasa appealed to the world and to the United Nations for help. Britain and India raised the issue in the UN. The status of Tibet as an independent state then appeared to be undefined (after 38 years of practical independence), and India hoped for a peaceful settlement. This peace was settled in Peking, where a delegation from Lhasa was compelled to accept a political program in 17 points, which made Tibet a voluntary part of China on condition that Tibet was granted full autonomy. The only alternative was war, under which threat the Tibetan delegates agreed to sign the settlement.

The systematical eradication of Tibetan religion, the genocide and the implant by force of Chinese in the country was commenced almost immediately. Already in 1956 the bombings of monasteries and mass sterilizations were a fact while innumerable Tibetan children were methodically evacuated by force into China to have a thoroughly Communist education and the monasteries were emptied of monks and nuns who were compelled to deadly physical labour and to marriage against their will.

In March 1959 Dalai Lama and his autonomous government professed that the Chinese had violated 13 of the 17 articles of the agreed-upon settlement, wherefore they declared the settlement no longer valid. The total independence and sovereignty of Tibet was proclaimed anew. The Chinese immediately took measures and intended to arrest and dispose of the entire Tibetan government, but Dalai Lama escaped and organized his exile government in India.

Nehru of India wanted Dalai Lama to return to Tibet and achieve a peaceful settlement with the Chinese, but Nehru's co-operation policy towards China came to a sudden end when China attacked India along two frontiers, in Ladakh and in Assam.

The Tibetan declaration of independence on March 1959 has never been retracted by Dalai Lama and his exile government and is consequently still valid after 34 years' indefatigable resistance against the Chinese occupation of Tibet. By right and by law, Tibet has been independent since 17 March 1959 and has in this century only belonged to China during the years 1900-1912 and not even during eight full years from 23 May 1951 to 17 March 1959.

At the time of the proclamation of independence in 1912, Tibet, apart from its official area nowadays, also comprised all lands up to the Altyn Tag Mountains and to the lake of Koko Nor (Tsing Hai) and to the east to the regions where the rivers of Hwang Ho and Yangtse Kiang run closest to each other. China not only transformed Tibet into an exploited and impoverished province but also truncated its geographical nature and natural limits.

Mention should be made concerning the remarkable position of the Panchen Lama. He is officially and traditionally the spiritual leader of Tibet while Dalai Lama is the political head of government. In reality they have changed parts: Dalai Lama has proved an unchallengeable spiritual leader while Panchen Lama has enacted some remarkable political turns. When the British came to Gyantse in 1904 Dalai Lama (XIII) escaped to the neighbouring country of Mongolia in the north while Panchen Lama (IX)

remained and came to terms with the British. When China assaulted Tibet in 1910, Dalai Lama escaped to India while Panchen Lama remained and came to terms with the Manchu dynasty. When Tibet declared its independence from China on the 16th of December 1912, Panchen Lama found himself in such a precarious political situation that he felt obliged to escape to China, where he lived protected by the Kuomintang and by Chang Kai Shek under vain efforts to return to Tibet. He was not enabled to return until he was in his coffin in 1935.

When China attacked Tibet in 1950 it was from the official reason that the new 13-year old Panchen Lama (X) had asked China to come and liberate Tibet. When Dalai Lama escaped from Tibet in 1959 Panchen Lama remained, continuing to co-operate with the communists, according to or against his will, which he already had done since 1952. His rival of the title had been disposed of while making a pilgrimage from Tashilumpo to India - no one has heard anything about him since the Chinese arrested him in Yatung. The remaining Panchen Lama candidate was established by the communists, but when he in a more mature age proved loyal to Dalai Lama, he was obliged to come to Peking to spend some 20 years in isolation, at times badly tortured and unable to communicate with anyone outside China, until he agreed to co-operate again. Whether he was true or false as Panchen Lama, his position was most tragical. He died five years ago although several years younger than Dalai Lama. His death occurred under mysterious circumstances, and in that context a number of his family members expired from heart attacks, according to the Chinese. A new Panchen Lama has not yet been found.

China has violated 19 of the Human Rights in Tibet:

§3 The right to a private life, freedom and personal security has been violated by murders, rapes, imprisonments without trial and arbitrary executions.

§4 The prohibition against slavery has been violated by the fact that China, under the pretext of liberating the people of Tibet, has enslaved them instead.

§5 The prohibition against torture and against cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment of people has been violated since this has been carried through against the Tibetan people.

§9 The prohibition against arbitrary arrest, detention and exile has been violated.

§12 The prohibition against interfering with people's private lives, family lives, home lives and correspondence and against defamation of character and the right to protection of law against such attacks has been violated by compulsory divorces, dispersion of families and the deprivation of children from their families against their will.

§13 The right to freedom of movement to and from and within one's own country and from any other country has been taken from the Tibetans.

§16 That marriage may be entered on only by the free will of both parties has been violated by compulsory marriages between monks and nuns and by that many Tibetan women were forced into marriage with Chinese.

§17 The right to property and the prohibition against arbitrary deprivation of property has been violated by mass confiscations as the Tibetans often were bereft of everything except clothes and household articles.

§18 The right to freedom of thought, of conscience and of religion was taken from the Tibetans.

§19 The right to freedom of opinion and expression was taken from the Tibetans mostly by the methodical destruction of their writings and the burning of their books.

§20 The right to peaceful assembly and association was forbidden by the Chinese as only meetings proclaimed by the Chinese were allowed.

§21 The right to take part in the government of one's country was forbidden by the Chinese.

§22 The right to social security was denied the Tibetans as 1) the economical resources of Tibet went to China, 2) the social changes in Tibet were disadvantageous to the Tibetans and 3) efforts were made to destroy the religion of the Tibetans.

§23 The right to work, free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to a fair salary was denied the Tibetans by forced labour under inhuman conditions without a salary.

§24 The right to rest and leisure with paid holidays from labour was denied the Tibetans.

§25 The right to a decent standard of living and to medical care and the right of all mothers and children to special protection was violated as all Tibetan economical resources were taken care of by the Chinese.

§26 The right to free education and upbringing was violated since the educational institutions of the Tibetans were closed and replaced by communist schools of propaganda and by the fact that the Tibetan children were taken from their parents to be indoctrinated in enforced propaganda.

§27 The right to participation in the cultural life of the home country was taken from the Tibetans by the Chinese effort to eliminate Tibetan culture by replacing it with atheistic communism.

§29 That personal freedom is to be limited only by appropriate consideration of other people was violated by the Chinese mostly through the bombings of Tibetan monasteries, which were built most of all to protect personal freedom and development.

The violation of Human Rights in Tibet has continued undisturbed for more than 40 years, since the systematical, methodical and well premeditated genocide against the Tibetans that was initiated in 1950 never has been interrupted although China is a member of the United Nations.

Development is now progressing in the right direction and has done so since the death of Mao Zedong in 1976 but has constantly been disturbed and hindered by the Chinese (the Tiananmen Square in June 1989). The above-mentioned statements of violation of Human Rights in Tibet were ready and internationally known since 1960, and that was long before the Cultural Revolution. Nothing was done about it then, and practically nothing has been done about it ever since, except by the Tibetans themselves, who restore their monasteries by means of their own while the Chinese continue to abuse and expropriate their country.

Gothenburg, Sweden, March 17th, 1994.

### *Tibetan Chapter*

A most influential person in every family is the uncle, who is a monk. Although he stays part of the year in a monastery and spends much time travelling, there is always one bed reserved for the uncle in every home. He is also the family's representative of education. He is responsible for one of his nephews, the second oldest, becoming a monk and that the other children learn something.

The oldest son knows, that when he marries and inherits the father's home and property, it is the great honour of his nearest brother to become a monk. For those of us who live in countries where religion doesn't have much influence it is difficult to appreciate the very high level of desirability with which the inhabitants of the

Himalayas regard the monk's life. We who are born to a mundane life do not understand the desires of a more spiritual life. The children of Himalaya are taught from the beginning to respect their teacher, to like books and venerate literature and to regard life as just a transient phase on the journey to fulfilment and perhaps consummation. The basis for all spiritual life in Tibet is the respect for the written word and that all things written are taken seriously, nearly as though all written words were the words of God. That makes the Tibetans like the Jews a people of the book, and the monk is responsible for this respect. To become a monk is to the boys a great privilege and a great social and spiritual honour. They also know that their uncle, who is a monk, leads a very interesting life. "A better life is not possible. I have no wife, no children to support, I don't have to work in the fields nor walk up the mountains to find some lost cow or horse. I have no temporal worries and am perfectly free; of course, I have no riches, but instead I have the greatest treasure of all, which is to understand the Buddhistic philosophy and its true nature. No kind of life could be compared with a life dedicated to Dharma (insight)."

The Chinese and some western scientists have called the monks of Tibet and Himalaya parasites. A sociological film about Ladakh, which was made not long ago, has even represented the monasteries of today as terrible instruments for exploiting the poor. Many have failed to understand that the reality is the direct contrary. The monasteries are economically advantageous to all. There is not much farm land which can be cultivated with artificial irrigation or farmed at all. If the farms were inherited and shared by all the children or just between the sons, in just a few generations the population would have increased so much that there would have been a compulsory choice between emigration and starvation. To an agricultural people with only limited areas of arable land it is absolutely vital to have some kind of birth control. Voluntary celibacy seems to be one of the best methods to stabilize the population. By receiving the second son from every family into their midst, the monasteries limit the growth of population in a most natural way. This is in fact the only natural method of birth control.

It is a fact that the tradition of creating gigantic buildings goes back to the ancient days, but a fortress of eleven storeys from the 7th century must have been one of the first skyscrapers in the world. We are all familiar with Potala, the palace of Dalai Lama in Lhasa, which was built in the latter half of the 17th century and which has something between 16 and 19 storeys. It must have been one of the highest buildings in the world for several centuries. In Europe it was not surpassed until 1922 by a skyscraper in Belgium.

The most important trait in the culture of the Himalayas is of an aesthetic nature, not economic. For an example, an old rotten door on crooked hinges may squeak but still be beautifully decorated with the most exquisite ornaments. In this case the aesthetic character of the door is considered as important as its practical function if not more. In our modern western world the contrary is generally preferred. We use more time and money on efficacy than on artistic embellishment. When this is used, it is generally for a sales argument to attract the buyer. Notions like efficiency, comfort and practical use are much more important than the notion of beauty. It has been like that ever since functionalism made a break-through in this century while we in the last century still preferred beauty to everything else. To a Tibetan's mind, happiness is synonymous with beauty, while we nowadays tend to replace beauty with comfort. Our sense of beauty is unfortunately almost reduced to nothing by the maladies of comfort, and aestheticism almost no longer exists as a clear subject. Here is one of the major differences between us and the world of the Himalayas.

A well-known and dubious phenomenon in Tibet is the so called Tibetan disease or mountain sickness, which above all mountaineers suffer from especially after experiences in Tibet. There is a related phenomenon in the far north of Scandinavia called the Lapponian disease. Everyone is familiar with it who has been living in Lapland. The symptom is an irresistible attraction to a geographical area which is stronger and more difficult the more barren and hostile this area is. In the Himalayas this phenomenon haunts the mountaineers to such an awful extent that they simply have to return and climb the same impossible mountains again even if they have to die for it; and the worse the mountains, the better. Many have sacrificed their lives for K2 in this manner. If you have visited the Himalayas only once, this phenomenon is all too true and stronger than reality. It is very rare that a traveller to the Himalayas does not feel the urge to return at any cost to the same desolate mountains or even worse and more hostile ones. To Sven Hedin, the famous Swedish explorer, (the Indiana Jones prototype,) this illness mounted to an obsession which constantly drove him back to "his cold bride of Asia" of the Tibetan mountains and deserts. You are simply hopelessly lost forever from the moment you place your foot on the Tibetan plateau. Yes, even Darjeeling or Kathmandu will do, and you are stuck.

- after *Michel Peissel*.

### *Documents from the Darjeeling Conference*

This note is confidential. John may not see it himself. His illness hit us as the most unwelcome of occurrences just as we were heading for a difficult journey and exertion towards Darjeeling. The whole conference might have been damaged. He fell ill immediately as we came down from the hills. At first I thought it was the Delhi pestilence, but it was not. He became unconscious without any other symptoms. His remaining life was but threadbare. You can take a blackout for a few minutes, but if it continues for two days it becomes worrying. God knows what his spirit did in those days. And then suddenly he quite peacefully returned to life and even wished us a good morning, like the emperor in Andersen's tale. He was very weak, though, and could hardly speak and seemed quite absent-minded. But his fever was gone. I wanted immediately to return to Simla, but he persisted in pursuing our program. I feared for his life all the way to Darjeeling, but he was not worried at all, and gradually his weakness became less apparent. I have previously seen examples of this symptom. Many mountain people are not fit for life in the tropical lowlands. Many Tibetans suffer from this. John has a Scandinavian Fenno-Russian physique, he has spent most of his life under very cold conditions, he can easily take Siberia, but the sweaty subcontinent is as inept for him as the Scandinavian climate is for Negroes. Here in Darjeeling I have communed with a Buddhist expert who decidedly advises against his going to Indonesia. This will be very difficult to convince John of.

Nevertheless, our Darjeeling conference became a decisive success. Everyone was inspired and contributed with his best. Here are the main concluded issues:

1) Representatives of China (5), India (3), Thailand (2), Burma (2), Vietnam (2), Japan (2), Kampuchea (1), South Korea (1), Taiwan (1), Mongolia (1), Nepal (1), Bhutan (1), Laos (1), Malaysia (1) and Indonesia (1) acknowledged His Holiness the Dalai Lama as the supreme leader of Buddhism in the world since he has no competitor or equal historically or at present, and his holiness is regarded as more perfect than that of his only colleague in the world, His Holiness the Pope of the Roman Catholic Church. No human perfection can ever be supreme, though, although that of Gautama Siddhartha was next to it. All Buddhists and all Buddhist countries are advised to acknowledge His

Holiness the Dalai Lama as the supreme spiritual leader of Buddhism. (The Panchen Lama was almost totally disregarded.)

2. In consequence of the problem of Muslim fundamentalism, all religious fundamentalism was unanimously condemned as being inhuman, destructive and insane. That includes all fundamentalists within Islam, Hinduism, Christianity and Communism. Islamic fundamentalism is considered the worst and most perilous, Hindu fundamentalism comes next to it, while Christian fundamentalism was considered less aggressive nowadays and Communist fundamentalism to be waning. One must not compromise with any form of fundamentalism or deal with fundamentalists as if they were rational and reasonable people, which they definitely are not. You can't argue with lunatics either.

3. It is advised to all countries in the third world who can't afford to deal with the epidemic of Aids to refrain from doing anything about it. It simply doesn't pay.

4. The greatest problem in the world today is considered the intolerable occupation of Tibet since 44 years now by the Chinese communists or, more realistically, the Han imperialists, resulting in the third genocide of this century, a genocide worse than the two previous ones, because the world should have learned something from the slaughter of 1,5 million Armenians in the first world war and of 6 million Jews in the second. On these two previous occasions the world did nothing. When it happened the third time in Tibet the world again did nothing but acquiesced and sanctioned the genocide in silence. The chief responsibility (after that of China of course) rests with India, the first nation to acknowledge the communist regime in China in 1949. When Tibet was invaded by China the following year, India did nothing but hoped that "Tibet would solve the problem peacefully". That was only the beginning of the tragedy. The genocide has been going on for 44 years, a greater part of the Tibetans have been exterminated than the parts of the Armenian and the Jewish peoples on the previous occasions, and today China is still supported by the US to continue the genocide, the oppression, the exploitation and the suppression of human rights in Tibet. All the free democratic world is helping the intolerable Han imperialism to continue and expand, while Tibet, Sinkiang and Inner Mongolia remain as illegally occupied by China as the Baltic states were by Russia. It is advised to all the world never to compromise with or further the Han Chinese, the world's most hopelessly imperialist, egoist and expansionist people, which is proved by all history, as the neighbours of China always have suffered from Chinese inhumanity. The only possible remedy for China would be 1) complete destruction of the communist party, 2) reinstatement of Buddhism and Taoism in all China.

### *John's Letter (in three parts)*

"Dear Christian, I am writing this to you with a heavy heart. Cry with me if you feel like it. I am confronted with the first defeat of my life, and I don't know how to cope with it.

That I write to you at all about this depends on Kim's having revealed to me that he has written to you about doctor Tsering's diagnosis in my case. I allowed him to examine me with the utmost reluctance. I can't however just ignore his expert knowledge, so I have to take his advice seriously.

In parts his negative diagnosis is flattering: "You have a Tibetan's constitution. You are not fit for the plains. If you wish to maintain your health you have to remain in the mountains." He has seen tens of thousands of his countrymen perish because of the Indian climate, which is the opposite of the Tibetan. Tibetans can well withstand Arctic conditions but not the tropical bacteria of India. Indians can resist any bacteria but catch

colds for nothing. I have lived too long among Tibetans and become even physically like one of them. That is why Kim's doctor advises me against going to Indonesia.

There is a positive alternative, though. Here in Darjiling and Kalimpong I have made contacts with several interesting Tibetan refugees and also Khampas. They have invited me to join them in a venture inside China. It's an invitation to counter-revolutionary activities against China, but why not? My plans in Indonesia would also have been counter-revolutionary against the Indonesian military dictatorship. The aim of the Khampas is to overthrow the communist dictatorship party in order to restore Tibetan freedom and independence. What could possibly be more constructive?

My decision is made. I dress up as a Tibetan again, my hair has grown out to Tibetan length again, so it's just to colour it jet-black, and my Tibetan outfit will be perfect. Rabbi Yohanan was always pleased with my disguises. Maybe it pleases him in his grave that I am still an actor. The only difficulty is the dialect of the Khampas. I learned Tibetan in Ladakh and Ngari which is almost an entirely different language, but I will probably get used to it."

"The following day. It is now the 13th November, a Sunday, the anniversary of our meeting at doctor Singh's in Benares two years ago. In vain I have waited this week for any sign of life from you, but I will just have to continue waiting, while nothing makes waiting more unbearable than loneliness. I do not suffer from want of company, but no company here is Swedish. My only touch with the Swedish language is through you. I usually almost get to learn every issue of your magazine by heart.

This day and its memories fills me with volcanic eruptions of thoughts as if the soul would explode. I have to begin, however, by explaining something about the Khampas to you.

A short history. When Mao Zedong became supreme ruler of China in October 1949, he almost immediately declared that Tibet and Sinkiang would be brought by force if necessary under Chinese control to be sinofied. The world was still paralyzed by the effects of the second world war, and after the general collapse of all empires the coast was clear for new tyrannies to break through, and Communist China was lucky enough to immediately be generously backed up by the recently released India of Nehru's, which became the first nation in the world to acknowledge the regime of Communist China. So Nehru in fact paved the way for Mao to do whatever he liked.

When Tibet was occupied the following year, nothing was done about it, since the Korean war was a much more important matter than anything else in the world at the time. China was also very careful about not having Tibet making any sound while she was raped, which was why China from the beginning saw to it that the victim was carefully gagged before she was raped, so that nothing would be heard about it in the world. Every case of individual resistance was immediately muffled by death. But Tibet was a cultivated and peaceful nation which desired to co-operate peacefully, why in the beginning there was not much resistance. The Chinese occupation of Tibet became incredibly simple especially since neither India nor England would do anything at all to question the swallowing up of a vast nation with a culture and identity of its own by the formless gigantic amoeba of China.

Gradually followed the sinofication of Tibet. Those who first discovered the real intentions of China - the extirpation of the Tibetan people and culture - were the inhabitants of Kham, the eastern part of Tibet. This people, the Khampas, was a strong and warlike tribe who had never forgotten the proud traditions from the days of king Srongtsen Gampo 1200 years ago. In 1956 they commenced their bloody revolt against China which continued until 1974. During the course of this war the whole region of Kham was methodically devastated and its population exterminated and substituted

with Han Chinese. During the heyday of this uprising these Khampas could organize the escape of the Dalai Lama from Lhasa in March 1959. Then they controlled the whole of southern Tibet and had support both from Taiwan, America and Russia. This support continued until 1972, when the most dishonest American president of this century, Richard Nixon, (who probably was the ultimate schemer of the conspiracy against the brothers Kennedy with two of them murdered and the third dishonoured, since Richard Nixon more than anyone else benefited from these tragedies,) made peace with all the crooks of Communist China and abandoned Taiwan. After that the interesting guerrilla war of the Khampas gradually ebbed out, and most Khampas were betrayed and killed to the last man.

This eighteen-year guerrilla war is probably the most heroic and least known war in this century. China succeeded skilfully in suppressing all knowledge about it. No reports were let through anywhere. A handful of Khampas could for years keep a number of Chinese armies checked in terror. When China launched their great invasion of Tibet in 1959 they sent an army of 120,000 men against 8,500 Khampas. China succeeded with her intentions to transform all of Tibet into a severely restricted concentration camp where all the prisoners had to gradually languish to death from starvation and oppression, but China never succeeded in controlling or defeating these my friends the Khampas.

The Tibetan genocide, which has been going on now for 44 years, in which some billion Chinese have set their heart into eliminating a higher educated and cultured people of half a percent of the Chinese population, and during which 44 years they have actually succeeded in exterminating 20% of this one half percent, was made possible by the treason and lack of responsibility against Tibet by India and England. Not until 1962 did Nehru wake up from his blind faith in Mao's China when this paragon of nations suddenly without warning invaded India. During the 50s nothing was done to help Tibet. The world was as indifferent then as it was during the Turkish genocide against the Armenians and during the German genocide against the Jews. Later on in the 60s China released the full holocaust of the cultural revolution which devastated all of Tibet. By then it was too late to start emergency programs to help Tibet when already 20% of the population was exterminated, and their culture, 95% of their monasteries and schools, were destroyed.

Who then is able to stand forth to accuse the Khampas for not refusing any means in the overthrow of the Han Chinese? Who can hold it against them that they can't respect Chinese more than rats and flies and locusts? And who can fail to admire and love these Khampas for not having given up after 44 years but still are anxious to do something about it, still keeping the initiative and carrying on?

Their cause is mine. We are a lonely few, but our morale is greater than all the world. In a matter of villainy one person's resistance against it is more worth than 1,2 billion Chinese.

This does not make me an idealist. On the contrary. Don't worry. I am a realist taking no chances, and I know what I am doing. I am aware of powers within the WES which turn the heads of certain members so that they imagine it is enough for them just to enter into Iraq or Indonesia in order to make these dictatorial governments fall, and of course it is not altogether impossible that certain people may have such influence. I prefer not to confuse reality with wishful thinking, though. I happen to be a thoroughly educated theologian, but that still only makes me a man.

On the other hand, I don't think that the Tibetan tragedy would have happened if the British Empire had remained in office. If India had not broken away from England, China would never have dared to occupy Tibet. India was the first brick to drop off the wall of the British Empire, and the fall of that brick made the whole wall collapse,

morally first, and then totally. England, the most realistic and romantic nation in the world, was realistic enough to realize that she could not trust the world and age any more when even India let her down. If India had stayed on, on the other hand, a constructive world order could have maintained itself and some control over such monster nations as the Soviet Union of Stalin and the Communist China of Mao to check their destructive expansion in time and maybe put an end to the cold war at a much earlier stage. Instead, the eternal cold war goes on against tyrannies like many Moslem states, Indonesia and above all China, which no one so far yet has managed to interfere with in its methodical genocides in both Sinkiang and above all in Tibet."

"Your November issue has now arrived. No comment. Instead, I would like to comment on Kim's summing up of our Darjiling conference. I guess that item 3 would seem the most remarkable one to western eyes. No comment on that either. The arguments about the matter were presented as confidential, and my only allowed reference is to the published case of Isaiah Demner, Haifa, Israel. This illness is so abnormal in its psychological monstrosity, that it can not be regarded or treated as an ordinary illness.

Our conference document is carried forth in the world by the 25 delegates with careful instructions that only key personalities in governments and societies should be informed. Thus also this conference has received my personal stamp of mysterious secrecy and exclusive elitism - the fewer that are chosen, the surer the calling and its consequences, and the greater, hopefully, the results.

Nothing new at the moment, but I hope to return soon."

(*Winter 1994*)

J.B.W.

### **The Darjeeling Conference : *Aftermath***

#### ***Letter from China :***

"My dear son, Kim has kindly forwarded your "Free Thinker No. 2" by Special Delivery, that is, smuggling. Earlier he has kindly forwarded your generous thoughts in my imprisonment. This was not as dangerous as one could have expected. I was carefully interrogated and kept in custody for a few weeks but never tortured. Since then I have been under surveillance. That is all. I never lost contact with our common friends. For natural reasons I was not able to travel to this conference in Darjeeling. Instead I succeeded in sending a few others. These were permitted to leave China on condition that they would act as "spies" in Darjeeling, in India and of this conference. They were allowed to enter Darjeeling by the Indian authorities since these were informed that they were actually traitors of China. It's the usual Asian chess game of double crossing and triple crossing all around.

My reason for writing to you is that you have published John's dangerous letter about the Khampas. He knows my view, and I have to let you know it also. This is a very difficult problem for China.

The nature of the problem is not easy to define. In order to make it clear I have to start from the beginning of things.

Of course, the annexation of Tibet by Chairman Mao in 1950 was illegal. The chief fault in the Chinese reasoning about Tibetan matters is, that China persists in disregarding historical facts, which leads her to deny that Tibet was ever independent. The historical fact is that Tibet was independent from everyone else whenever it could. But once China has expressed a lie she has to stick to it in order to maintain her dogma

of impeccability. China simply can't be wrong. That's the main thing wrong about China.

The occupation of Tibet was not protested against by neither Tibet, India nor England. Everyone agreed to it and even Tibet. Dalai Lama welcomed Chinese involvement, because Tibet was backward already, all English support had vanished since the English were ousted from India, and the Indians could not even rule their own country. As soon as India got her independence she used it to make war on Pakistan. I entirely agree with John's views on the tragic breaking up of the British Empire.

The trouble in Tibet started in 1956 when the Khampas made rebellion. If Tibet had maintained her peace and her wise doctrine of non-violence (the same as that of Gandhi) there would never have been any trouble, probably. The rebellion of the Khampas forced the Chinese to become tyrants.

Things might have turned out better if Dalai Lama had stayed on in Lhasa. His escape was the crown of his immaturity and cowardice, and by abandoning Tibet he politically ruined and sacrificed his home land by denying his responsibility. It was a most traumatic crisis. By giving up to the Khampas, abandoning himself to their will, he abandoned the pacifist cause of wisdom to the tragic cause of violence. We do not know what would have happened if he had stayed on, but escaping was certainly more desperate than wise.

This is the turning point of Chairman Mao's career. From the moment of this crisis he turns from a good leader into a savage monster of unhuman cruelty. He encourages criticism against the government only in order to get hold of the critics and eliminate them. He denies the failure of his industrial revolution, and to him 45 million casualties is just a handful of dust. But the more inhuman he becomes, the more frightened he becomes. But he has no one left in China to fear, except all those who are wiser than he is. Those are the traditionalists, the Buddhists, the Taoists, the Confucianists. So in his life's greatest effort he lets loose his holocaust against the past and all wisdom of China in the Cultural Revolution, the greatest human catastrophe since the second world war, instigated only by the madness of one single man.

Letting loose this holocaust also against another nation, another people, another culture like Tibet, thus destroying this most delicate and intact of ancient civilizations utterly, must of course be considered unpardonable for ever. But the Khampas were not extirpated only by the Chinese. John mentions the culpability of President Richard Nixon, but he was not alone. Everyone helped in the destruction of the Khampas, the only defenders of the Tibetan cause. The matter was practically organized by the foreign secretary Henry Kissinger, who also saw to it that the Christians of East Timor were eaten up and sacrificed by the autocrat regime of Suharto. Even Dalai Lama helped in destroying the Khampas. The final slaughter was not even in Tibet. The government of Nepal was being pushed on by Dalai Lama, India and Henry Kissinger to perform the operation of eradicating the Khampas from their stronghold in Mustang in northern Nepal. The idea was Nixon's. The freedom fighters had to be sacrificed if there was to be a deal with China. And they were sacrificed to the last man. Those who didn't languish to death in Nepalese dungeons fled back to Tibet where they were executed by the Chinese.

The problem for China is that these Khampas are still riding. When China invaded Tibet they did not know what kind of a country they invaded. They judged the matter materialistically and strategically and ignored all the ghosts. These ghosts have been multiplying in a most awful manner.

You see, by eliminating people you don't get rid of them. What happens is that they are just transferred into a timeless zone. This zone of timelessness is outside history and can not be located. Once you have transferred someone into that zone you never get rid

of him. He will eat your back in eternity, and you can't reach him. This is the problem with Tibet for the Chinese.

The Khampas are still riding. The Chinese have done a thorough job in exterminating them to the last man, but the higher they ride against them. A ghost is much harder to get at than a living man.

You see what is going on in China today. It is a reeling merry-go-round where all the dwindling profits of the world's greatest monkey business is just vanishing in an ever-increasing monstrous inflation. "Forget about Beijing, Deng Xiaoping is already a mummy," the Chinese are saying. No one believes in the communist party any more. This has defended itself by pointing a warning finger at the unfathomable poverty of democratic India, but things might become worse in China than in India.

The generous slogan of China today is that "everything is possible and everything is allowed in Deng Xiaoping's China" - except disloyalty. And this is of course a most laughable matter. The only loyalty ever in China was hypocrisy, and today that lie is greater than ever. The bubble will burst - and that deluge might become the salvation and rebirth of Tibet, Buddhism and Taoism.

Yours, Doctor Sun, now resident in Chungqing."

### *Prelude and Aftermath*

Why was the conference not in Kathmandu? It was planned to take place there, and we were set on going there - we already had a visa. In the last moment plans were changed, and the conference moved to Darjeeling because of the elections in Nepal, the consequences of which were not surveyable. While the communists won the elections, the conference was undisturbed in Darjeeling. That's why we couldn't attend. We had already booked an air ticket to Kathmandu for just £425.

Doctor Sandy immediately contacted us on receiving our latest communication and demanded an explanation of §3 in the Darjeeling declaration, this remarkable Buddhist stand-point on the question of Aids. We instantly contacted Kim and gave him doctor Sandy's anxious request. Kim offered an explanation. It was not just economical.

It has long been known that an increasing number of development countries simply can't afford battling against Aids. These countries are usually overpopulated, why they can better afford to lose a few million sick people than to nurse them till they die anyway. But this is not the frightening prospect for the Buddhists.

The Buddhists of Darjeeling have noticed the steadily increasing economical proportions of the issue of Aids in the west, so that Aids doctors confidently can count on steadily increasing responsibility for ever increasing numbers of patients with consequently also a constantly growing budget. This implies a rather appalling power position of life and death with a so far unavoidable death guaranteeing ever increasing economical resources.

This development the Buddhists of Darjeeling consider a mistake. Above all in India numerous non-medicinal methods have been tried against Aids with partly fantastic results. The Buddhists believe more in such methods in the war against Aids than to rely solely on AZT and other medicines with only effects of slowing down the illness and with destructive side effects as well, at least as long as there is no efficient vaccine; and the distance to finding that pot of gold beyond the rainbow seems still to be but a long up hill without a visible crest.

Doctor Sandy has accepted this explanation and is brooding on it over Christmas.

## *Heroes of Tibet*

In the history of Tibet there are some personalities quite impossible to overlook who at the same time are of universal interest outside Tibet as well. There are very few such personalities of China. There is Confucius and the far more interesting and more universalistic but totally anonymous Lao-Tzu, who both are excelled by the Indian Buddha. Then we have the dreadful emperor Shih-Huang-Ti, a Chinese equivalent to Ivan the Terrible, only worse, who not only sacrificed a fifth of the Chinese population in building the Chinese Wall but who also was the first in a long line of emperors who in a vain effort to make history begin with themselves tried to destroy all previous literature. Bonfires of books have been burning in China since then (the 3<sup>rd</sup> century B.C.), and the latest who tried to blot out all previous Chinese history was Mao Zedong, who 18 years after his death is still venerated and worshipped as the father of the country after having made greater damages to China than any previous emperor in the long history of the celestial empire.

The topic is encyclopaedic in its follies, disasters and devastating mistakes, it's a perpetuum mobile of fiascos all dependent on the incurable tyranny, where no tyrant during 3000 years ever wanted to learn anything from the mistakes of any predecessor but rather preferred to hide them and brush them away under a constantly more lumpy mat. The history of China does not consist of personalities but of signatures of dynasties. No individual is ever made responsible for turbulences of Chinese history, and the dynasties are too extensive and complex to have individual reigns sorted out. Everything in China is lost and drowned in this ocean of human anonymity and irresponsibility.

Conditions are the opposite in Tibet, where the people consists of personalities and where there is a higher individual regard than anywhere else on earth since the days of glory of the Egyptian Pharaohs. Already 700 years before the ascent of the Dalai Lama we find the greatest personality of Tibetan history, king *Songtsen-Gampo*, the 33<sup>rd</sup> king of Tibet, who ruled 617-649, about the same time as the fabled king Arthur ruled in Cornwall. This Tibetan king was not only a conqueror but also an organizer and administrator comparable with Augustus and Charlemagne. He introduced Buddhism in Tibet and established Tibet culturally as a bridge between India and China especially by his two favourite wives, one from Nepal and the other from China. Like Augustus he is just the introducer of the empire, which like that of Rome then lasts for some 200 years. He is also responsible for introducing the Tibetan alphabet and literature, which is derived from Sanskrit with letters written from left to right.

Our next great Tibetan personality is *Padmasambhava*, an Indian Buddhist monk and teacher, who is invited to Tibet by king Trisong Detsen to organize the Tibetan religion. He is the founder of the first great Tibetan monastery of Samye on the northern shore of the Brahmaputra southeast of Lhasa in 779, and that commences the epoch of the greatest monasterial culture in the world.

Tibetan history is not only full of noble kings and heroes, though. One of the most dramatic incidents occurs when the wicked king *Langdarma* persecutes Buddhism trying to exterminate it 836-842. One monk decides to do something about it and takes the law in his own hands, colouring his horse and his clothes jet black, approaching the king masked as a dancer and killing him off with one good shot from his bow during a religious festival, after which feat he escapes across the river, which washes off the colours of his horse and clothes, which turn white - an excellent camouflage, when he flees to the monastery of Yerpa, since everyone bear witness of the murderer and his horse having been black. The name of this hermit assassin was Lhalungpa.

The most sympathetic of all the prominent personalities of Tibet is the poet and mystic *Milarepa* (1040-1123) who roams around the country as a bard and beggar and becomes famous during his stay at the holy mountain of Kailash and in his cave closer to Mount Everest, where he produces his greatest poem of a hundred thousand hymns. If anyone, he speaks directly to the heart of everyone in all ages to all men.

Marco Polo did not visit Tibet but passed through southern Turkestan by the town of Khotan to then north of Koko Nor follow the Hwang Ho down to China. Tibetans in the far west of Tibet maintain, though, that Alexander the Great built a bridge across the Indus in Ladakh which still remains. It is not very probable though that Julius Caesar had anything to do with the origin of the great poem of the hero Gesar, a legendary Tibetan Hercules kind of person of probably purely Tibetan origin.

Another most important monk besides Milarepa is *Atisha* from India, who died in 1055 after having founded the order which later gave rise to the second oldest order of Tibet, Reting, northeast of Lhasa.

In the 13<sup>th</sup> century Tibet becomes of vital political interest by the Mongol emperor Kublai Khan's great fascination of Tibetan Buddhism. Djinghis Khan was a Moslem, but through *Kublai Khan*, also emperor of China, the deep alliance between Tibetan and Mongolian Buddhism is created which continues still today. At this time the dominating sect is that of Sakya in the south of Tibet. The first thing that was done in Mongolia after the introduction of democracy a few years ago was the restoration of Buddhism as a state religion, which hasn't been done in China yet.

The Sakya monastery was founded in 1073, in 1179 the monastery of Tzurpu, where the first reincarnation traditions occur, is founded; in 1189 the monastery of Drigung Ti between Lhasa and Reting is founded; and this magnificent medieval development of Buddhism and monasterial life in Tibet is then capped by the activities of *Tsongkhapa*, who lived 1357-1419. He is the great reformer of Buddhism in Tibet and the founder of the Gelugpa sect, the most influential sect in the centuries to come. The first Dalai Lama rises in its shadow in 1391, and the three great Gelugpa monasteries are then created in the 15<sup>th</sup> century, Ganden ("the felicitous") in 1409, Drepung ("the wealthy") in 1416, and Sera ("the rose garden", that is "the beautiful") in 1419. The title Dalai Lama means "Ocean of Wisdom" and was first bestowed on the highest abbot of the Gelugpa sect by Altan Khan of Mongolia in 1543.

The most famous of these first Dalai Lamas was *the great fifth* (1617-1682) who constructed the Potala palace (1645-94) and instituted the office of the Panchen Lama at Shigatse in the monastery of Tashilumpo. His age was dominated by difficult crises which he could help the country out of with some help from the Mongols. The sixth Dalai Lama was more liberal, a poet and lover of women. When he is overthrown in 1706 the Manchu dynasty of China claims the suzerainty of Tibet, and the sixth Dalai Lama perishes in Chinese captivity the year after. Only from this time China could be said to have some influence and dominance in Tibet, and politically for the next two centuries Tibet becomes the object of a tug-of-war first between China and Mongolia and later between England and Russia.

The first Europeans to enter Tibet were Jesuits. Ippolito Desideri and Manuel Freyre came from the west in 1715 and were the first westerners to set eyes on Kailash. They were allowed to start a mission in Tibet and even to build a church, which no longer remains, until they were recalled by the pope. There were more Jesuits and also Englishmen. The most conspicuous of these was a veterinary from Lancastershire, *William Moorcroft*, who was much of an adventurer. He nourished a passion for horses and wild plans to import blood-horses from Turkmenistan to India, which fantastic project made him hazard an expedition through Tibet to open up and chart convenient roads. Here begins the classical Tibetan romanticism full of espionage and masquerades

with false documents, often on the run and not seldom ending in disaster. This pattern dominates the fates of all Europeans in Tibet in the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Those who were spied on were the Russians, but not a single Russian seems ever to have been located. Moorcroft reached the lakes of Manasarovar and Rakkas Tal and seems to have shown a lot of interest in the question of whether Ganges, Indus and Brahmaputra had their sources in these lakes or not. He discovered the small channel between the lakes and the outlet of Sutlej from the Rakkas Tal, which lake he deemed dangerous since some of his yaks perished in the swamps along the shores, so that he had to return to India, encountering bothersome Nepalese as he travelled in disguise with false papers and even found himself with his fantastic high Asian projects eventually also in trouble with the British government. Officially he died in misery in 1825, but the Jesuit Abbé Huc claimed to have spotted him in Lhasa the following year, where he continued to dwell for twelve years until he returned to Kailash and Ladakh. He would then for convenience to avoid further trouble with authorities, whether British or Nepalese, be content with being regarded as dead and continue living happily ever after as a free independent wanderer in Tibet. The great romance of this heaven-storming horse-lover's strange career from a daring pioneer at Kailash in 1812 to a legendary pilgrim of doubtful ends is still waiting to be written.

The English in Tibet in the 19<sup>th</sup> century then move along the wide scale from romantic idealists with fantastic projects to unbearable bullies and scoundrels, who didn't do much else in Tibet than flog lazy servants and end up badly. Lieutenant *Henry Strachey*, who visited Kailash in 1846, was a good artist though, who was the first to render these incredible landscapes some justice. In his view the holy mountain had its most favourable aspects from Rakkas Tal, and he could never tire of studying the environments. His brother Richard launched the first geological expedition to Tibet two years later.

The problem about *Sven Hedin* was his egocentricism and vanity. He might very well have been the greatest traveller and expert of Tibet ever, but he had difficulties with human relationships and was apt to deceive himself. He was as good a geographer as he was a diplomatic failure. He not only made August Strindberg his enemy but the whole English-speaking world, when he took sides with the Kaiser in the first world war and with Hitler in the second, like the even more pathetic Norwegian national novelist Knut Hamsun. It is difficult to understand the case of such a brilliant explorer behaving so utterly without sense in other fields.

He was not at all opposed by the British from the beginning. On the contrary, men like Kitchener and Younghusband stood by him and encouraged him with all their heart in India. His difficulties with England started when he was to meet the Royal Geographical Society in London to defend his theories and discoveries and claim his rights and honours, which the Society was not quite ready to bestow on him without arguments. This Society already had a very long tradition and experience of phoney explorers and of carefully investigating the feats of everyone trying to claim something, from Burton and Speke to Stanley and Scott, and they couldn't see why Sven Hedin was to be an exception from being grilled like all the others. Sven Hedin could never forgive the Society the treatment which they offered him. He was actually wrong in certain conclusions, and the fact that the Society questioned his infallibility he never could forgive the British Empire.

The illustrious *Younghusband*-expedition against Lhasa became partly notorious for its brutality, using modern automatic weapons to slaughter thousands of Tibetans armed with bows and javelins. The purpose of the expedition was to thwart the Russian and Chinese plans to obtain a monopoly of trade in Tibet. Instead the British secured this monopoly for 40 years. Even this heroic expedition had another side to its dashing

stalwartness though. As the handsome British officers were to ascend the Potala to sign the treaties of trade, the giant steps to the palace were rather slippery, the temperature in autumn often being below zero. The steps were also quite large, so the elegant officers had some difficulty supporting themselves, ascending slowly with care. After the solemn ceremonies it was even trickier to get down. Many were the stylish officers who bounced along hundreds of stairs at a time while all the monks of Potala stood above them laughing their sides off. Peter Fleming, the brother of Ian, has written a gallant book about this swashbuckling expedition.

A most original lady has also given a special performance in Tibet. *Alexandra David-Néel* (1868-1969!) was a celebrated opera star harvesting triumphs at the opera house of Hanoi especially in the role of La Traviata, when her voice at the age of fifty began to waver, and she as a remedy decided to cure her anguish of getting pensioned off by making a trip to Tibet. This proved to be the wisest thing she could have done. As an exotic Tibet voyageur writing books about her ordeals she became even more famous than the opera primadonna. She worked on constantly improving her books all her life until she passed away as a centenarian. Add to this figure her tiny length of only 156 centimetres, and you have the picture of one of the most incredible women of all times.

She spent years wandering about Tibet collecting impressions. Her first book, "My Journey to Lhasa", is not as remarkable as the second, "Magic and Mystery in Tibet", which will be a Tibetan classic for all times. Her first book is more like an introduction and adventure book, she too had to colour her hair, dress up in native costume and dirty her skin to make it swarthy in order to produce the right feeling of adventure, but in her second book she comes to the point.

Disguise and dyeing of one's hair were also necessary preparations to the Austrian *Herbert Tichy's* travels to Tibet in the 30s. He was a geologist and mainly interested in mountaineering, but he was the first to show the splendours of Tibetan landscapes to the world by the new technical art of colour photography. He has always returned to the Himalayas, climbed new mountains and published more books with ever finer photographs, but his greatest efforts have been in western Nepal.

His countryman *Heinrich Harrer* is maybe number one among westerners in Tibet. Escaping from British prison camps during the war from India to Tibet, his classic "Seven Years in Tibet" is the supreme masterpiece among true accounts from before the Chinese invasion. He remained in Tibet as tutor to the young Dalai Lama while getting to know the country more intimately than any other visitor ever. He grew attached to the country, its people and culture for life, and his life's work, breathing an irresistible freshness of health and good spirits, is mainly concerned about the Tibetan situation. His book is a must to everyone interested in Tibet. His later book, "Return to Tibet" from 1983, we have not yet been able to obtain and peruse.

In the same first room of Tibetan travellers we also have to place the Italian *Giuseppe Tucci*, perhaps the foremost of all tibetologists. Contrary to Sven Hedin, this nimble gentleman had a remarkable faculty for making friends with anyone. Wherever he wanted to go, doors just opened, and he never had any problems with documents or authorities. He was never hindered from collecting whatever he wanted to bring out of the country from sacred places and any sites, and as a scientist he was not only extremely meticulous and careful but due religious reverence impersonated. His oriental institute in Naples was the most highly regarded in Europe for years. It was later taken over by the second great Italian tibetologist *Fosco Maraini*, but since his days it has lost its supremacy. Tucci was probably the first traveller into Tibet who didn't have to trick his way through - probably because of his high sense of diplomacy and understanding of alien mentalities.

*Lama Anagorika Govinda* was born in Saxony in 1898, but his mother was Bolivian. His assumed name "Anagorika" means the homeless one. He became number one among pilgrims in Tibet. His wonderful book "The Way of the White Clouds" is a unique documentary of decades of pilgrimage throughout Tibet in its entirety and most beautifully written. There is no other such work, and it is a book which you'll never do without - it can not be reread too many times.

The chief expert among connoisseurs of the area around Kailash is an Indian though, *Swami Pravananda*, who spent more time making more careful studies of the Manasarovar area than anybody else. He first visited the most sacred of mountains in 1928, from 1935 he returned yearly, sometimes he has stayed by the lakes all the year around, he has accomplished 23 pilgrimages around Kailash and 25 around the Manasarovar Lake, but only one around the Rakkas Tal. His book is generously furnished with indispensable maps of the area and is the perfect guide for pilgrims. He was still alive in 1981 when the old pilgrimage route from India to Kailash was reopened to Indian pilgrims for the first time in 22 years, guiding new generations of pilgrims across the mountains, as he had done 50 years previously.

From 1950 no one is allowed to visit Tibet from the outside except reliable lackeys, like Madame Han Suyin, who could be counted on not to make any unfavourable observations of what the Chinese did to Tibet. When the country is opened up to visitors after 30 years, everything is ruined. Of about 6500 monasteries only 10 remain, and the number of monks has been reduced from 130,000 (after 1959) to 1,000. All travellers to Tibet after 1981 bear witness of total cultural and human annihilation, so it can't be doubted. At the same time there are many witnesses of how the Tibetan sense of humour, kindness and hospitality, so well-renowned before 1950, has managed to survive. The friendliest people in the world had survived its own genocide, preserved the soul of the country and started to reconstruct the more than 6000 destroyed temples and monasteries from the beginning.

Charles and Jill Hadfield spent a winter in Tibet in 1987 as teachers and wrote a book about their nine months' impressions of the country and people, a most genuine and touching book, which is rather close to the spirit of Heinrich Harrer. Let's conclude this chapter by illustrating the mentality of the greatest Tibetan heroes of all: the Tibetans themselves. It's about the Ganden monastery, the third greatest in the world before 1959, founded in 1409:

"In the fightings of 1959 the monastery was bombed, and the destruction was completed during the 60s. Not one roof-beam or wall was left intact, and our first terrified impression of the ruins was that the monastery must have been bombed by aircraft, because the destruction was so complete. Later we were informed that the buildings had been dynamited, axes and sledges had then been used, and most of the beams, planks and pillars had then been transported down into the valley to be used for other buildings. Now it looks like Warsaw at the end of the war, a most frightfully disheartening and depressing spectacle. But monasteries can be reconstructed, unlike, as Mao put it, heads, that do not grow out again. But worst of all were not the ruins but the utter uncontrolled violence and hatred which had resulted in this utter desolation.

The reconstruction was apparently commenced in 1982 by Tibetan initiative, and the truck used for transport of materials by the local people was "the first privately owned vehicle in Tibet". When we first arrived here a few years ago seven buildings were reconstructed. Now about ten are completed. Keeping this pace it will take about twenty years to restore everything.

Ganden is today a blend of past nightmares and future hopes. Here like everywhere else the pride which Tibetan youths demonstrate in doing works of clay, carpentry,

frescoes and ancient architectural traditions fulfilled in the same way as innumerable past generations constructed their monasteries with the pure joy of creation is wonderful to behold. They grab hold of your hand and drag you along to make you witness their love's work. At the same time they learn the old handicrafts and perform a religious service. Something of our most wonderful experience was the reception which the monks had arranged for our visit. We were taken care of with overwhelming kindness, were offered butter-tea and shown around with inexpressible pride. There was a glorious feeling of optimism amidst all the banging and hammering, and we had a very distinct reality of something of the ancient Tibet in spite of the many hard years of terror surviving and now shooting new springs into the future."

### *Later Heroes of Tibet*

The thirteenth Dalai Lama, Thupten Gyatso (1876-1933), the greatest Dalai Lama since the Great Fifth, guided Tibet to complete independence in 1911, which was guaranteed by the British and lasted up to 1950. He even tried to modernize the country, but in 1925 these efforts failed against the complacent conservatism of the leading sects. He realized the danger of Tibet in not trying to follow the technological race which made a monster state like Hitler's Germany possible and presaged that Tibet with her natural kindness, generosity and warmth of heart would not be spared by a reeling age which did not know where it was heading.

The fourteenth Dalai Lama, originally named Lhamo Doendrub, who is 60 years this summer, has had a more difficult position than any earlier Dalai Lama, as he in the capacity of theocratic ruler of his country with no restrictions to his powers and responsibilities has been obliged to follow closely the most serious tragedy which ever befell his country and people - the Chinese destruction of the Tibetan culture, people and religion. He was only 15 years when Mao Zedong invaded Tibet the first time (in preliminary strategic intention to in the course of time use Tibet as a nuclear weapon depot), between 15 and 24 he had to incessantly endure the demanding political necessity to find a peaceful compromise and avoid bloodshed in the one-sided conflict from the side of the Chinese, which policy finally suffered a total defeat as the Chinese opened fire in Lhasa on the 16<sup>th</sup> of March in 1959 at 16.00 hours, (two grenades were fired from the Chinese camp without any purpose ever having been explained,) which compelled Dalai Lama to take a decision to go into exile. He has always stressed the fact that the decision was entirely his own, no one influenced him except the hopeless political circumstances, and the Khampas who supported him in his escape and made it possible did it of their own free will without being asked to and without influencing him.

Under western eyes His Holiness the Dalai Lama appears as a fine and noble hyper-intellectualist of the most exquisite sensitivity. A visitor immediately notices how sensitive His Holiness is as he removes his famous spectacles and exposes his very shy and brittle but at the same time most humorous and wakeful eyes. As a unique leader of Buddhism in the world one must say that he constitutes a unique ornament of honour to his religion. Not even His Holiness the Pope holds a higher position in metaphysics and nobility than this personification of supreme tolerance, who claims that the Chinese can not be accused of their crimes as in a dictatorial state only those in charge of the highest command can be held responsible. The development of China and the countries she occupies suggests though that the Chinese in the future might be regarded as new Nazis - excepting refugees, Hongkong-Chinese, Taiwanese and other

Chinese from outside China. But the Chinese of Communist-China have regrettably surpassed the Stalinists of the Soviet Union in compromising communism forever.

Many imply that the Chinese destruction of Tibetan culture and civilization still has to have brought some benefits and point out the hospitals, schools, roads and bridges built by the Chinese for Tibet. But Tibet used to have its own medicinal science and had no need of getting its main institution bombed out on Shakpori Hill and replaced by an alien science wholly based on unnatural medicines with harmful side-effects, which Tibet earlier had been spared. In the new schools built by the Chinese the Tibetans were forced to learn Chinese and communist propaganda and not even to write their own language, which is why many adult Tibetans today know how to speak and write Chinese but only to speak and not to write Tibetan. The roads were constructed to transport Chinese military forces. Across the bridges carefully guarded by armed soldiers, mainly Chinese were let across while Tibetans needed permits and were only welcomed with obstacles. These hospitals, schools, roads and bridges were chiefly financed by taxes imposed on the Tibetans. Part of the reality is also the fact that the Tibetan economy was totally destroyed by Chinese inflation. Summary: the Chinese have achieved humanly nothing positive in Tibet, what "progress" they have artificially imposed on the country has only benefited the Chinese while the Tibetans only have been exploited, what material benefits the Chinese have brought to Tibet have been undone by the fact that almost only Chinese were given the possibility to benefit from them, and the good things that existed before their arrival they have fortunately failed in ruining - although they made hard work out of deliberately destroying them to 95%.

The only positive results of this holocaust are instead to be found abroad. By the escape of the Dalai Lama in 1959 Tibetan Buddhism for the first time came to some international attention. Since then it has expanded everywhere. In all greater cities in the democratic world you find today Tibetan centres. Those who convert from Christianity and other religions to Tibetan Buddhism are an ever increasing number. The enforced exile of the Dalai Lama from Tibet to the outside world has resulted in a long term religious avalanche all over the world. This mental earth-quake has continued ever since and constantly doubled in strength, especially after the universal destruction inside Tibet became known to the world in the 80s.

One example is Thomas Lofstrom, Swedish writer, a child of his age, grown up during the 60s and the Vietnam war, when he unhesitatingly took sides with Mao's China and built barricades in Paris. To him it was obvious that Mao and China were right in Vietnam and that America was wrong. To him, like to so many others, it was consequently also self-evident that China couldn't be wrong in Tibet.

His visit in Tibet in the beginning of the 80s launched an earth-quake in his political views. He was completely reversed to the contraries of everything he had been, just by being shown what the Chinese really had accomplished in Tibet.

Others were never duped by Mao or China not even during the heyday of the Vietnam war. The most daring voice of all against all those in favour of the Chinese cause, just as the Vietnam war reached its most abominable heights of cruelty, and left-wing views were at their most popular, was that of *Michel Peissel*, probably the most notable of all Tibetan heroes from the west after 1950. By exposing himself to the worst conceivable hardships and political risks, he came into contact with the most remote parts of the Himalayas where nothing ever had changed and where resistance against China had found their last resorts, especially in Mustang in northern Nepal. Like Herbert Tichy he is a great photographer, and his most well-renowned book is probably "Kingdoms in the Himalayas" where he documents life in Zanskar (between Kashmir and Ladakh but beyond both of them,) in Mustang at the remotest northern parts of Nepal, and in Bhutan. He has lived together with Khampas and succeeded in compiling

the only existent complete documentation of their guerrilla wars against China 1956-74, although the end of the war is missing, and this is probably his greatest achievement and his most important work. He was one of the first westerners to be allowed inside Bhutan (1970 after ten years' efforts to obtain an admission) and finally availed himself of the opportunity by travelling straight through the whole country under intolerable primitive conditions. One of his more eccentric projects was to go up through Nepal to Mustang by its rivers using hover-crafts, battling with constant adversities and shipwrecks. In spite of this he is one of the most clear-minded Tibetan travellers ever, and we must include some quotations of his views on Tibet and her problems:

"Too many Europeans imagine the Tibetans to be a placid people of meditating teachers of wisdom dwelling in remote contemplation in inaccessible monasteries far away from reality. This mistaken notion is founded on the western focus on just the Tibetan monks and their fascinating religion, ignoring ordinary people. Behind this curtain of religion is hidden the more warlike mentality of the Tibetans. In fact, the total dominance of the Tibetan religion in the country is explained by the martial mentality of the Tibetans: a people like this has to be ruled by priests preaching peace. Martial peoples, Christian as well as Moslem, often combine ardent religious feeling with bloodthirst and lust for war. Some of the greatest wars were fought in the name of religion, which not seldom became the basis for world empires. And the Tibetans have for generations fought the surrounding nations. Not until recently have they laid down their weapons and never completely."

-----  
"How then does the Chinese pattern fit into this armed religiosity? The dogmatic atheism and materialism of the Chinese is surely contrary to the pattern. Only by supremacy in numbers the Chinese were able to invade and conquer Tibet - according to Mao China could always afford to sacrifice any number of millions of people - and by the total power centralization - one word from Mao, and the world's greatest steam-roller was set going which nothing could stop. But Mao is now gone, dogmatic materialism is now being questioned, and if someone sets another gear in the steam-roller in another direction, no one will be able to turn it from that direction either."

He is today 57 years of age, and we sincerely hope that he is still going strong. If anyone reading this has a possibility of communication with Michel Peissel, we ask him to deliver our sincere and personal greetings.

What first brought John B. Westerberg to the Himalayas was a rumour in Russian monasteries about there somewhere in some Indian monastery in Kashmir would exist a manuscript proving that Jesus had been active in India. Eager for research John went to India, and although he never found the manuscript, he was convinced that it had existed but had been carried away by some unknown traveller. He became so much interested in the country and the Tibetans, that he learned enough Tibetan to be able to get on and remained in the country until winter became too severe. He promised himself to return, which eventually he did many times.

His attitude as a religious researcher is the absolute contrary to that of Sven Hedin. The driving force of Sven Hedin was an insatiable appetite for glory and honours and the impossibility to prove to himself the superhuman excellence of an over-grandiose ego. He succeeded in a way by becoming the last person in Sweden to become knighted and generally regarded the world over as the last great explorer; but all this honour, which he justly deserved, he fumbled away by taking sides with Wilhelm II and Hitler. Humanly speaking he became nothing more than a grandiose and tragic fool.

John strives in the other direction. He also has a powerful ego additionally strengthened by a most unusually enduring and well-created physique; and his whole life has been like a striving away from all temptations which such a personal superiority could convey. Thus he has always tried to diminish himself by working for others. As long as the Russian church was persecuted, he was the most zealous of her servants, keeping dangerous contacts everywhere in Russia, inspiring good morals in all catacombs and indefatigable in his undermining of the regime, with the consequence that he was no longer needed in Russia after August 1991. Then he turned towards Islam and made himself at home in every persecuted church in the Orient.

The problem about him is that he never stays in one place long enough to be thanked. He refuses to have his activities documented, and he has never appeared in media. If I hadn't made his acquaintance from June 1979, perhaps nothing would have become known of his very widespread underground life.

As mentioned, it was in Ladakh he first met with Tibetans, and each time he has returned he has gone deeper into the Tibetan world. After the fall of communism in Russia he became interested in the communism of China and maintains stable contacts with Mongolia and East Turkestan.

Contrary to the exhibitionist Sven Hedin, John always disappears among the people and assumes the same ways as those he associates with as far as possible. What he can't do anything about are his blue eyes, which sometimes have given him some problems in Tibet. That's why he usually carries dark glasses. So if you see a tall blond westerner with his hair blackened and with blue eyes masked as a Tibetan Khampa in dark glasses, it could be him.

Besides practically all the monasteries of Tibet he is also familiar with most of all hippie communities along the Himalayas and in Nepal. He learned from necessity how to get around with false papers in the Soviet Union, which art he has mastered with such skill that he has never run any danger. The greatest peril he has so far encountered was in consequence of a small avalanche somewhere beyond K2, in which he had both his arms broken in an effort to save animals and luggage, after which accident he had to remain for some time in a monastery, which was visited by Chinese soldiers. He then had to stay for two days and nights like buried alive in a crypt before the Chinese left without having detected him.

The latest incident about his illness and blackout on the way to Darjeeling is remarkable since he has not had such problems in India before. This episode needs some attention.

Now (December 1994) he is riding with Khampas in eastern Tibet - where and how far we don't know yet.

Readers have observed the remarkable resemblance between his mentality and ways of thinking and the editor's, as if they were two pieces of a jig-saw puzzle fitting exactly. This is a phenomenon which even John and myself often have been puzzled with. Astrologically he has a conjunction between the Moon and Venus in Pisces, which to astrologers explain something about his personality. This conjunction is in exact correspondence with the editor's north node, and John's node axis falls in almost exactly with the axis of the editor's ascendant. We are also from the same country and of Swedish origin in Finland.

The summing-up of his religious research in northern Kashmir is also in accordance with his personality. He found clear indications of Jesus having been active there but no evidence. He was convinced to 100%, the indications were overwhelming, but a total lack of evidence makes it impossible to prove.

John's conclusions are decisively backed, however, by no one less than Swami Pravananda, who visited those places fifty years earlier, the consummate Kailash

expert, who was never proved to have committed any mistake. He recounts, that in the Himis monastery some distance east of Leh there was a book called "Namthar", a Jesus biography about his "unknown years" in India. An old monk at Himis told Swami Pravananda in 1928, that according to this book Jesus had had a quarrel with his parents and then travelled to India (Gya-Kar) where he stayed at Chargotri (Gridhrakuta or Rajagriha), at Varanasi (Sarnath) and in several other places for some years, learnt Pali, studied Buddhism and even embraced that religion. Then he had returned home to start a religion of his own on the basis of what he had learnt. Thus the Christendom of Jesus would really have been a combination of Judaism with Buddhism.

What then had happened with such an important book? A Russian traveller called Notovich or something similar had once visited the monastery, found the book and brought it with him. Years later he had sent back a copy transcribed either to English or Russian, the monk didn't know which. Then this transcribed copy had been discovered by another alien traveller, who had taken it with him after having given a decent price for it, that is some cheap present. Then no one knew anything more about the matter.

The book is lost and also its Russian or English copy, but if this book "Namthar" once has existed in India there must be more copies somewhere.

*(Since this was written some 8 years ago we have found the rest of the story. The Russian's name was Nicholas Notovich, and he later published the 'Tibetan Gospel' found in Hemis in Ladakh in French, which aroused some debate and controversy around the 1890s, was banned by the pope and was translated into many languages. It should be available in libraries still today and is very interesting.)*

## ***Tibetan Letters***

### *1. John B. Westerberg*

"Back again after a most successful and interesting raid through Kham, which must have been the most beautiful part of Tibet once before the Chinese introduced their most brutal "civilization" thinkable, devastating the country and leaving only open wounds in the landscape and human ruins in endless villages destroyed by bulldozers, in all the monasteries bombed to cinders and in the hills, where most Tibetans were condemned to an existence of lifetime beggary. However, it became rather cold in Tibet in this time of the year, so I had to return to warmer zones. The main purpose of the raid was to form contacts and establish safe grounds for future activities.

The problem with China is that far too many within her borders, and then especially in Kham, Turkestan, Inner Mongolia and Manchuria, have reasons more than good enough for wishing China 10,000 years of bad luck. This dilemma can only be sorted out by the Chinese themselves, and they are almost impossible to move, especially since so very few of them still have understood so very little about the nature of this problem, which brings me to your latest journal.

Doctor Sun's letter is indicative of how most enlightened Chinese are thinking today. Even they can but think that His Holiness the Dalai Lama did wrong in going into exile, which brings me to your concise history, where some points need some comments.

The two grenades fired from the Chinese military camp that fatal afternoon of March 1959, which signalled Dalai Lama's departure, harmed no one and landed at a safe distance from the city. This the Chinese have always pointed out as an argument

for there being no reason why the Dalai Lama by this should be frightened into exile. But this was just psychologically the very fatal factor. The grenades were fired by the Chinese just to frighten the mass of Tibetan people protecting the Norbulinka. It was an open threat. The Chinese have never admitted to this themselves, since everything threatening them with losing some part of their faces makes them hide between lies and hypocrisy. Dalai Lama's exile was a protest against the Chinese coming with threats. A head of state must not tolerate that an alien power tries to frighten his people with grenades.

Most of all your note of the Youngusband-expedition, which you almost place within brackets, craves some attention. This expedition was maybe the parting line between the good old world with its perfect safety and the devastating deluges of twentieth century technological terrorism. Most interesting of all the expedition was to Sir Francis Youngusband himself, since it completely altered his personality from a bold egoistic imperialist to something of an enlightened guru. The consequence of the expedition was that he later founded "The World Congress of Faiths" with the specific purpose to unite Christianity, Jewry, Islam, Buddhism and Hinduism, the same aspiration as that of Bahai and the whole of ecumenism, as if the British Empire by Lhasa in the person of colonel Youngusband lost her imperialistic ambitions to instead acquire higher aspirations, which brings us to your discovery of the Jesus book at Himis in the rare book of Swami Pravananda.

I knew of the existence of this book of Pravananda's but not the contents you refer to. I have myself had this book in my hands without noticing this most important paragraph, which in a wonderful way confirms my conclusions.

The problem about Christianity is that it became a continuity of the Roman Empire (the Catholic Church) instead of just a church. When Rome was turned into the capital of world Christianity, the derailing of Christianity unfortunately became an incurable fact. But many were the mistakes leading to this final mistake. The editors of the New Testament ruthlessly eradicated all texts and paragraphs which they did not understand and above all every detail and word referring to any idea of reincarnation. This thought was anathema in the Roman world but not in the Greek church headed by Origen. Maybe the doom of Christianity was sealed when Constantine the Great turned it into a state religion instead of allowing it perfect religious freedom. From the year 325 Christianity is lead more by political powers than by spiritual.

You write that one of your readers ask in which monastery I passed some nights with broken arms as the Chinese came by. I can't reveal this. It's a perfect secret between that monastery and me. "Somewhere beyond K2" is a wonderful and perfect preciseness.

Concerning my collapse in Delhi I think it was a sign by fortune that I would return to Tibet and *not* go to Indonesia - nothing else.

As you reach Darjeeling you will know where to meet me with Kim - we don't know it ourselves yet. It would be interesting to meet at the unknown grave of our friend Max Chablon in Imphal - if possible.

Welcome to India, and be certain that, if anywhere in the world, here nothing is impossible.

P.S. Concerning your quotation from Michel Peissel: This is the very problem. As the Chinese destroyed the Tibetan society by liquidating the monasteries they destroyed the one thing which could keep control of Tibet. Thereby they released terrific powers of hatred, which not yet have found expression. The Tibetans are without comparison in the world regarding self-control and mind control. If they are compelled to use their spiritual potentials in directions of hatred instead of constructive religion, the

consequences might become worse than the whole Tibetan tragedy. The subdued hatred of Tibet is like an unexploded bomb which has to go off sooner or later. That was what the Darjiling conference was all about: returning this unexploded bomb to sender, that is China. The future will show if we in any way succeeded."

## 2. *Kim* :

"Dear Christian, Please correct me if I am wrong. Your magazine, especially the Swedish edition, is invaluable, but every now and then there are a few mistakes. It is only reliable for its truthfulness to some 95%, which is an admirable rate of credibility. But I would advise you to make an effort to be more precise in your facts and figures. You have a tendency to easily let yourself be carried away.

To me the best part of "The Free Thinker" is its political assessments. You often display interesting political initiative ideas which you are never afraid to express however dangerous they might be. It is my pleasure to help you sail in the same ship.

The monasteries in Tibet destroyed by the Chinese red guards were 6246 in number. Not only were they destroyed. In this holocaust, 60% of traditional Tibetan literature was irrevocably lost. The library in Dharamsala contains some 50,000 volumes, which is the 40% that was saved. That means some 75,000 volumes of priceless original scripts in the Tibetan language being destroyed by the Chinese for no other reason than the pure delight of destruction. What was not destroyed with the 6246 monasteries, gold ornaments, statues and other valuables of art, were taken to China and molten down or sold by Hong Kong as antiquities on the international market.

The loss of this vast amount of original Tibetan literature is the more fatal since Tibet was the only country that had preserved the entire stock of original Buddhist documents. In other nations like Ceylon, Thailand and China the Buddhist original scriptures were polluted and dissipated by other traditions, evaluations and wars, but in Tibet everything was conserved in perfect piety. Since the Buddha himself was a Tibetan (since his mother was,) the country of the Tibetans and her people could rightly be regarded as the heartland of Buddhism.

The exact amount of Tibetan victims to the Chinese can only be roughly estimated to about some 1,2 million, but already in 1983, names of 1,207,487 victims and fates were documented. Only the Chinese themselves know exactly how many Tibetans they have killed and brainwashed and imprisoned for life and keep the figures secret. Only in the one year of 1959, according to secret Chinese statistics, 87,000 Tibetans were murdered, which the Chinese bluntly denied until they were shown their own records.

The Tibetans being a delicate race, living in a most vulnerable world exposed to the harshest climate on earth, dedicating a large part of the population to a life of celibacy, the damage caused by the Chinese to the Tibetan people was greater than that of the Germans against the Jews. A larger number of Jews were killed, but none of their literature was damaged. The Jews received a new country of their own after the 12 years' holocaust, while the Tibetan people still are concentration camp prisoners in their only possible home country. The Tibetans are still after 44 years a persecuted and oppressed people, and their very identity and future is still denied to them in their own country by the implant and tyranny of the Han Chinese. So much damage was not done to Poland by the Germans as to Tibet by the Chinese.

Concerning the end of the Khampas, this is the sole instance where the Chinese were without any immediate guilt. Dalai Lama encouraged them to give up without foreseeing the consequences, which frees him as well. But all the others were guilty, and, as you say, the chief responsibility was that of Nixon, Kissinger and their

government. The Khampas were trained by Americans and supported by Taiwan from 1959 (under the period of Eisenhower), and their heroic war against China was an unrivalled epic all the way down to the American betrayal. Nothing could defeat the Khampas except betrayal.

China was to blame of course since only China was responsible for the whole situation. I will deal with them later. But India, Nepal and America were not obliged to make themselves traitors to Tibet as well. Nehru betrayed Tibet personally by tragically nourishing some idealistic faith in the good will of China in spite of Mao's actual terrorist regime, and the attitude of India is still that of indifference towards the fate of Tibet. In the negotiations with China in September 1993, Tibet was again sacrificed and driven over, as usual, to secure peace and co-operation between India and China. Nepal has followed the same course, trying to play chess with India against China and with China against India, ignoring and sacrificing the case of Tibet. Also Taiwan never recognized Tibetan independence. Chang Kai Shek in the 30s wanted to revive Chinese imperialism, and if Mao had not invaded Tibet, Chang Kai Shek would have been happy to do exactly the same. In fact, the greatest Chinese imperialists, with no mind to ever consider Tibet as a different nation, are still found in Taiwan. But the American betrayal was by far the worst.

Of course, China was an irresistibly tempting bait to American business. The coward policy of India was in exact consequence to that of the equally commercial Britain, which invaded Tibet in 1904 only for the sake of business. For the sake of business India abandoned Tibet, just like Britain. What is that kind of business worth, when you sacrifice the most basic and universal human values, even the cause of democracy and human rights, in order to make money, which costs blood and brings bad Karma and the curse of future generations?

The chief fault, though, was the incapability of Nehru, India, America and Britain to recognize the fundamental evil of materialistic China. The ways of China have always throughout history been sly flattering ambiguities with hidden goals, the ends always justifying the means. You can never trust any Chinese. That summarizes the historical experience of incurable Chinese imperialism.

Concerning the Khampas, their last fight was their bravest. When they were forced to give up in Mustang in northern Nepal by the earnest command of Dalai Lama and 10,000 Nepalese troops, with 20,000 Chinese troops on the other side, part of them decided to give up, while those 40 who refused to give up decided to head for Dharamsala some 400 miles away. Those who followed Dalai Lama's command and gave themselves up were sent to Nepalese prison dungeons for seven years, all their property being confiscated. Their three highest officers committed suicide by cutting their own throats when they discovered the treachery - they had been promised no retaliations. Those 40 who made a run for it almost got to the frontier of India 200 miles away but not quite. Chased all the way by the Nepalese and the Chinese, they were finally killed to the last man in an ambush 20 miles from the Lipulek La in India towards the end of August 1974. Their story is an epic comparable to that of Masada. Of those 40 no one survived, but they will live forever as the foremost Khampas of all, and there are still Khampas everywhere from Ladakh to Kham who train themselves to become like them. As John said, "Knowing the story of the sacred 40, it is impossible not to see one of them in every Khampa you encounter." In brief, their glory is infinite. You should write a book about it.

Please correct my English if necessary. I am very much in agreement with your editing principles, only the facts of reality are important, and the proper form to bring them forth I leave to you.

Expecting you in Darjeeling, or elsewhere, yours truly, Kim."

(Kim is an Indian Buddhist from Bihar, closely associated with John B. Westerberg on his journeys.)

### 3. Doctor Sandy :

"My dear Christian, My warmest thanks for the presentation of Kim to me. The material he has provided me with, Tibetan literature of healing above all, has opened up a world of miraculous possibilities. In fact, I am positive that the evasive riddle of the inextricable Aids problem now has found its solution.

This solution however presents a lot of problems. The world establishment of hospitalization will never accept the Tibetan alternative. Its liability is of course the inevitability of quacks, and unfortunately the scientific establishment is prone to ban all forms of quackery even if one quack brings with him twenty successful experts of the same school. The scientific method demanding 100% waterproof results unfortunately normally excludes and disregards 95% ratios of success - until they become 100%. Only then are scientific research results accepted, when they no longer offer any challenge.

However, these possibilities of the Tibetan alternative are so overwhelmingly tempting and astounding, that without any second thoughts I will drive the whole scientific world over and boot the whole medical establishment concerning the issue of Aids. Both Luc Montaigner and Robert Gallo will prove mistaken. The virus they found and fought about does exist, but their mistake was their method. The scientific method is to locate the disturbance and attack it. The Tibetan method is to locate in the patient what caused the disturbance and remedy that flaw in the patient's mentality or personality. The basis of Tibetan medicine is that everything can be cured psychologically, and the more than a thousand-year-old practice of Tibetan medicine is to cure everything psychologically by physical means. Tibetan medicine is thus a wonderful compromise between body and soul functions, always aiming at a balance between them, healing body disturbances by restoring loss of spiritual capacity and healing mental disturbances by restoring body balances. The curious disproportion between scientific and Tibetan medicine is, that while western medicine refutes Tibetan medicine as a philosophy of quacks, Tibetan medicine does not refuse western scientific knowledge but offers just another dimension to it.

Curiously, one who is proved right by these evident possibilities of Tibetan medicine is James Hilton with his Shangri La theory. The healing power of Tibetan medicinal knowledge can prolong life almost immeasurably. There are herbs growing in the Himalayas with healing powers unique on this planet. I was never so surprised in all my life as when I learned that Tibetans actually practised brain and heart surgery already in the ninth century - more than a thousand years ago! All respectable Chinese medicinal knowledge also comes from Tibet or India or both. The only Chinese speciality is of course acupuncture, but some say even that has its origin in Veda, while all other Chinese methods and practice they definitely owe to the Tibetans (who often got them from India).

The HIV virus can't be cured with medicine, and this virus is only one of many new killer bacteria, as if all nature revolted against man, a suddenly most unnatural parasite causing havoc in the entire global echo system. The Buddhist method, so far the only sensible and certain one, is reserved to a happy few with proper insight, while it will probably be a matter of several decades before the world and its scientific establishment of hospitalization with its monopoly awakes to their gross mistake of their own

infallibility. How many will die before then? Maybe 10 million, maybe a hundred, maybe a thousand, maybe several billion.

From the beginning, more than 2500 years ago, Buddhism had the good sense to adopt the ways of man to the ways of nature, dedicating a large percentage to celibacy, thus avoiding overpopulation and imbalances in nature. The only religion to make efforts in the same way was Christianity. All the others - Hinduism, Islam, materialism, communism - have failed completely.

We the happy few knowing this stand so far on our own, as I have done for the last twelve years. But we stand on solid ground, while the world is swaggering, and our responsibility therefore is almost unbearable."

*Comment.* Doctor Sandy's theory is fully in accordance with the scientific development during this century. During the last century materialism became constantly more dominating in human thought carried by leaders like Darwin and Karl Marx. The first to find new metaphysical paths of research were Freud, Rudolf Steiner and Einstein, whose theory of relativity turned all empiric science and materialism upside down. This theory put science into developing the atomic bomb, which definitely ended the illusion of science as something exclusively beneficial to mankind.

In 1950 China invaded Tibet expressly to "help" Tibet on the road of progress. This "help" became such an embarrassing enforcement that the Tibetans decided to resist it. This brought China to occupy and enslave Tibet by means of force and military violence in 1959. In connection with this forced conquest, the medicinal institute on Shakpori Hill, located there since 300 years, was bombed and utterly destroyed.

Already in 1960 the International Commission of Jurists presented their report of widespread genocide going on in Tibet. This report was out of tune during the 60s when the mode of the day was to extol China for her defence of Vietnam. Like in 1950, the universal reaction to the atrocities performed by China in Tibet was indifference and passive silence.

During the 60s, 6246 Tibetan monasteries and temples were systematically destroyed by the command of Peking while only 13 were left intact, mainly for the sake of tourism. Many of these monasteries were torn down by forced Tibetan labour, the Tibetans themselves were forced under armed threat to tear down what their ancestors had accomplished, and what couldn't be destroyed by hand was bombed by aircraft or dynamited. The red guards under the direct command of Chairman Mao were solely responsible. Since all victuals grown in Tibet were used to support the Chinese army (PLA) there was a famine in Tibet lasting from 1958 to 1979. Before 1950 Tibet had been self-supporting and had never experienced any shortage of anything while China was in a bad way. Through the Chinese invasion and occupation, Tibet was gradually reduced to the poorest country on earth.

Why did China do all this? Her only gain was access to Tibetan highlands with their minerals and strategic advantages - with strategic nuclear weapons placed in Kongpo Nyitri, Powo Tamo, Rudok, Golmud and Nagchuka, the whole of northern India and the south of Siberia is within reach of Chinese robots, while the elevation of about 5000 meters make these highlands with their weapons highly inaccessible to Russian and Indian weapons. This strategic advantage is the sole gain of China from her enslavement of Tibet.

This could be described as the supreme evil: to plan and execute a systematical genocide on a peaceful cultured people who only wanted to be left in peace with their religion in their monasteries, in order to use their country as a basis for nuclear weapons.

Now Doctor Sandy suggests that the Tibetan medicinal science with its eleven-year education probably has the means and correct knowledge to solve the Aids problem. And this traditional science the Chinese have tried to eradicate to substitute it with torture methods, sterilizations by force, electro shocks treatment and death concentration camps for tens of millions of prisoners around Golmud and other locations by the Gobi desert.

The genocide in Tibet has at least been documented and proved beyond doubt. A more massive implant of Han Chinese has taken place into Turkestan (Sinkiang) than to Tibet. What has occurred in this area much greater than Tibet has not yet become known, since no one has been able to document it; but here the Chinese nuclear tests were commenced and carried on until Tibetans started to observe strange mushroom clouds over northern parts of Tibet, which observations were later confirmed by new strange epidemics in the area with miscarriages and malformations, just like after Tchernobyl in that area, and especially around the great sacred lake of Koko Nor.

#### *4. Doctor Sun :*

"My dear friend, Many thanks for your letter, which was successfully smuggled unopened to me, wherefore I dare write an answer, using the same smuggling system. I do not exactly know if this extreme caution is necessary, but it is better to be on the safe side. There are people who never get caught however flagrant risks they take, and there are people who get caught for nothing in spite of total discretion. It seems to be a most individual trait. All I know is that the authorities of this Chinese totalitarian world are losing control every day, the Chinese developing into the worst capitalists in the world. They have always been fooling the Americans, and they are fooling them still. People like Edgar Snow and Richard Nixon they regard as despicable idiots while only Pearl Buck among Americans is respected in China, since she worked with Chinese for many years and got to know them well.

Writing to you I feel again as if our conference in Lhasa is going on forever. Those days in the city and outside at Ganden and in our most important meetings at Nechung are forever still in my mind. When I met with John in a secret encounter (I will not tell you where) he was well and full of initiative power, but he told me of his sickness at Delhi. He also told me, that a doctor from Tibet had told him, that his only enemy, that could do him any harm, was his own over-empathy. This is a both promising and dangerous prospect.

In his person he combines a deep Christian philosophy with expert Buddhist knowledge (actually Tibetan) which makes him doubly explosive as a spiritual peril in China. Actually this might be the correct formula for breaking the Chinese difficulties. The Chinese are the most racist people in the world, taking for granted that all other peoples, and especially neighbours like the Tibetans and Burmese, are barbarians, who do not even deserve the worst treatment they can get. They look on their bad treatment of other nations as acts of grace. This Chinese conceit is the greatest curse of China. But if Jesus, combining in himself deep Jewish traditions with the knowledge of Buddhism, could upset the Roman Empire so completely for ever, maybe something like that would be the proper formula also for breaking down this world environmental menace of the totalitarian state of China. There might be no greater human force in existence than Jesus and Buddha acting together.

Yours with compliments, Doctor Sun."

Our friend in Chungqing belongs to an old Mandarin family of Canton, actually related with the Ming dynasty. He is an agent of an underground opposition movement challenging the communist party and willing to allow independence to Tibet, Turkestan and (Inner) Mongolia.

Gothenburg, March 14<sup>th</sup>, 1995.

### *The Panchen lama*

Since the 16<sup>th</sup> century he is the second highest authority of the Tibetan hierarchy, being established by the Dalai Lama himself as an insurance of the hierarchic stability: when the position of the Dalai Lama was weakened by exile or minority, the Panchen Lama would compliment the power liability and vice versa. In the 20<sup>th</sup> century it has constantly been the case, that while the Dalai Lama has found it necessary to leave the country, the Panchen Lama has remained in office, and when the Panchen Lama has fled to China the Dalai Lama has increased his power. The tenth Panchen Lama, who died in 1989, and the 14<sup>th</sup> Dalai Lama, who is today 59, have always been good friends and supported each other even during the most hideous adversities.

The position of the tenth Panchen Lama was however dubious and tragic from the beginning. He was not the only candidate for the office but the candidate of the Chinese; and there was another more trusted Tibetan candidate, whom the Chinese succeeded in eliminating - he was arrested at Yatung on his way on an Indian pilgrimage and probably murdered - the body was never found. He was just a small boy.

When the Chinese invaded Tibet in 1950 it was done on the pretext that Panchen Lama, then 13 years old, had asked China to come and liberate Tibet. Already then they had the boy firmly under their control, and they turned him into their best collaborator in Tibet. His universal reputation as a phoney Panchen Lama and the chief lackey of the Chinese occupation army was founded in the 50s; but in the face of the resolute rebellion of Kham from 1956, the atrocities following the escape of the Dalai Lama in 1959 and the looting of his own monastery Tashi Lumpo a few years after, his loyalty towards China started to vacillate.

His great moment of truth came in March 1964. He had then been forbidden to speak in public for two years by the Chinese, but they now decided to give him a chance to improve his conduct. At the great prayer festival celebrated for three weeks he was on one occasion to make a propaganda speech before an audience of 10,000 people. The Chinese had commanded him to once and for all officially denounce the Dalai Lama. If he pleased the Chinese by doing so, he was to be reinvested with all his authority and privileges.

Conventionally he started his speech and advocated diplomatically the necessity of freedom of conscience and religion and for Tibet to be developed by her own people in their own way.

The moment came when he was supposed to denounce the Dalai Lama. He fell silent looking around at all his fellow Tibetans seemingly meeting every one of them with his eyes and sighed audibly. Everyone held his breath. Then he spoke the most carefully considered words of his life:

"His Holiness the Dalai Lama has been brought from his country into an alien nation. While he is away it's in the interest of all Tibetans that he meets with no harm. As long as Dalai Lama is safe, the happiness of the Tibetans will also prosper and continue. Today as we all are gathered here I must express my firm belief that Tibet

soon will regain her independence and that His Holiness the Dalai Lama soon will be restored on his golden throne. Long live His Holiness the Dalai Lama!"

Of all affronts thinkable that any Tibetan could have insulted China with, this took the first prize. The highest respected and positioned Tibetan in the country spat China right in her face in front of the whole Tibetan people. The dramatic effect was tremendously extreme and should have its place in world history.

The Chinese unfortunately have no political sense of humour, and this was not even a joke. The consequences became vast and unsurveyable. The Panchen Lama was arrested and forbidden to leave his house, where he was totally isolated. After some comprehensive conferences in Beijing behind locked doors among only the highest chiefs of the communist party like Mao Zedong, Chou Enlai and all the great bosses, a massive campaign of calumny against Panchen Lama was launched all over Tibet.

The trial against the Panchen Lama then took place during 17 days in August. Chinese trials all have the same procedure, soon degenerating into lynching of the accused, which everyone present must take part in if he doesn't want to become an accused himself. This trial was no exception from general Chinese routine, and the well organized public trial enabled everyone present to approach the accused Panchen Lama to beat him, kick him, spit on him, denounce him and abuse him in every conceivable way, though many were those who refused to participate in his official lynching.

The verdict had been decided in advance. Directly after the trial, the Panchen Lama, his parents and all those of his family and household who as yet had not been murdered or brought into concentration camps, were put in irons and brought in an armoured car as very dangerous criminals to an unknown destination. For fourteen years no one knew where the Panchen Lama was being held. Not until February 1978 news came that he had been kept in the number one prison for top party members, where they had constantly tried to brainwash him, which he constantly had protested against by trying to commit suicide. Neither brainwash nor suicide efforts had succeeded.

In 1982 he was allowed to revisit Tibet after 18 years of imprisonment under extreme and inhuman conditions outside Beijing. His freedom to act and move about was very much restricted mainly to restoring and rebuilding monuments destroyed by the command of the Chinese. Just after finishing the great stupa at Tashi Lumpo, the mausoleum for the last five Panchen Lamas, one of the most beautiful monuments in Tibet, made in the same architectural style and timeless harmony as all traditional Tibetan architecture, he died of a heart attack 52 years old. During the course of massive adversities and inhuman sufferings, he ultimately succeeded in defending his title, his own and all the integrity of Tibet and the honour of his ancient office.

Now the reincarnation of the Panchen Lama has been confirmed by the Dalai Lama. As all the world wished the eleventh Panchen Lama "tashi deleg", that is good health and happiness, the Chinese authorities sought the six year old child out, kidnapped him and brought him to China together with all other possible candidates for the office in order to start again from the beginning in the vain efforts of deprogramming and brainwashing out the 2500 year old Buddhist faith, which the Chinese communists feel to be the greatest threat and peril to their ideal state.

### *The Tibetan Problem - a concise summary*

Of the Human Rights, as established by the United Nations, China has violated 19 in Tibet:

§3 The right to a private life, freedom and personal security has been violated by murders, rapes, imprisonments without trial and arbitrary executions.

§4 The prohibition against slavery has been violated by the fact that China, under the pretext of liberating the people of Tibet, has enslaved them instead.

§5 The prohibition against torture and against cruel, inhuman and degrading treatment of people has been violated since this has been carried through against the Tibetan people.

§9 The prohibition against arbitrary arrest, detention and exile has been violated.

§12 The prohibition against interfering with people's private lives, family lives, home lives and correspondence and against defamation of character and the right to protection of law against such attacks has been violated by compulsory divorces, dispersion of families and the deprivation of children from their families against their will.

§13 The right to freedom of movement to and from and within one's own country and from any other country has been taken from the Tibetans.

§16 That marriage may be entered on only by the free will of both parties has been violated by compulsory marriages between monks and nuns and by that many Tibetan women were forced into marriage with Chinese.

§17 The right to property and the prohibition against arbitrary deprivation of property has been violated by mass confiscations as the Tibetans often were bereft of everything except clothes and household articles.

§18 The right to freedom of thought, of conscience and of religion was taken from the Tibetans.

§19 The right to freedom of opinion and expression was taken from the Tibetans mostly by the methodical destruction of their writings and the burning of their books.

§20 The right to peaceful assembly and association was forbidden by the Chinese as only meetings proclaimed by the Chinese were allowed.

§21 The right to take part in the government of one's country was forbidden by the Chinese.

§22 The right to social security was denied the Tibetans as 1) the economical resources of Tibet went to China, 2) the social changes in Tibet were disadvantageous to the Tibetans and 3) efforts were made to destroy the religion of the Tibetans.

§23 The right to work, free choice of employment, to just and favourable conditions of work and to a fair salary was denied the Tibetans by forced labour under inhuman conditions without a salary.

§24 The right to rest and leisure with paid holidays from labour was denied the Tibetans.

§25 The right to a decent standard of living and to medical care and the right of all mothers and children to special protection was violated as all Tibetan economical resources were taken care of by the Chinese.

§26 The right to free education and upbringing was violated since the educational institutions of the Tibetans were closed and replaced by communist schools of propaganda and by the fact that the Tibetan children were taken from their parents to be indoctrinated in enforced propaganda.

§27 The right to participation in the cultural life of the home country was taken from the Tibetans by the Chinese effort to eliminate Tibetan culture by replacing it with atheistic communism.

§29 That personal freedom is to be limited only by appropriate consideration of other people was violated by the Chinese mostly through the bombings of Tibetan monasteries, which were built most of all to protect personal freedom and development.

The violation of Human Rights in Tibet has continued undisturbed for 45 years, since the systematical, methodical and well premeditated genocide against the Tibetans that was initiated in 1950 never has been interrupted, although China is a member of the United Nations.

The above-mentioned statements of violation of Human Rights in Tibet were ready and internationally known since 1960, which is long before the Cultural Revolution. They were published by the International Commission of Jurists of Geneva, which in 1959 carefully documented an overwhelming number of individual cases with precise statistics, which China negated and still denounces as lies and fantasies.

The cultural revolution, which was given free reins in Tibet 1966-76, added a number of 6246 monasteries destroyed out of 6259 possible to the list of crimes against human rights in Tibet. The only monasteries to be spared were such that could be of advantage for tourism. Of this universal destruction amounting to 99,5%, not much is seen today, since all prominent and noticeable monasteries have been rebuilt since 1979. As a rule, the restored monasteries only form a tenth out of the original size and area of the real monasteries, and only about 5% of the original number of monks and nuns are permitted to live there.

Besides monasteries, also a vast number of temples and other traditional monuments were destroyed, even the oldest one of Tibet, which for the sake of tourism were restored to form a conspicuous façade of the Chinese fashioning of Tibet.

How many Tibetans that were killed by the Chinese is not known, but in 1983, the names and destinies of 1,207,487 Tibetan victims were documented, who all met with death because of the Chinese. Of these about 480,000 were from Kham, who fought a heroic guerrilla war against China 1956-74 until the Americans betrayed them by the deal of president Nixon with China.

Furthermore, in this Chinese holocaust of Tibet, 60% of all Tibetan literature was destroyed. Those 40% that were saved are represented at the library of Dharamsala by about 50,000 volumes, all written in longhand or printed by hand. This means that about 75,000 volumes of priceless original manuscripts in the Tibetan language are lost forever in the Chinese destruction. About 85% of all existing Tibetan books and manuscripts were destroyed in all. What escaped destruction in the 6246 ruined monasteries, that is objects of gold, statues and other items of art, were transported to China, melted down or sold by Hongkong on the international market for antiquities.

In Tibet China maintains an army of 500,000 men posted close to the Indian border of which 200,000 are permanent.

In Tibet China has constructed 17 secret radar stations and 14 military airfields.

In Tibet China has established 5 bases for nuclear weapons, in Kongpo Nyitri, in Powo Tamo, in Rudok, in Golmo and in Nagchuka.

In Tibet China has stationed 8 ICBM (long range missiles), 20 intermediate and at least 70 short-range missiles reaching all of northern India and southern Siberia.

Koko Nor is the greatest of the four holy lakes of Tibet. The "Ninth Academy" at the Koko Nor is a nuclear power station for among other things store of nuclear waste.

In Manchuria the original population has almost been exterminated. Only 3 million Manchurians remain in their own country while the Chinese immigration amounts to 75 million.

The corresponding figures for Inner Mongolia are 2,6 Mongolians against 8,5 immigrated Chinese.

The corresponding figures for East Turkestan ("Sinkiang", in Chinese "the new province") are 3 million Uigurs against 7 million Chinese settlers.

The corresponding figures for the Tibetan province of Amdo are 900,000 remaining Tibetans against 3,5 million Chinese colonialists.

In the Tibetan province of Kham it is not known how many Tibetans remain, but during their resistance against the Chinese 480,000 Tibetans lost their lives. Since then 3,6 million Chinese have been established in Kham.

In the autonomous province of Tibet there are at the moment 2 million Chinese increasing all the time while the Tibetans are constantly reduced in their own country.

One Chinese in Tibet costs as much as 4 Chinese in China. These Chinese in Tibet the Tibetans are forced to pay for by taxes and inflation.

Before 1959 there were 592,558 monks in Tibet. Today the Chinese allow only about 35,000 since the monks, who live in celibate, are considered a dangerous threat to the Chinese control society.

The world did nothing in 1950 as Tibet appealed to the United Nations for help against the Chinese invasion.

The world did nothing when China let loose the holocaust of the cultural revolution over Tibet, which was a calculated effort to extinguish all Tibetan culture and national identity.

Even today Tibet is of no interest to the world being so remote and without economic attractions, while China as the fastest growing economy of the world is of vital interest, why the world for economical reasons gladly close their eyes to the Tibetan case, as it likewise has refrained from doing something decisive about Kurdistan, Indonesia and Bosnia, other genocide stages, since these remote mountain and jungle places are not economically interesting. The world did not hesitate to interfere with the occupation of Kuwait by Iraq, however, since Kuwait had oil resources, no matter how dirty that business is.

Only the happy few are aware of the enormous importance of Tibet to the world. Among other things, Tibetan medicine offers the only cure to the world epidemic of Aids. But who cares about curing Aids when there are so many medicines to make money on, for instance AZT, which only can be applied to Aids patients as long as they remain ill?

In brief, the Chinese have committed the greatest genocide since the Nazi holocaust in Europé (surpassing Indonesia, Turkey and Pol Pot in Cambodia), the vastest ecological destruction of the environment which ever has been committed by a nation in another nation, (the Chinese desolation of forests in Tibet has resulted in ecological disasters in all adjacent countries,) and they have tried to utterly destroy the Tibetan civilization and culture, and they are getting away with it, the world closing their eyes, refusing to learn the truth, profiting by the crimes of China, while China just tells all those who know and remember anything about the holocaust of the cultural revolution and the multi-decennial destruction of Tibet to try to forget all about it.

The Tibetans are not Chinese. As a people they are completely unique and find their nearest kin in the Navajo and Hopi Indian tribes of Arizona.

Tibet is historically an independent nation which not only has been recognized by China but to which China even sometimes has paid tribute.

The Tibetan language, written like Sanskrit from left to right, has no connection whatsoever with the Chinese language.

The Tibetan Buddhism is originally Indian and not Chinese.

We introduced this issue stating the case of His Holiness the Pope Pius XII and his cowardice in the Jewish issue in the second world war, doing nothing and not even mentioning the Jews during the whole war although he was completely aware of what

was going on. The genocide of the second world war was followed by other genocides against the Tibetans, against other peoples suppressed by communists, against minorities in Moslem countries and by Serbians against other people. If you fall silent in the face of any of these genocides you are as much of a coward as His Holiness the Pope Pius XII in the second world war. The least you can do is to take sides by at least saying a word. If you can do more it is even better, but it has to begin with a clear declaration of which side you are on. If you don't even take this preliminary step of the least reaction and spread the word of knowledge about the truth of the world's greatest crimes against human rights going on today, then you are by your silence quietly acquiescing to what the Chinese are doing.

### *What Is To Be Done About China?*

*by Doctor Sun.*

This issue is very difficult. The root of the problem is the megalomania of the central government as established by Chairman Mao. In the 1950s he had the golden opportunity to bring forth a new China as a paragon of modern states politically and militarily. Instead he marched into the trap of megalomania, occupying Tibet by force and launching a Chinese atomic bomb program. That was his most unpardonable mistake. Without a nuclear program of military purposes, China could together with Japan have constituted the most powerful political peace force in the world, leading a pacifist course against nuclear politics, which would have resounded with universal acclaim all over the world. Instead, China lead by Chairman Mao embarked upon a military nuclear program and launched the devastating cultural revolution, wasting all the prestige of China, ultimately ruining her economic possibilities and politically committing suicide, pulling the entire communist party with him into the abyss.

What then is to be done? The communist party and the military forces must be dismantled. In the beginning of the 1980s, Dalai Lama of India presented a very reasonable suggestion: total disarmament of Tibet, dismantling all the atomic bombs and missiles, on condition that China retains her suzerainty and her control of the administration. This was so reasonable and opportune that only madmen could have objected. Unfortunately the Chinese communist party mainly consisted of madmen and does so still.

We have to wait for the madmen to be cured or to be done away with. An old Chinese proverb says, that if you wait long enough by the river, your enemy's corpse will come floating by. That is all we can do: patiently wait, at least praying, if we can do nothing more concrete.

Tibet has experienced 20 years of a winter nightmare 1959-79. Tibet is not alone. Many millions in China are still also waiting for the first ray of spring, and we have been waiting since 1949.

This letter is smuggled out of China by clandestine ways, because if it was to be published in China, many good people would lose their very small amount of freedom in China.

Doctor Sun of Canton, June 4<sup>th</sup>, 1995.

## *Talks in Kathmandu*

"Dear Christian, In the spirit of our friend Max Chablon I would like to convey the essence of a small "conference" we had in Kathmandu earlier this year. Besides me and Kim, also our friend Doctor Sun was present with the two Chinese gentlemen, of which one was a communist. As you remember, there was no conference in Kathmandu last year because of the elections, wherefore we had one in Darjeeling instead; but perhaps you could say, that the Kathmandu conference took place this year instead.

No one made any notes, the meeting had no secretary, so I transmit only the headlines and the atmosphere of our conversation. Copy the document, make editions and abbreviations as you will, and then destroy it according to our normal procedure.

(It should here be noted, that all conferences and political talks which John ever participated in were possible only on the condition that nothing was taken down in writing. That's why I always have to destroy all of John's documents, so that he never runs the risk of being blamed for any written reports of such secret talks.

*Editor's note.)*

I imagine our talks should be of special interest to you since you were being discussed. What was said could be of some guidance to you for the future.

Our talks were held in English, Nepali and Chinese. Most of what the Chinese said between themselves in Chinese I could not understand, but Doctor Sun gave me detailed accounts afterwards, which I trust. Nothing was said in Swedish, which is why my translation sometimes may seem a bit artificial. I didn't write it all down in English, since I would rather concentrate it all in Swedish, since no one else here understands that language, and since I enjoy practising my Swedish. Of course, no microphones or tape-recorders are possible on occasions like this.

Doctor Sun acted as our host and chairman. I will try to render it all as Max Chablon would have handed it down.

*Sun* I am very happy to have you all here together under the same roof, so that we can discuss important matters, which concern not only India and China but the whole world. These my friends from China are Mr Ho and Mr Ping. Mr Ho is a member of the communist party and has some influence. Mr Ping is a diplomat and is mainly here as a spectator. Mr Kim is a Buddhist representing India, while our friend Mr John, who is a westerner, is deeply concerned in both Tibetan, Buddhist, political and religious issues.

*Ping* What religion does he represent?

*John* I was born a Christian in the Orthodox Church, and my education is Greek-Russian; but I have now been here in India for almost four years and know Ladakh as well as Tibet.

*Ping (to Sun)* So he does not represent the western world?

*John* I represent the western world only as a democrat.

*Ping* A most important political marking.

*Sun* But we all represent peace. We all desire peace, and we have here a golden opportunity to meet across the borders, India with China and democracy with communism.

*Kim* India feels the continued Chinese occupation and sinofication of Tibet as a constant and growing threat against India.

*Ho* India has nothing to fear from China, we assure you.

*Kim* How can India have faith in the insurances of China when China has placed so many nuclear weapons in Tibet pointing directly at the most populous states of India?

*Ho* You simply have to believe our insurances. You have no alternative. You have nothing to put against us.

*Ping (in Chinese)* Undiplomatic, Mr Ho.

*Ho (in Chinese)* I don't care. India can't threaten us.

*Ping (in Chinese)* That's why we shouldn't threaten them either.

*Ho (in Chinese)* Don't you think I know that? But that fellow (*pointing at Kim*) tries to be rude and impertinent.

*Ping (in Chinese)* Let him roar. He has no teeth.

*Kim* We have nothing to put against you, but the world opinion is growing against you without the help of India.

*Ho (to Ping)* Just listen to him! He dares to threaten us! - Mr Kim, are you trying to threaten us? Are you part of the international conspiracy against China? What do you think we have the communist party for? To safeguard China and save her! We don't want western decadence and corruption in China! We don't want American barbarity with video violence, pornography and drugs! We want to keep our China intact and well organized as a state! The whole western world is disintegrating especially morally! It is our moral duty towards our country and people to protect us against all that!

*Kim* Why then do you persecute Buddhism?

*Ho* We do not persecute Buddhism.

*Kim* It is almost extirpated in China. In Tibet you destroyed almost all Buddhistic monasteries and books.

*Ho* That was a mistake committed by the gang of four. Since then we have restored the monasteries.

*Kim* You have restored a tenth of all the ruined monasteries and only such monasteries that could be visited by tourists. The rest of the monasteries you allow your impoverished Tibetans to rebuild at their own cost, like for instance Ganden, one of the three greatest monasteries in the world, which you forced the Tibetans to tear down brick by brick, beam by beam, by hand, to transport all the loose stones down into the valley. Now without your help they have to carry up every one of those stones again.

*Ping (in Chinese)* Leave this to me, dear colleague. (*to Kim*) Buddhism is being restored in all China. It has been subject to gross injustice not only in Tibet but in all China.

*Sun* Is it not even so, Mr Ping, that you, knowing well the state of affairs in China, quite coolly reckon with the possibility that Buddhism could regain so much influence that it could replace the communist party in China if necessary?

*Ping (with a shy glance towards Ho)* As a matter of fact, that is so, Doctor Sun.

*Ho (in Chinese)* What is this? The communist party can not tolerate Buddhist conspiracies.

*Ping (in Chinese)* This is no conspiracy, my friend. It is rather like an insurance.

*Ho (in Chinese)* Dear colleague, I don't understand you. Are you loyal to the party or not?

*Ping (in Chinese)* Of course I am.

*Ho (in Chinese)* How then can you be a Buddhist?

*Ping (in Chinese)* Mr Ho, our party has existed for fifty years. Buddhism has existed for one half of five thousand years. It has survived all crises. Not even the communist party has succeeded in destroying it.

*Ho (in Chinese)* Comrade, your superstition amazes me.

*Sun* My friends, let's speak English and not depart from the subject.

*Ho (in Chinese, pointing at John)* For the sake of that imperialistic westerner?

*Sun (indicating Kim)* We are not only Chinese here, and English is the one language that we all understand.

*Ho (turning to John)* Well then, Mr Westerner, for your sake we will speak English. You haven't said much. We would like to know what you are doing here. We can't identify your colour.

*John* I am neutral but very much here to learn and understand. I respect your arguments. I myself consider the American vulgarity culture and capitalism as perhaps the greatest evil in the world. The one thing which perhaps is even more evil is your treatment of the Tibetan people.

*Ho* They were barbarians. We civilized them.

*John* With atom bombs? By destroying their schools and universities?

*Ho* No. They were fortresses of corruption and exploitation.

*John* They contained only books and works of art. (*interrupting before Ho starts to speak*) And to this evil is added your treatment of the Uigurs of East Turkestan and the Mongolians of Inner Mongolia.

*Ho* You mean the barbarians of Sinkiang. They are only muslims.

*Kim* But you explode your atomic bombs in the land of this people which you occupy.

*Ho* Sinkiang has always belonged to China.

*John* No, it has been independent whenever it has had the possibility, just like Tibet, Manchuria and Mongolia.

*Ho* So, Mr John, you desire to bereave China of Tibet, Sinkiang, Inner Mongolia and Manchuria?

*John* Unfortunately the Manchurians are now only four percent in their own country. The rest of the people there are implanted Han Chinese.

*Ho* Emigrants and pioneers!

*John* Call it what you will. They were placed there by you. The other peoples, that is the Tibetans, Mongolians and Uigurs, don't want to share the same destiny of being swallowed up and naturally exterminated by Han. They want to survive. And they see no other possibility of survival than by freeing themselves from China.

*Ho* They can only survive within the civilization of the People's Republic.

*John* They themselves say the direct contrary.

*Ho* They can't manage on their own. Not even the Russians could manage on their own after their fall from socialism.

*John* Because socialism had destroyed the environment of the whole Soviet Union. Do you want the same thing to happen in China?

*Ping* It has already happened in many places.

*Kim* Koko Nor for instance.

*Ping* Not only Koko Nor.

*Ho (in Chinese)* Comrade, you amaze me more and more with your low morals.

*Ping (in Chinese)* Comrade, China is no longer infallible in the eyes of the world. Sooner or later all our secrets will become known.

*Ho (in Chinese)* Through spies! How do we know for certain that these westerners are not spies, who have come here only to get something out of us?

*Ping (in Chinese)* Doctor Sun assured us of their neutrality.

*Sun* Gentlemen, I assure you that Mr Kim only represents Indian and Buddhist interests. Mr John has taken sides against America as much as you.

*Ho (in Chinese)* America is not the only dangerous party! It's the whole world capitalism! How do we know that Mr John does not represent some secretly false humanitarian organization which only serves capitalistic interests?

*Ping (in Chinese)* Comrade, I must warn you against your lack of diplomacy. Your way of thinking can only lead into blind alleys and civil wars.

*Kim* Speak English!

*Sun (in Chinese)* Gentlemen, please co-operate. That's why we are here. His Majesty the King of Nepal gave us his special permission to gather here for the sake of peace.

*Ho (in Chinese)* How can the world be so blind and seduced by capitalism so as not to see how communism only desires to propagate peace!

*Sun (in Chinese)* Say it in English.

*Ho (says the same thing in English)*

*Kim* If it only wants to propagate peace, why then does it use violence?

*Ho* China does not use violence. Our only method is friendly persuasion.

*Kim* In Tibet that friendly persuasion has always only consisted of violence.

*Ho* You are wrong.

*Kim* Mr Ho, you are extremely naïve.

*Ho (to Ping, in Chinese)* He insults me!

*Sun* Mr Ho, a theoretical question. If there would be a civil war between the communist party and the army, which side would you take? Would you defend the order and security of the country and support the army, or would you defend your country's freedom and the communist party?

*Ho* Such a situation can never occur.

*Sun* How can you be so certain?

*Ho* It is simply impossible.

*Sun* And you, Mr Ping?

*Ping* I admit that the situation could occur. Doctor Sun's question is important. The communist party defends positions which are becoming obsolete while the army is constantly becoming more corrupt. These two developments work against each other. If a crisis would occur, I would abandon both and join a Buddhist party.

*Kim* Why not a democratic party?

*Ping* China is not yet mature enough for thorough democracy.

*Ho (in Chinese)* This is the first sensible thing you have uttered today, comrade.

*Ping (in Chinese)* I wish you the same wisdom.

*Sun* Mr Ho, in what respects do you think the communist party has succeeded?

*Ho* In all respects.

*Sun* Give an example.

*Ho* Birth control. In that field China has succeeded while the whole world has failed, *(turning to Kim)* and especially India.

*John* Do you then consider it human and natural to *force* families into having only one child?

*Ho* It is necessary. It is necessary in the whole world. The uncontrolled growth of mankind is a threat to all life. The natural epidemics, which formerly limited the growth of mankind, have been eliminated by medical science, and Aids is spreading too slowly. That's why compulsory measures have to be used.

*John* So you desire a faster epidemic of Aids?

*Ho* Yes, especially in Africa, South America and India. Look what life has become in cities like Calcutta, São Paulo, Mexico City, Cairo and Delhi! It would be pure charity to let 90% of all the poor people in the world die, so that the others could have a safer future!

*John* More than half of humanity are living in extreme poverty. So you would suggest that half of humanity would perish so that the other half would survive?

*Ho* Yes. That would be reasonable.

*John* And would you then also sacrifice half of all Chinese?

Ho China would only benefit if more than half of all Chinese didn't exist.

John At least you are consistent.

Ho And what are your views on the development of the western world? There you find the worst destruction of the environment in the world.

John I have always been of the opinion that man should return to nature since only nature can save her. The great cities of eight figures I have always considered as death traps.

Ho Then we lean in the same direction. That pleases me. You are sensible after all. But on my part all cities with more than a million people should be done away with.

John In the western world we think that the population explosion is only due to poverty. If the standard of living was increased beyond poverty and distress, families would no longer have many children, and uncontrolled population growth would cease. But we don't believe in communist compulsory measures. Only capitalistic freedom could accomplish the desired results.

Ho What differences do the methods make, as long as we have results? I believe our methods to be more efficient.

John But they are inhuman.

Ho Is Aids, prostitution, drug abuse and suicide more human?

Sun The problem is whether the results could be reached by human means.

Kim Gentlemen, your alternatives are equally inhuman, while the voluntary celibacy of Buddhism and Christianity could be the correct solution and even more efficient than dictatorial force.

Ho China is democratic!

Ping (in Chinese) Don't start all that again!

Ho (in Chinese) He is insulting me!

Sun Gentlemen, I think we have come through our most important matters. May I now invite you for dinner?

Ho Doctor Sun, this was the first sensible thing you have said today. I wanted to end these meaningless discussions all along.

Ping Before we finish, I have still an important question. Doctor Sun, it has come to my knowledge that you have written an article in a western English-speaking journal published by a close friend of Mr John's. We agreed to accept your invitation here for these discussions on condition that they would not come out. How do we know that our talks will be kept secret?

Sun I wrote an article about the future of China in a small insignificant cultural journal, the editor of which I know personally. He works with music and research in literature and is completely harmless.

Ho How can you be so certain?

Sun Gentlemen, you just have to accept it, like Kim has to accept that your nuclear guns are pointed at India.

Ho So you will write nothing of this in that journal or any other journal?

Sun I give you my word that I will not. I am under obligation of silence.

Ping (in Chinese) And what about these two? (indicating John and Kim)

Sun Mr John and Mr Kim, my friends demand of you that you will write nothing in English about our talks here today.

John We promise not to transmit any single English word of what has been said here today.

Ping Or Chinese.

John Or Chinese.

Sun Are you satisfied, gentlemen?

*Ping* We shall have to be. Perhaps China after all here today has come one step closer to India and the western world.

*Kim* Only one question: what are your plans concerning Hongkong and Taiwan?

*Ho* The conference is finished.

Doctor Sun brought us smoothly over from our explosive debates to dinner. We did not get anything more interesting out of the Chinese. Mr Ho was silent and sullen during dinner, while Mr Ping was all superficial politeness. I think both felt they had said too much and at least more than they had intended. Doctor Sun was admirable all through by keeping a perfect balance. He is an invaluable asset to us.

Next day we had a completely different kind of conference, which I have not been able to reconstruct in the same way. Instead of the Chinese we had a Buddhist monk from Tibet who is close to Dalai Lama, and a tough Khampa, an incorrigible fighter of the Chinese, who belonged to the last who openly fought the Chinese, who has never given up and who still moves about in Tibet as he wishes without ever having been caught by the Chinese, since he knows the roads and paths better than they do. It is maybe superfluous to add that he is an old close friend of mine and one of my best guides. Doctor Sun was also present.

Instead of Chinese a lot of Tibetan was spoken, but neither Doctor Sun nor Kim interrupted when the Tibetans spontaneously passed their intensive discussions over into Tibetan, since they always afterwards explained everything to us.

The only important point of this almost equally enduring conference was, that my friend the Khampa succeeded in making it quite clear to Doctor Sun, that he personally had no intention to ever rest or give up until not only Tibet was completely independent and restored to its natural and ethnic borders, but also East Turkestan, Inner Mongolia (restored to Mongolia) and Manchuria. He also made it quite clear to Doctor Sun that the Chinese, after the restored independence of these nations, could count on being thrown out from all parts where they had succeeded to plant themselves at the cost of the original population, and with greater consequence and brutality than the Russians were bereft of their rights in the Baltic states. He implied that it was quite realistic, when Turkestan would become independent, to count on that the Muslims there would not hesitate to massacre every single Chinese who had helped in ruining their country. Concerning Turkestan he also made it plain that the Muslims there had massive support to count on from all Muslim nations in Central Asia, since all these countries including Turkey had received hundreds of thousands of refugees from Turkestan, the so called Sinkiang, which in Chinese only means The New Province. Further, he warned Kim especially against leniency and compliance towards the Chinese from the part of India and the western world. He pointed out the western indifference concerning Hongkong and its future after 1997:

"The Chinese have no soul and no integrity. They are a vast spiritless mass constituting a kind of ethnic amoeba swelling and spreading and swallowing everything up which it gets into contact with. Hongkong and the western world can not rely on Hongkong being permitted to keep any kind of individuality after July 1997. The way we know China, it is probable that all things personal in Hongkong then will vanish, like in Taiwan, if China is allowed to take care of this island too."

Of course, the representative of Dalai Lama protested against such an uncompromising attitude and considered the policy of my Khampa both dangerous and unwise. The Khampa answered, that his attitude was no policy, but simply the manner in which every Tibetan, Turkestanian, Mongolian and Manchurian was thinking all over Asia, who had ever had any contact with any Chinese. They had

learned this implacable attitude from 46 years of oppression. The monk maintained that the attitude was dangerous, unwise and most un-Buddhistic but resigned.

Doctor Sun said very little but listened very carefully. When my Khampa seemed to have won the field, he said: "God help China," as if he had given up and thought that nothing could save China.

Afterwards I asked him more privately what he really had intended. He presented a very interesting train of thought: "China suffered terribly under western imperialism from 1850 and under the Japanese and Kuomintang up to 1949, but no evil coming from the west was worse than communism. Karl Marx based his life's work and philosophy on an envious hatred of higher classes, and this hatred was the only drive in his whole life. Communism was from beginning to end based only on hatred, and this hatred all Chinese have been forced to swallow during the whole period of Chairman Mao and even longer. This hatred was allowed to furiously hit also other people and especially the Tibetans, perhaps the least hating people in the world. But hatred always returns to itself. It has to strike back on the Chinese themselves; and this hatred, which the communists have scourged China with for 46 years, will not hit the communists, who like in Russia will simply vanish and change colours, as hard as it will hit the vast innocent mass of the ill-fated Chinese people."

These memorable days were the first and second of November in Kathmandu. A few days later an Israeli shot his Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin to death. This gave me much to think of. There is however nothing that unites this Israeli right-wing extremist with my Khampa. They come from two different worlds. I was reminded, though, of your analysis of the equally extremist doctor Baruch Goldstein, who in February last year in madness shot down, was it 29 Palestinians? Your analysis with a cautious explanation of the madman's way of thinking must have given rise to misunderstandings and bad blood. You must denounce such terrorism, because it is nothing else. No Tibetan or other person branded by Chinese oppression has ever gone so far as to terrorism. The terrorists in China are only Chinese; and unfortunately there are many resemblances between individual Chinese commissars, soldiers and guards who kill from sheer panic or madness, and such as those two senseless Israeli murderers, who only do their utmost to destroy Israel. That at least is my opinion.

While I sympathize with Doctor Sun and his compassion, I must at the same time declare my Khampa to be in the right. When Chinese perish through national convulsions you are never informed of the exact number of casualties. An example: at Tiananmen Square in Peking June 4<sup>th</sup> 1989, the communist party published casualty figures of some hundred who had been "killed by mistake" or had died "under self-inflicted circumstances". In brief, Deng Xiaoping was of the opinion, that it was all their own fault who died on Tiananmen Square, since they stood in the way of the tanks; while the whole world could watch on television, how these brutally drove over and killed off thousands. The actual figure of death is estimated to some 10,000, possibly 12,000. It's impossible to find out the exact figure. In the concentration camps around Xining some 10 million prisoners are reputed to be held. No one knows exactly, and even less does anyone know how many have died there or been killed under the communist regime, but it should be more. During the "great leap forward", when China was industrialized by force during the 50s, about 40 million people died from starvation. No one knows exactly. They were forced from the countryside into vast industrial collectives where only worthless junk was fabricated, while millions were organized to kill little birds in madness for nothing. During the cultural revolution about 100 million people perished or vanished - no one knows exactly. The human dignity is non-existent in China and has only been developed in Taiwan and Hongkong, which these oases naturally don't want to lose, and which is the first thing

they will lose if they are incorporated into China. No human dignity can be developed in China as long as the communists run the country. Their regime has from beginning to end been characterized by empty promises that were broken - the Chinese have never given any promise without breaking it. Of all the unreliable peoples of the world, this is the most consistent."

*John B. Westerberg*

(All this has been translated from the author's Swedish original. We have reason to assume, that the discussions as recorded above never took place, since what was actually said never was taken down in writing except in another language afterwards. The facts and figures, only, should be considered truthful, while the wordings certainly must have been different in reality.)

*(November 1995)*

### *It Happens in Lhasa*

A young Tibetan threw two stones at an armed guard. A vice-platoon leader asked: "Shall we beat him?" As the stone hit a vice-battalion commander in his leg, he ordered: "Beat him!" Then he led three armed policemen to chase the Tibetan who had thrown the stones. The Tibetan ran into the house of an ordinary Tibetan family. The armed policemen crashed upon the door and raked the residents with gunfire. All six members of the family were killed, among whom the youngest boy was only eleven years old. But the Tibetan who threw the stones climbed a wall and ran away. The armed policemen followed him and shot him in the leg. One armed police then rushed forward and hit the Tibetan's head with his rifle. The rifle went off accidentally, and an armed policeman behind him was struck in the neck and died instantly. When the vice-platoon leader saw his fellow die, he angrily hit the Tibetan with his rifle and smashed the brains out of the Tibetan's head. When the policemen hit this young Tibetan with their guns, six Tibetans from another family stood in their doorway not far away and cried: "Murderers! Murderers!" The vice-platoon leader then picked up his machine gun and raked them with gunfire. All six Tibetans died.

This is a quotation of a Chinese cadre who witnessed the whole thing. This was not during the difficult days in the 50s but as late as in March 1989. The same Chinese reported to Amnesty International of a massacre in Lhasa in the same month in which 256 Tibetans were murdered.

As you see, the situation in Lhasa is somewhat different from the case of the poor Palestinians throwing stones in the Intifada.

We shall present similar incidents from China's occupied territories in following issues.

### *Concerning Buddhism*

It could be discussed whether Buddhism is really a religion, since it is rather the supreme philosophy. Religion has been defined as "a conviction about a higher power which rules the life of man", which indicates a belief in one or more gods or in destiny. Those are the very things that Buddhism denies. Instead it professes, that each individual is himself responsible principally for the whole universe and his connections with it, which includes his relationship and all his business therewith. Buddhism is in fact so scientific, that its founder from the beginning makes all dogmatism impossible, as he instead encourages his disciples to never take anything for granted but to

carefully investigate everything and never accept anything which hasn't been proved to be valid and true by testing. Each one should carefully find the right way by himself alone and one step at a time.

So there is no god in Buddhism, and the one who least of all is any kind of god is Buddha himself, whose real name was Siddhartha Gautama Sakyamuni Tathagrata, which names stand for Christian name, surname, clan name and a title which means "Truth-sayer". This last name was the only title which the man gave himself. It means more exactly: "the teller of the truth, as others have told the truth, as it will always be told" or "the speaker of the timeless truth". An absolutely exact translation of the word is not possible in English.

The man, who was born a Hindu in a royal castle, broke radically with the Hindu traditions, all the established gods and the whole caste system. The one thing he developed instead was the teaching of Karma, which is close to our sense of "destiny" or "fate"; but the Asiatic way of taking the idea of reincarnation for granted gives Karma an infinitely more profound significance. What Buddha consistently sought and found was a total liberation from all vanities and unimportant things in life - all disturbing thoughts, all desires and sufferings and, in brief, all things evil. The Buddhist ideal is then to acquire a perfectly pure mind which is free from every kind of desire, which necessitates a perfect celibate. This supreme peace of mind has a higher status in Buddhism than all the knowledge and education in the world.

To reach this ideal you have to clean up your Karma, which is the burden of all evil subconscious memories from the past and notably from past lives, which then could be infinite in number with infinities of burdens. This process is achieved by a moderate life of asceticism and meditation. According to Buddha, each one could only do this by himself and alone.

You could also call Buddhism a high ethical moral philosophy, which goes further than anything else in realizing the Greek god Apollo's command: "Know thyself!" A consequence of this commandment would seem to be a slight risk for egoism, which risk is eliminated by the great Buddhistic commandment of love and charity, which even involves the prohibition against killing animals, and by the establishment of the human phenomenon called *Bodhisattvas*.

A Bodhisattva is a Buddha who has achieved Nirvana, that is perfect freedom from the burdens of Karma, and who accordingly have no need of further reincarnations, but who from sheer pity with mankind allow themselves to be reincarnated all the same just in order to help others. There are different views within Buddhism whether Buddha himself after his life's work left the reincarnation process for good or continued as a Bodhisattva. According to the Theravada school of Buddhism, which is the oldest school and the established one in Ceylon, Burma and Thailand, concentrating on Buddhist teachings, it is quite possible and maybe even probable that Buddha returned occasionally. According to Mahayana Buddhism, "the great wheel", which is more practical with a remarkably democratic character, and which stresses Buddhist charity in practice, the established school of thought in Japan and China, Buddha never returned. Of course it is more positive and tempting to speculate in his possibly continued career as a chronic Bodhisattva. (There is a parallel in Christianity: "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," the famous last words of Jesus in the gospel of St. Matthew, the clearest thinkable manifestation of a real Bodhisattva.)

There is a third school within Buddhism which at the same time is the newest, the most remarkable and definitely the most controversial. This is the Tantric school of Tibet, which evolves Buddhist meditation to such extremes, that the breath-taking exercises may lead to perfect control not only of one's own body (enabling you to survive a Tibetan winter naked outside keeping warm all the time) but even of the laws

of nature (enabling you for example to dispose of the law of gravitation, calling forth hail-storms as Milarepa did, and to run wild at tremendous speed almost weightlessly, a phenomenon described in detail by Alexandra David-Néel, etc.) and even of world politics (enabling you to predict incredible events which actually occur.) The controversial element in these extreme Tantric practices is, from our point of view, that they seem to be nothing else than super-egoistic trips, with an ugly stress on ego and egoism. In such extreme Tantric exercises there seems to be no room left for love and charity. Typical of lamas of the Tantric school is, though, that they consistently dissuade others from following that way, simply because it is so utterly perilous, demanding a Buddhist sense of what is right which transcends this world. The higher up you get, the more easily you go wrong and fall down the whole way to the bottom.

Buddha was himself against such supernatural practice. On one occasion he met a guru by a river who had spent forty years trying to learn to walk on water. Buddha deplored him and said: "Forty years he has thrown away on this vanity, when it would have been so much easier for him just to go to the ferry-man down the river, who would have brought him dry-shod across for almost nothing!"

Buddhism has dominated the major part of eastern Asia for 2500 years and is still expanding, nowadays also in the west. 1500 years ago it also dominated all Central Asia up to Persia, all India and large parts of Indonesia; but Islam replaced it with violence, while Hinduism regained all India. How could Hinduism, which Buddhism almost universally had replaced, recover almost totally and regain almost all lost territory?

The answer is threefold: the Indian climate, Buddhist moral strictness with never popular celibacy, and the irresistible sensualism of Hinduism. In the long run the Hindus preferred a sensual religion to the opposite, which has much to do with the warm sweet climate of India. Buddhism has almost only survived in India in the cooler mountains. However, Buddhism is now expanding in India again, since so many Hindus born out of caste find this religion a better alternative than a life born outside society, from which you automatically become an outcast forever. That brings us back to Buddha's radical and in those days heroic overthrow of all barriers between different castes, classes and races.

### *Letter from Calcutta.*

The most important point in the letter from our old wonderful friend in Calcutta is this:

"The biggest crime we are facing today in the world is, that only 10% of all people are enjoying 90% of the global resources, and that 90% of all people in this world are starving because they only get 10% of the resources of this world. The 10% rich people are polluting the environment by 90% while the rest of humankind, 90%, are only polluting it by 10%. This situation can not go on any longer, and these problems of universal injustice you can't write about without receiving threats to your life."

The most resounding approval our dear friend in Calcutta would probably have from *Greenpeace*, who justly point out the great oil companies as the chief polluters of the planet almost without anyone to match them; and the heroic *Greenpeace crusaders* make it their indefatigable aim to stop all new oil fields from exploiting new grounds and from continuing to accelerate the already disastrous imperilment of the planet.

At the Kyoto conference, the United States showed the least interest to impede the global environment destruction and the global warming while they at the same time are the leading destroyers of the atmosphere. Significant for their double standards is also the fact that they produce the films "*Seven Years in Tibet*" and "*Kundun*" about the Chinese oppression of Tibet while at the same time they allow themselves to be duped

by Jiang Zheming to sell nuclear technology to China for tens of millions of dollars, while the communists in Peking laugh at their naïvety.

*"The head task of a politician is to never let his head know what his hands are doing."*

13. old Chinese proverb.

### *Concerning Hinduism*

Its most remarkable characteristic is connected with its basic mystery. The problem and the mystery of Hinduism is that it is impossible to date. According to its own traditions, its origin goes back in time between 3000, 30,000 or 300,000 years. The first task the first European religious scientists tried to grapple with when they came to India was to find out how old it was. They have never succeeded.

A faint glimpse of hope started to appear as the ancient civilizations in the Indus valley around Harappa started to be unearthed by archaeologists. These ruins of a high ancient civilization have been dated to around 3000 years B.C. In vain, however, were any clues sought to the origin of the Indian literature. In this field no one got any wiser while many got more confused.

The Indian literature of the Vedas, which is completely religious and the basis for all Hinduism, has apparently then from the very beginning taken a position outside the dimension of time. It is impossible to date, it is without historical marks, it will have nothing to do with historical reality, it is a complete outsider to this world from beginning to end. This makes it unique. All other world religions are firmly tied to a historic reality and to exact dates. Hinduism is the great and brilliant exception.

The next great problem concerning Hinduism is whether it is monotheistic or polytheistic. This problem is also impossible to solve, because it is both. It beats all other polytheistic religious records by having no less than 33 million gods, but all these uncountable gods are at the same time just different manifestations of the one and only universal divinity.

In this matter you could at least try to bring some order into the welter. In the oldest Veda scriptures the different gods are rather like the divine personages of the ancient Greek and Nordic myths. It is here important to recall that the Hindus are as much an Indo-European people as the Greeks and the Northerners, and that there are direct links and grammatical relationships between Sanskrit, Greek and Latin. But the oldest Indian mythology is constantly refashioned while it evolves. During the bringing into existence of the four parts of Vedic literature the divine personalities are transformed, so that for instance Indra and Rudra soon disappear to give place to something like a trinity consisting of Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva. Brahma is then the creator, Vishnu the maintainer and Shiva the destroyer. Shiva's wife is Kali, the goddess of death, who is often portrayed with a long bloody mouth hanging outside her mouth. The Suttees, the sacrificing of widows, with or without their permission, were performed to the honour of Kali, and also the sect of the Thugs, (a society of stranglers who probably murdered some one million people just for the sake of killing, until the English put an end to it around 1830,) were in the service of Kali. She is the chief divinity of Calcutta and the general stumbling-block in Hinduism, although her husband Shiva should share her responsibility. These two divinities represent that element of open and demonstrative eroticism, which is so alien and repulsive to all other religions.

Typically enough, the great organizer in Indian mythology is a poet of prehistoric times, quite impossible to date, even more obscure than Homer, who performs some

kind of gigantic editing of the whole Vedic literature and in addition to this writes the entire "Mahabharata", the longest epic poem in the world, which consists of more than 100,000 verses. (For comparison, the "Iliad" and the "Odyssey" contain together only 27,781 verses.) Now you may consider, that the "Mahabharata" is not altogether up to Homeric standards, but then you also have to confess, that the "Bhagavad-Ghita", which is a chapter in "Mahabharata", must be considered one of the highest quality masterpieces in world literature. Gandhi found greater solace in the "Bhagavad-Ghita" than in the whole New Testament, and he is not the only person educated in the west who came to that conclusion. Many, who were asked what book they would bring to a desert island if they only were allowed one, did without hesitation choose the "Bhagavad-Ghita".

This great editor of all the Vedic literature was called Vyasadeva, and although you don't even approximately know when he lived - (awkward western efforts have placed him somewhere before Alexander the Great and Chandragupta, but that age is long - ) we do know exactly *where* he was busy. He moved around the parts north of Delhi approximately between the river Beas and the Nepalese border, where many of the geographical names in his epic are to be found even today. Kurukshetra, the battle scene of the "Bhagavad-Ghita", is half way from Delhi to Simla.

In the "Bhagavad-Ghita" a new divinity in Hinduism climbs up to the first rank and stays there to in some ways even replace all the earlier ones. This is Krishna. In a way he resembles Christ, since he is a god who incarnates himself in a human body and has many all too human traits to his character. The Brahmins, the highest caste and class in Indian society, affirm at the same time that Krishna is only another incarnation of Vishnu, which they later on also affirm that the Buddha is.

That brings us to make a closer investigation of this Vishnu. To many Hindus he is the same as Brahma while he is never confused with Shiva. Vishnu is a highly constructive divinity, both creator and supporter of all things created, an upholder of life; no evil or destructive tendencies are to be found here but only creative and positive forces. That both Krishna and Buddha are regarded as incarnations of Vishnu gives Vishnu an undeniable status in Hinduism as a kind of highest universal divinity and a perfectly good divine ideal.

We earlier touched Buddha's reformation, his radical annulment of all barriers between castes and races and how his new form of religion dominated India and Asia from Afghanistan to Indonesia and Japan for more than a thousand years. The great reviver of Hinduism was the reformist Shankara, who defeated Buddhism by reinstating Shiva. Hinduism in its prebuddhistic, populist and primitive forms had completely vanished from all India, and by appealing to those very emotions and instincts of the Hindus which were personified by the dubious, partly destructive and impertinently erotic Shiva, the young Shankara succeeded in urging an irresistible Hinduistic renaissance all over India. He died only 32 years old in the year 820.

Two remarkable revivals of Hinduism have occurred also in modern times and that by European initiatives. Madame Blavatsky was seized by such an interest in Hinduism towards the end of the 19<sup>th</sup> century that she founded her theosophical movement directly on Hinduism. The second great European discoverer of Hinduism was the author, the music expert and the Nobel prize winner Romain Rolland, who preached Hinduism to all Europe especially during the 20's and became a Hinduist himself.

Ramakrishna, Vivekananda and Rabindranath Tagore are other names which must be mentioned in the context of the modern dynamic life force of Hinduism together with Mahatma Gandhi.

The irresistible vitality and explosively constructive dynamic qualities of Hinduism have in our time, however, brought us into something of a theological crisis, which also

comprises Buddhism. This problem has risen from the population explosion. Within these religions it has always been regarded as self-evident, that life consummation only can be accomplished by the human being. Today the human being appears suddenly like a monster worse than any animal, since he is devastating the planet by environment destruction and the annihilation of living species, whole races of plants and animals and all living things. Suddenly leading Hindus therefore start to regard certain animals as higher creatures than man, since these animals are being martyred by man. This is an increasing theological dilemma to all religions that embrace the reincarnation way of thinking, since man by his uncontrollable multiplication is losing his special standing and status by a sort of flooding homeopathic dilution, that imperils all life, whereby other life forms than man emerge as more important than man. To the Hindus this is the evil and self-destructive time of Kali.

Finally a clearance of the great Hindu mistake. The name is wrong from the beginning. The river Indus was originally called Sindus, as the desert Sind still maintains its correct original name. The Persians got the name wrong and called the river Indus and the people Indians from the river, while others instead of an "s" placed an "h" in front of the word, so that the people were called Hindus. Correcting it now seems to be difficult, although you can try, like Mr Thackeray of Bombay tries to change the name of the city to "Mumbai", which some people claim was its original name. Well, a dear child gets called by many names.

### *The Rules of the Buddhistic Order*

Here are the four rules about the offences that deserve expulsion. They should be recited every fortnight.

1. If a monk should have sexual intercourse with anyone, down to an animal, this monk has fallen into an offence which deserves expulsion, and he should no longer live in the community.
2. If a monk, whether he dwells in a village or in solitude, should take anything not given, he should no longer live in the community. This, however, only applies to thefts for which a king or his police would seize a thief and kill, imprison, banish, fine or reprove him.
3. If a monk should intentionally take the life of a human being or of one like a human being with his own hand or with a knife or by having him assassinated, then he has fallen into an offence which deserves expulsion. And this applies also to a monk who incites others to self-destruction and who speaks to them in praise of death with such words as, "O man, what is the use to you of this miserable life? It is better for you to die than to be alive!"
4. Unless a monk be actuated by excessive self-conceit, he commits an offence which deserves expulsion if, vainly and without basis in fact, he falsely claims to have realized and perceived superhuman states or the fullness of the insights of the saints.

Here are the thirteen offences which deserve suspension, and which should every fortnight be recited. These forbid a monk:

1. intentionally to emit his semen, except in a dream.
2. with a mind excited and perverted by passion to come into bodily contact with a woman; he must not hold her hand or arm, touch her hair or any other part of her body, above or below, or rub or caress it.
3. with a mind excited and perverted by passion to persuade a woman to sexual intercourse, speaking wicked, evil and vulgar words, as young men use to their girls.

4. with a mind excited and perverted by passion, in the presence of a woman to speak highly of the merit of the gift of her own body, saying: "That is the supreme service or gift, dear sister, to offer intercourse to monks like us, who have been observing strict morality, have abstained from intercourse and lived lovely lives!"

5. to act as a go-between between women and men, arranging marriage, adultery, or even a brief meeting.

6. to build for himself, without the help of a layman, a temporary hut on a site which involves the destruction of living beings and has no open space around it, and that without showing the site to other monks, and without limiting its size to the prescribed measurements.

7. to build for himself, with the help of a layman, a more permanent living place on a dangerous and inaccessible site, which involves the destruction of living beings and has no open space round it, and that without showing the site to other monks.

8. from anger, malice and dislike to accuse falsely a pure and faultless monk of an offence which deserves expulsion, intent on driving him out of the religious life. That becomes an offence which deserves suspension if on a later occasion he withdraws his accusation and admits to having spoken from hatred; and likewise if-

9. he tries to base his false accusation on some trifling matter or other which is really quite irrelevant.

10. to persist, in spite of repeated admonitions, in trying to cause divisions in a community which lives in harmony, and in emphasizing those points which are calculated to cause division.

11. to side with a monk who strives to split the community.

12. to refuse to move into another district when reproved by the other monks for habitually doing evil deeds in a city or village where he resides, deeds which are seen, heard and known, and which harm the families of the faithful.

13. to refuse to be admonished by others about the non-observance of the Rules. These are the thirteen offences which deserve suspension. The first nine become offences at once, the remaining four only after the third admonition. The offending monk will be first put on probation, then for six days and nights he must do penance, and thereafter he must undergo a special ceremony before he can be rehabilitated. But he can be reinstated only by a community which number at least twenty monks, not one less.

### The Ten Precepts

I undertake the rule of training to refrain from injury to living things.

I undertake the rule of training to refrain from taking that which is not given.

I undertake the rule of training to refrain from unchastity.

I undertake the rule of training to refrain from falsehood.

I undertake the rule of training to refrain from liquors which engender slothfulness.

I undertake the rule of training to refrain from eating at wrong times (i.e. after noon).

I undertake the rule of training against (attending) dancing, singing, music and stage plays.

I undertake the rule of training against adorning the body with garlands, perfumes and cosmetics.

I undertake the rule of training against using a high or large bed.

I undertake the rule of training against the accepting of gold and silver.

----

These rules are perhaps the only testament of the Buddha. That's the closest we can get to him, and they are perhaps the oldest and only preserved original wordings by himself. They have been of inestimable significance to all Asia and remain so still, since this simple Rule, which concerns monks and nuns, could be said to have been the most civilizing factor of Asia. It was drawn in the fifth century B.C. and has never changed.

In those days the Greek drama and classical music had not yet been developed, and he would probably not have had anything against such advanced and disciplined forms of art, in spite of his seventh precept.

----

These articles have been selected from the Swedish issues of "The Free Thinker" numbers 41-48, December 1995-July 1996. All have been translated from Swedish, except the Rule of the Buddhist Order, which we owe to mr Christmas Humphreys and his excellently informative and concise book "The Wisdom of Buddhism", Harper & Row 1970.

Gothenburg, Sweden, July 1996.

### *Peter Fleming and the Great Game*

This brother of Ian Fleming wrote his most renowned book "Bayonets to Lhasa" about the Younghusband expedition 1904 to Tibet, in 1960 directly after the Tibetan rebellion in 1959 and the escape of Dalai Lama from Lhasa. No wonder then that the book is much more than just a documentary on the Younghusband expedition.

Peter Fleming is really the first one to realize what the Chinese actually have done. He makes his book the instrument to sound the alarm of what is going on, in a most literarily proper way, thereby directly catching on to "the Great Game" of the 19<sup>th</sup> century and opening the scene for its continuation.

"The Great Game" in the 19<sup>th</sup> century was the competition between Britain and Russia for domination in central Asia. It almost amounted to a frontier between the two super powers going right through Persia and Afghanistan, since the British were very much afraid of the Russians gaining a foothold in Kashmir and Himalaya. To prevent the Russians from entering Tibet, the Younghusband expedition was launched, which practically led to Tibetan independance until 1950. Colonel Younghusband reached Lhasa and achieved some trade agreements with the Tibetan government, which excluded both China and Russia from Tibet. At the same time, the British left Tibet as untouched as Nepal.

In 1947 India separated from Britain and made it impossible for Britain to assist Tibet in any way. Instead the Chinese were given free hands to do whatever they liked in central Asia. 1949 Mao seized power in Peking, and he immediately planned an invasion of Tibet, which was carried out the next year. The Tibetans were forced to sign an agreement in 17 paragraphs under the threat of war if they didn't, and during the years that followed every single one of these paragraphs were violated by the Chinese, until the Tibetans had had enough of it and rebelled in 1959, which made it possible for Dalai Lama to escape to India.

Peter Fleming very percipiently points out the greatest harm in all this, which is an upset power balance in Asia. China was given the whole field alone to do whatever they liked with almost all Asia without anyone being able to interfere. Peter Fleming's perspicacity reaches a climax as he reveals the immense strategic importance of the Chinese occupation of the Tibetan plateau, from which heights long distance missiles can reach almost any object on the planet or at least every city in Asia, since Tibet is in

the middle. Neither Britain nor India realized this possibility and danger in 1947 when India broke loose, which only Winston Churchill reacted against, who then was bereft of all possibilities to do anything about it.

### *The Murder of Panchen Lama*

The last year even Dalai Lama has voiced the opinion that Panchen Lama was murdered by the Chinese in January 1989. This is what is known in the matter:

Shortly before Panchen Lama left Peking to return to Tibet in January 1989, he had a great quarrel with the communist leaders in Peking. Two days after having publicly branded the Chinese oppression in Tibet he had pains in his chest. He called for his doctor in the evening, but that doctor never turned up. Instead an unknown nurse appeared to give him an injection. After this injection Panchen Lama fell into a coma. He was dead before sunrise, while the Chinese claim that he suffered a heart attack and died later in the afternoon.

Shortly upon this a number of Panchen Lama's relatives were disposed of in the same way: they were visited by strange nurses who gave them injections putting them into a coma, whereupon they died. China officially explained that they also had suffered from sudden heart attacks. This strange occurrence of so many heart attacks in one family must then have been something of an epidemic.

This method of execution in China is regarded as more human than to shoot the victim a bullet in his neck and then bill his family for the bullet, although the more elegant method is also more expensive. Above all, it is more discreet and more diplomatically supple, especially concerning high officials with a public reputation.

The greatest worry of Dalai Lama concerning the 6-year-old Panchen Lama, who was arrested and taken away together with his parents by the Chinese, is that he might vanish into a Chinese psychiatric asylum to be drugged and brainwashed.

Chinese prisons are known to be the most horrible in the world. The one thing more horribly unhuman would then be Chinese psychiatry.

-----

This article caused some consternation and protests. It was stipulated, that it can not be proved that Panchen Lama or his relatives were murdered, and that their heart attacks might have been natural. We have to admit that none of these alleged murders have been scientifically proved.

But put the case that Panchen Lama really died of a heart attack and that all his relatives did the same. What then might have caused his heart attack? Is it impossible that 14 years' imprisonment and torture might have affected his condition and added to the risk of a heart attack at the age of only 52? Already in 1962, when Panchen Lama criticized the Chinese for the first time, he was put under close guard and forbidden to speak publicly. It took two years before the Chinese dared to let him speak publicly again. It was then on the great occasion at Barkhor, the great square in central Lhasa, when Panchen Lama praised Dalai Lama and Tibetan independence so that every Tibetan could hear it. Consequently the Chinese buried Panchen Lama alive for 14 years after a mock trial in which he was publicly manhandled.

Even after his release in 1978 he was often taken in again by the Chinese and was sometimes seen with a cauliflower ear, which he hardly had managed to inflict on himself.

In brief, although the possibility that Panchen Lama might have died of a heart attack can not be theoretically excluded, the Chinese must all the same be held responsible for his martyrdom.

It has also been stated, that Tibetans can die of heart attacks from pure empathy with a close relative, who has died in this manner. With this theory for an explanation, the relatives of Panchen Lama might have died naturally, although their heart attacks were strikingly epidemic. But if the Chinese were directly responsible for the death of Panchen Lama, the more responsible they were then for the deaths of his relatives, especially if they all died of empathic heart attacks.

So in any case the Chinese remain morally and directly responsible, which no natural or medical expertise in the world can explain away. To this comes the fact, that the Chinese had every motive in the world to wish to get rid of the exclusively embarrassing presence and existence of the late Panchen Lama.

### *A Political Reflection*

Now and then you hear countries like China, Turkey, Iraq and Indonesia scold the United States and other western nations for interfering with "the internal affairs" of these countries. Without any exception it has proved, that whenever these quarrels occur, those "internal affairs" always consist of genocides, to such an extent, that it has become axiomatic, that whenever a country tells other nations to refrain from interfering in "the internal affairs" of that country, the only thing that country wants is to continue practising genocide alone and in peace.

The more important then to interfere with "the internal affairs" of countries like China, Turkey, Iraq and Indonesia.

### *Problems in East Turkestan*

"Sinkiang" means in Chinese "the new province", while the correct name of that country is East Turkestan. It was occupied by force together with Tibet in 1950, although Mao Zedong already in 1944 had promised the Uighuri, the people of East Turkestan, independance and freedom, if they only helped him against general Chang-Kai-Shek of the Kuomintang in the Chinese civil war. The Uighuri offered Mao Zedong that help, whereupon after his victory in China, he enslaved the Uighuri together with the Tibetans and other non-Chinese peoples. Like Tibet, East Turkestan hade before 1950 normally been independant. In February this year there were violent atrocities in the town of Yining, in which 10 people died and several dozen were wounded. Already on the 6<sup>th</sup> of February, a number of Uighuri were arrested for being regarded as guilty of the disturbances, summary proceedings were held, and hundreds of Muslims were executed in the course of a few weeks. Only on February 7<sup>th</sup>, 30 Uighuri were publicly executed.

The Chinese in "Sinkiang" are only 37% of the population, of which the majority are Muslim Uighuri, a Turkish people of mainly nomads. About 500.000 Uighuri live as refugees in neighbouring countries from Central Asia to Turkey. Almost all Chinese in "Sinkiang" have been stationed there against their will and deported from China to this kind of Chinese Siberia. China has almost only used "Sinkiang" as a testing ground for nuclear weapons.

According to official Chinese sources, there has been no disturbances, trials or executions in "Sinkiang" this year.

The Chinese attitude towards Islam has generally been most disdainful.

### *Whatever Happened in Mongolia?*

No one really knows. She went through an equally disastrous revolution as Russia after 1917 and China 1949-76, as the dictator Khorloin Choibalsam, the obedient puppet of Stalin, decided to exterminate all religious thinking in the country to replace it with purist atheism. As a result, he burned most of the 700 monasteries of the country and killed off 18,000 monks. The remaining 92,000 monks that survived the holocaust, although homeless, were compelled to forced labour in factories or forced matrimony or both. The greatest monastery of Mongolia was Erdene Zuu in Karakorum with 60 temples and thousands of monks and teachers. Like the Orthodox Church of Russia, Buddhism in Mongolia was compelled to go underground and remain there for 70 years. Only since 1990 it has started to come out again from its hiding, which China greatly worries about, although in the greatest monastery of Mongolia, Erdene Zuu, there are only three restored temples and a few old monks.

The communist urge to eradicate all Buddhism in China, Mongolia and Tibet for atheistic reasons, in order to establish atheism as a sort of substitute religion, is very difficult to understand, since Buddhism isn't even a theistic religion - there are no gods to abolish or to replace with atheism. Instead of exterminating some kind of godliness, they only destroy old honest traditions and historical monuments, culture and civilization, to replace it with nothing. Is that any better?

### *Heinrich Harrer's Return to Tibet*

His first book is maybe the absolute classic among authentic accounts of Tibet as it was before 1950. He lived in Tibet for seven years (1943-50) which gave him perhaps a more intimate knowledge of the country than any other European's.

He couldn't return until 1983, and to make his return possible he had to join a tourist group. It was lucky, however, that he could return at all, and the book which resulted from his return visit is a most valuable complementary book to his "Seven Years in Tibet" 30 years earlier.

The book is a very melancholy, nostalgic and painful account of the Chinese occupied Tibet compared to the wonderful old Tibet which Heinrich Harrer once used to know. The most tormenting comparison is all the new Chinese ugliness to the old Tibetan beauty and fantasy which once flourished. Harrer analyzes the new order constructively, however. He meets his old friends and dedicates several chapters also to such that chose to collaborate with the Chinese and even serve them. The book is extremely sensitive and delicate all through, it vibrates constantly of Harrer's intensive emotions in his encounters with everything he recognizes and all the changes he observes, he has a perspective like nobody else by having seen everything 30 years earlier in time, and his analyses and conclusions, judgements and critical observations are throughout sincere, convincing and probably correct.

The only thing you can criticize in him is firstly his very subjective unreserved partiality to the Dalai Lama, which in a way is against Dalai Lama's own policy, since Dalai Lama is highly self-critical and has himself often pointed out the flaws and disadvantages of that theocratical system which he himself is the leader of. You can also criticize Harrer for his prejudice against the Panchen Lama: we know today that the tenth Panchen Lama already in May 1962 took a firm stand against the Chinese communist party in a long letter of 120 pages to the foreign secretary Chou-En-Lai, in

which he sharply pointed out the methodical Chinese destruction of Tibet in impressingly exact statistics. (After this letter the Panchen Lama was forbidden to open his mouth publicly for two years, until he delivered his famous speech to the Tibetans in Lhasa in 1964, whereafter he was interned and not allowed to see Lhasa again for 18 years.)

Finally you can criticize Harrer for his denouncement of the poor Lobsang Rampa, (really Cyril Henry Hoskins). To demand that Lobsang Rampa should be stopped is a crime against the freedom of speech and of the press. Lobsang Rampa was entitled to write whatever he wanted, and you can't categorically condemn his books for being lies, just as you can not deny St. John the Apostle his right to his own revelations and his right to write them down in the Apocalypse. Naturally, Lobsang Rampa is to be read with the greatest possible scepticism, but you can't altogether pronounce his writings as perfectly devoid of interesting symbolical meanings.

Thank you, Heinrich Harrer, for your splendid contributions to the cause of Tibet. May such efforts always continue and never cease.

### *Successful Pilgrimage to Kailas*

We were ten people from Scandinavia who embarked on this exquisite Tibetan journey in the beginning of May, going by air to Kathmandu and Lhasa, thence proceeding by land rovers to Gyangtse, Shigatse and Lhatse, taking the northern route to western Tibet by Oma and Gar (Ali), coming to Darchen by Mount Kailas from the west. We spent four days walking around the holy mountain after having witnessed the great festival at Tarboche of raising the great flag pole, and then went down to bathe in Lake Manasarovar. We did not visit Purang but turned back east and travelled through winter snows and desert sand dunes, where we often went stuck, back to Saga, from whence we turned south to visit Tingri and Shegar before going to Rombuk and Mount Everest, alias Sagarmatha, alias Chomolungma. That mountain also had a Chinese name, which was impossible and unnecessary to learn. Then we went down to Zhangmu to return to Kathmandu, where we stayed for a few days before flying back to Sweden. The whole journey lasted for 34 days. Within Tibet we travelled altogether more than 3000 kilometres by jeep.

The only problem on the way were the Chinese. In every temple and every single monastery, even the cave of Milarepa above Zhangmu, there were Chinese officials extorting high fees for our entering these holy places, as if we were to be punished for visiting them as pilgrims. Between Darchen and Lake Manasarovar we were arrested by five armed Chinese military men in a jeep, who searched all our luggage, turned all our things upside down, all the time saying nothing with rigid stone faces. They also found nothing. The only thing they searched for was pictures of the Dalai Lama. After finishing their mission with no result, two of them went aside to pee in public in full view of all of us and of the whole plain. Unfortunately none of us had his camera ready.

Apart from the Chinese, the whole journey was a wonderful success, all of us came back home after this "the most difficult pilgrimage in the world" (Charles Allen) in better health and shape than ever, and I would gladly do it all again.

Our next Tibetan journey is already being planned for 1999.

Gothenburg, July 12<sup>th</sup>, 1997.

### *A Foreigner's View on Kashmir.*

My first journey to Kashmir turned out to be something totally different from what I had expected. I had thought that only Jammu and Srinagar might be difficult because of the closeness to Pakistan and possible military disturbances, while all troubles would be left behind as soon as I was out of Srinagar on the way to Ladakh.

It turned out to be the contrary. I was very well taken care of in Jammu, both up and down, and Srinagar proved to be the perfect peace and just a wonderful experience, so I stayed on there for more than two weeks; but as soon as I went east towards Zoji La there was a world of difficulties.

I learned some interesting facts. There seems to have been some efforts for a referendum for the Kashmiris to choose between India and Pakistan, but there should be a third option: independence for Kashmir from both, and that seems to be what most Kashmiris would want, since both Pakistan and India have given Kashmir nothing but troubles since 1947. The last Maharadja seems to have turned to India only because Pakistan tried to invade Kashmir by force. So India found a good reason to use force as well, and so Kashmir has had wars for 52 years, and there seems to be no end on it.

Now, force is always the most stupid of all solutions, because it never solves anything. It merely kills, and that's no constructive solution. I believe that the only possible constructive solution to the problems of Kashmir would be total independence from both Pakistan and India, both ceding their occupied territories to Kashmir. Also the area occupied by China, the Soda Plains, must be ceded back to Ladakh, since they are illegally occupied.

Such a solution could only be accomplished, though, in a very long run by patience, negotiations and diplomacy. Since such a constructive way would be the opposite of force, it is not possible to achieve it by any kind of force. The primary goal, then, must be to put a stop to all hostilities.

Of course, we have the problem that only India can stop the infiltration of war maniacs in the north from Pakistan and Afghanistan.

We must have patience, but in the end I think that sovereignty of Kashmir could be accomplished.

For some, the case is already on the international agenda.

### *Voices from China.*

During a mass meeting in the Tongwan district a man called Gan Dazuo was exposed to mass criticism, the dreaded Chinese process routine called *Tamzing*, where members of the crowds are obliged to accuse and assault the accused not to be accused and exposed themselves. ("If we don't kill the people the people will kill us." - Mao Zedong.) The accused was told to go down on his knees. "Gan Yewei hit the victim on his head with a club, but the victim didn't die. Then Gan Zuyang pulled down the victim's trousers to cut off his organ. "Let me die first; then you can cut it off," pleaded the victim. Gan Zuyang didn't care about this and continued to cut. The victim resisted with all his might and yelled out with the full power of his lungs. Gan Weizing (who had arranged the mass meeting) and his clique cut the meat from the thighs. Gan Deliu cut out the liver. The rest of the mob pushed forward and flayed him."

Official cannibalism is no news in socialist autocracies. China differs though for example from the Soviet Union by carefully making accounts of the procedures and preserving them.

Wang Zujian was head of culture in Wuxuan, where he witnessed the mass cannibalism movement growing into a daily whirlpool of bloodshed. He couldn't bear watching the metamorphosis of his home town into the stage of a ruthless mob who in the name of the party tore asunder new victims in streets which already had been covered by mutilated bodies. There are always those who can't remain silent.

Cannibalism occurs in three stages. First it is all done in utmost secrecy and fear of being discovered. When victims were murdered in the inner party conflicts the man-eaters stole out in the night to the killing fields and often fumbled in their arrangements.

Then the blood-tide rises. Now the tearing asunder of bodies is performed openly, enthusiastically and with great skill. A swift cut under the ribs - the model is the Chinese sign for a person. Then step your foot on the belly and squeeze simultaneously out the heart and the liver, why not to the suitable accompaniment of the chairman's eight allowed musical pieces, militant marches all eight of them, with flying red colours and enthusiastic quotations from the little red book of Mao, all in the name of holy Marxism.

Finally the mass cannibalism movement: the mob in berserk rage like a hord of hungry dogs. The victim is chosen for a *tamzing* procedure, an open trial for all the people to partake in on the plaintiff's side, which inevitably ends with the victim getting slugged down. Thrust a pointed metal tube into his skull and suck out the brains. Whether the victim is alive or not the mob rushes forth like cannibals with knives and daggers drawn, and everything is good enough as ingredients for the feast, which is accompanied by carousal and hasard games. In the campus areas, in hospitals, in the various administration unit canteens the cauldrons are boiling and the smoke rising in the sky.

The Chinese are famous for their good economy, and they have never left any spoils. During the years 1956-82 the Chinese murdered 1,207,487 Tibetans, and it's not plausible that so much meat was left to nothing.

In unsurpassable naïvety president Nixon and foreign secretary Henry Kissinger at the same time opened their bosoms to China, let her into the Security Council in the United Nations, kicked out the legally governed Taiwan and promoted China to a permanent status of "most favoured nation". One of China's conditions to accept president Nixon's generosity was that America was to discontinue their support to the Tibetan freedom-fighters, who consequently were let down and sacrificed after 18 years of heroic struggle.

During Mao's heroic "giant step forward" 1958-62, when all China was industrialized by force, between 40 and 80 million Chinese died as a result from famine, since the farmers weren't allowed to cultivate anything anymore, since they were forced into the factories.

Books like Zheng Yi's "*Scarlet Memorial*", a collection of authentic documentary material from the Mao era, make both the terror regime of Hitler and Stalin's Gulag Soviet Union appear like heavenly idylls in comparison.

"My opinion is that the whole Han-Chinese totalitarian culture is dominated by cannibalism."

- Zheng Yi.

"We love our country, but we hate our leaders."  
- student on Tiananmen Square, June 4th 1989.

"The one-party state of China is like the 'Titanic', and it's the west that keeps the doomed ship floating. Not until the leaking ship has foundered there will be any hope for China."

- Wei Jingsheng.

"China has one enemy only. His name is Truth, and China will never get rid of that enemy as long as China lives. But worst of all is, that as an enemy he is the most difficult and relentless one you can have. The greatest possible political mistake to make is therefore to make him your enemy by once failing him."

- Doctor Sun.

"There is not one Tibetan, monk or civil, who hasn't chosen to co-operate with the Chinese exclusively to thereby preserve his Tibetan life and heart. Their only hope is that they haven't done this ultimate sacrifice in vain, but that they one day will be able to return the enforced pledge and be rid of it for ever."

- John B. Westerberg.

### ***Doctor Sun Concerning the Hongkong Issue.***

"This is my statement concerning the Hongkong issue. I was very surprised when Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher gave up Hongkong so easily. She should have considered the fact of China being an autocracy and Hongkong being ruled by a democracy with greater concern. Instead she ceded Hongkong without scruples, just like Prime Minister Neville Chamberlain ceded Czechoslovakia to Nazi Germany in 1938.

Behind the transaction is of course primarily American business interests. China and America are today the world's only remaining imperialist nations. For that reason they back each other, believing their imperialist interests to be in common, although one is an autocracy and the other a democracy. Thus their belief that they have their imperialist interests in common is a gross mistake.

The folly in the matter is to allow the Chinese Communist Party to play any part in the game. The Chinese Communist Party is a bandit league without any popular support or legitimation. They usurped power in China in 1949 to establish a hard-line autocracy, ruling by exterminating millions and hundreds of millions of people, and they have stayed in power only by brute force. To at all recognize such a government was a terrible mistake from the first. I believe France was the first democratic nation to take such a most undemocratic step.

Anyone who deals with such an undemocratic government as the self-imposed communist regime of China becomes part of its oppression of the Chinese people and is contaminated by the crimes of that party, no matter how hard that party tries to conceal and negate its crimes of the past. The Communist Party of China has survived and keeps on surviving only by vile lies. It has no heart, no core and no legitimacy. It is itself what Chairman Mao called a "paper tiger". It calls the legitimate Tibetan exile government in Dharamsala in India the "Dalai Lama clique" while in fact the ruling communist party of China is no less than a clique of self-imposed usurpers.

The least duty of China towards that Tibet, which we have enslaved, tortured and bereft of their identity for so many years, would be to restore every single monastery

which we destroyed in Tibet between 1956-76. We destroyed more than 6000 monasteries and rendered more than 500,000 monks and nuns homeless, many of which died as a consequence. This atrocious universal crime China has to atone for, or she will be made to atone for it.

This is my statement concerning the Hongkong issue.

- Doctor Sun, Canton, May 1997.

### *The Tragedy of Tibet.*

**1910** Imperial China invades Tibet and occupies Lhasa. Dalai Lama escapes to British India and takes refuge in Kalimpong close to Darjeeling. The British-Tibetan friendship coöperation is commenced.

**1911** Revolution in China, which becomes a constitutional democratic republic under the leadership of the socialdemocratic doctor Sun-Yat-Sen, a thorough democrat and the founder of the Kuomintang party, the social-democratic party of China.

Tibet takes care of the opportunity and ousts the Chinese.

**1913** The Simla conference, in which the British try to arbitrate between China and Tibet. For the first time ever, China claims that Tibet has been a part of China since 700 years, which claim Tibet strongly opposes and proves to be wrong by facts of history. In a compromise settlement, China is granted an undefined *suzerainty* in relation to Tibet, but China refuses to attend to sign the final documents. Thereby Tibet is in reality fully independant, and no Chinese is able to visit Tibet for the next 37 years without a British visa by India.

**1947** India achieves independance from Great Britain under prime minister Nehru, which practically means that Britain is in no situation to do anything more for Tibet.

**1949** The Communists defeat Kuomintang in China, which is exiled to Taiwan. The dictator Mao Zedong sets a goal to 'liberate' Tibet (that is, to renew the Chinese occupation of Tibet,) and prepares the Red Army (the 'People's Liberation Army') for that purpose. Tibet immediately tries to get some help and support from abroad, but both India and Great Britain have recognized the new autocratic Chinese government. The United States will not even receive a Tibetan peace delegation.

**1950** Tibet pleads in the United Nations in May, but the UN will not put the issue on the agenda. Great Britain alleges in a purely formalistic excuse that the political status of Tibet never has been defined or recognized. You might here assume that the labour government of London has chosen to follow suit with prime minister Nehru and sympathize with the Peking government. Thus the issue is scamped away in the United Nations.

On **October 7th** Tibet is invaded by a Chinese army of 120,000 men on six fronts against a Tibetan defence army of 8500 men. Thus Mao's 'peaceful liberation' of Tibet is enforced on the largest possible scale with no possibility of failure.

**1951** On **May 23rd** the Tibetans are given the option to accept China's 'peaceful liberation' according to a program in 17 articles or to have their entire country and civilization destroyed by the Chinese army. Under this threat Tibet accepts and signs the 17 articles. In this moment no Tibetan can dream about that the Chinese will violently destroy their country and civilization anyway.

**1956** The communists start their methodic destruction of Tibet by ruining and bombing monasteries in the eastern province of Kham in Tibet. The famous Tibetan Kham warriors start their guerilla war against China, which will go on for 18 years. The Tibetan revolt is a fact.

China responds by accelerating their sinofication of Tibet by increased destruction of monasteries and by forced sterilizations of Tibetan women in order to in the long run ethnically cleanse the Tibetan people out of Tibet. Thus the Chinese genocide on the Tibetans has started.

**1959** The Tibetan rebellion culminates in March, when the guerilla warriors of Kham control all the southern parts of Tibet. 30,000 Tibetans demonstrate outside Norbulinka against the Chinese occupation and tell them to go home to China. Chinese militaries fire two grenades against the people, which explode inside the Norbulinka park without hurting anyone. But this is taken as a signal for Dalai Lama to escape, and everyone encourages him to seek shelter in India. The escape is successfully staged on **March 17th**. Thereafter the insurrection in Lhasa is crushed. The Chinese can easily massacre the Tibetan people, but they no longer can reach Dalai Lama, who reaches safety in India, where he establishes his exile government.

For the first time the Tibetan issue is taken up in the United Nations by the insistence of El Salvador.

President Eisenhower starts supporting the Tibetan guerilla warriors through CIA.

**1962** China attacks India on two fronts. For the first time Nehru realizes that he has been fooled all the way by China.

**1956-76** The Chinese destroy 6246 Tibetan monasteries out of 6259 existing ones and at the same time destroy 60% of all Tibetan original literature, which is about 75,000 volumes, while only 40% are saved, that is about 50,000 volumes.

Out of the Tibetan population of about 6 million the Chinese murder at least 1,207,487 Tibetans who are known by their names. Out of these more than 400,000 are celibatarians monks and nuns. At the same time the Peking regime floods Tibet with unvoluntary Chinese immigrants. The Chinese population of Tibet is today about 7,5 million.

**1958-79** Famine in Tibet as a result of Chinese exploitation and failed policies.

Gross Chinese destruction of the environment in Kongpo in southern Tibet, where forests are clearcut and transformed into deserts with ecological disaster for the entire Himalaya region as an incurable result. This brutal deforestation without any replanting of trees goes on still today.

**1972** As a result of president Nixon's new agreements with the Peking regime, the CIA support of the Tibetan guerilla warriors is discontinued.

**1974** The last Tibetan guerilla warriors escape to Mustang in Nepal, where the Nepalese authorities urge them to surrender on conditions that no evil will befall them. This is a result of Chinese manipulations. Those who surrender are forthwith thrown into prison and are bereft of all their property, contrary to given word of honour. Those who refuse to surrender try to run the gauntlet through all Nepal towards Dharamsala in India, where Dalai Lama lives with his exile government, but they are surrounded by Chinese and Nepalese just by the last pass into India, and the last 37 who dared to defend Tibet are sacrificed to the last man.

**1987** New surprising demonstrations in Lhasa against the Chinese, which continue still today.

The Chinese genocide against the Tibetans still proceeds today with continued forced Chinese immigration into Tibet and forced sterilizations of Tibetan women and mothers often without any anaesthesia with the result of death.

**1996** All pictures of Dalai Lama are forbidden in Tibet, and the remaining monasteries are cleansed of all monks and nuns who are not loyal to the Peking regime.

They start pulling down the old picturesque Tibetan quarters in Lhasa to replace them with unhuman Chinese concrete blocks.

The Chinese economical boom is used as one more weapon and perhaps the most efficient of all against the Tibetans: those who become Chinese are given a share of the surplus, while those who remain faithful to their Tibetan identity are left without. Thus the remaining Tibetans are turned out of the Chinese society, which is taking over Tibet and turning the Tibetans out of their own country.

The Chinese 'final solution' to the Tibetan issue thus seems to be easily carried through, since all the world gladly supports China economically for the sake of fast fortunes.

### *Concerning Genocide.*

A genocide is a genocide. It can never be forgiven, and the hunt for its practitioners must never cease. During and around the First World War the Turks carried through a comprehensive genocide on at least 1 million Armenians. That was the first methodically planned and accomplished genocide. The Turks obstinately deny it even today. The official Turkish version is that it never took place.

Hitler used the Turkish genocide on the Armenians as a paragon example for his planned genocide on the Jews. This genocide on six million Jews is the only genocide of the century which has somewhat been atoned for by many of the responsible ones being punished and many of the survivors being recompensed.

The genocide of the Chinese on the Tibetans began in 1956. During the years 1956-83 more than 1,2 million Tibetans were murdered, which was a fifth of the entire people. Not until 1959 the genocide was made publicly known through the careful investigations of the International Commission of Jurists of the United Nations in Geneva. However, China denied that any genocide had taken place and even more that it still went on. This genocide reached its height during the Chinese cultural revolution 1966-76 while the whole western world most enthusiastically exalted China to the skies for her paragon example of morality. No one ever tried to stop this genocide, and most people shut their eyes to it, especially president Nixon when he visited China in the beginning of the 70's to do business. The genocide on the Tibetans is still denied by China today with the same right as the Turks deny their genocide on the Armenians.

### *Violence or Non-Violence ? - a Tibetan Question of Destiny.*

H.H.Dalai Lama represents the non-violence policy with the utmost admirable continuity, thanks to which this policy line has become dominant in the struggle for Tibetan freedom. Strange enough, the same line is followed by the leading freedom fighters of Turkestan (Sinkiang), although these are Muslims and exposed to the same long term ethnic cleansing campaign as the Tibetans through compulsory sterilizations, prohibition of education in their own language, religion and culture, barbaric military oppression, concentration camps for all with different opinions from the autocracy, and Chinese monopoly on all corruption. This principle of non-violence, introduced by Gandhi, is certainly wise, admirable and the only right one, but it did not necessitate Indian independence from the British. Instead, it was general Subhandas Chandra Bose who in league with the Japanese and Germans and with terrorist means in the Second World War forced Gandhi into effecting total independence from the British for good and for worse.

The problem with the non-violence principle is its inefficiency. The Chinese laugh at the dovishness of the Tibetans and continue to sterilize them, torture and execute

them, put them in concentration camps from which tribulations they die sooner or later, and force them to leave the country *en masse*, which instead is being swamped by forced and reluctant Han Chinese settlers, all in accordance with the long term foolproof plan of methodical ethnic cleansing. This has been going on for 50 years without anyone having done anything about it. The Tibetan non-violence principle and placidity has spread like a disease across the world, which only silently has been watching China ruin 98,5% of all Tibetan temples and monasteries, extirpate 90% of its learning by extirpating 90% of her monks, nuns and educated intellectuals, and bereave the Tibetans of all their human rights. India and Britain were of course the most guilty ones of this passive assistance to national murder, when Nehru only thought well of China and thereby allowed China to do whatever she felt inclined to, and when Britain claimed, as Tibet desperately asked the United Nations for help in 1950, that Tibet never had been acknowledged or established as a sovereign nation - probably the century's worst instance of formalistic pedantry. But the United States continued this passive assistance to national murder under the presidency of Nixon by abandoning Taiwan and instead raising the world's most incriminated nation China to a status of not just any democracy (which China never has been except for a brief period under Dr. Sun-Yat-Sen 1912-25) but to the status of the most favoured nation in the world.

The non-violence policy of Turkestan appears even more remarkable when you observe the fact that China always has used Turkestan as their testing ground for nuclear weapons with the same catastrophic radioactive pollution results damaging the environment and all life in the area for times unsurveyable as the Soviet Union did in east Kazakhstan. The complaisance of the non-violence principle has actually favoured the development of Chinese capacity for universal aggression.

To this astounding acquiescence and submission to a terrorist state, marked by matchless cowardice especially on the parts of India, Britain, the United Nations and the United States, there is only one precedent in history: the complaisance of Neville Chamberlain to Hitler in the 1930s.

Does this mean that we advocate resistance by violence? No, we will never go that far. But there will always be characters like Subhandas Chandra Bose, who will not in the long run tolerate oppression, discrimination and injustice. Even the Jews finally rebelled against the Germans in the Warsaw ghetto, which initiative started a universal movement leading up to the independence of 1948. This process would never have been crowned with success without the initiative to resistance by violent means. History has never been able to stop characters like Subhandas Chandra Bose, Fidel Castro, Ho Chi Minh, Guzman of East Timor, or the men behind the French revolution. I never take to violence myself, but if it were within my power to stop the man who would start an avalanche engulfing all China in a deluge resulting in for instance the independence of Tibet and Turkestan, I would do nothing stop him.

To the world we would like to say with Wei Jinsheng: Let China go down. It's bad business to invest in a sinking ship. Let the communist party of China and its accursed corruption with all the lies of the People's Liberation Army perish and be forgotten once and for all, since the only thing these two establishments represent historically is oppression, destruction and evil.

*John B. Westerberg & Doctor Sun*

*October 1st 1999.*

### *Comments to Karmapa.*

This is a complicated story, but we'll try to make it as simple as possible. The 17th Karmapa, who escaped from Tibet to India now in January, is the head of the oldest sect in Tibet, and his reincarnations date further back than those of H.H. the Dalai Lama. The 16th Karmapa passed away in 1981 in Chicago, and the 17th, born in 1985, was acknowledged both by H.H. the Dalai Lama *and* China in 1992. This is unique. But one of the closest associate holy lamas of the 16th in Chicago, Shamar Rinpoche, an extremely trusted man, discovered and established another Karmapa in Sikkim in 1994, who actually was installed in his own monastery of Rumtek in Sikkim in India, a monastery which he himself (the 16th) had built in 1959 after his escape from Tibet and which is believed to be one of the richest in India with assets of \$1,2 billion. So there are two Karmapas, both are acknowledged and established, and none of them could with any certainty claim to be truer than the other. Unfortunately this has sometimes resulted in bitter enmity among followers of the different Karmapas against each other, which is both childish and stupid and which temptation Buddhists of all people indeed should rise above. Many ask themselves now with some worry how the Tibetan Karmapa will tackle this issue. Hopefully he won't. The reason for his leaving Tibet was, that neither teachers from India were allowed to go to Tibet to educate him, nor was he himself permitted to go to India to be taught by them there. He is 14 years old and urgently needs further education within his own religion to be able to assume the responsibility necessary as the head of the oldest holy order of Tibet.

It's just for us to wish him the best of luck.

### *Tibetan Seminar in Gothenburg, Sweden, May 6th 2000.*

By the initiative and invitation of the Swedish Tibet Committee, Jamyang Norbu, one of the founders of the Tibetan Youth Congress in Dharamsala, sometime member of the resistance movement in Mustang, Nepal; former leader of TIPA and Amnye Machen Institute, and for many years active within the Tibetan Exile Government in Dharamsala, led an amazing seminar in Gothenburg, Sweden, on the 6th of May. This was in brief his message:

There is ground for optimism. The political course of China at present is suicidal. She has definitely failed in her 50 years' effort to extirpate the Tibetan people, culture, history and religion. The world is awakening to the realities of the Chinese effort to by force wipe out a nation and its history. The justness of the Tibetan cause is self-evident, and so is the gross fiasco of the Communist government of China.

The argument of the debate of the seminar was violence contra non-violence. The second protagonist of the debate was Katrin Goldstein-Kyaga, tibetologist of the University of Stockholm. The paradox was, that while Jamyang Norbu, a true Tibetan veteran out of the heart of the conflict, advocated non-violence and admirably maintained a constructive attitude, the researches made by Katrin Goldstein-Kyaga, a Swede married to a Tibetan, rather pointed to the necessity of more drastic measures.

It was Jamyang Norbu, though, who most thoroughly charted the sea of troubles. The issue of East Turkestan, with its vast clamp-down of Muslim rebels, from which country no news ever reach the western world, made itself felt from its want of attention. One recent year 20,000 bombs exploded all over China, a great part of them unexplained, probably just out of general unrest and desperation. Although it is forbidden, hundreds of millions of farmers unsettle and invade the towns, totally out of

control of the authorities. The economic crisis deepens, and China has to rely on imports of cereals. Corruption is soaring, especially in the banking system. And so on.

So keep on working. Information, demonstration and protests, on international and especially on economic levels, are the means. Most governments have inaccurate or no knowledge at all of what is going on in Tibet and China. They must be informed, and the hard currency is Facts, Facts, and more Facts.

### *Letter from Bihar.*

Dear Christian,

Long time since. I beg your pardon for my long silence. As you know, things are never easy here in Bihar and getting worse all the time. It's not difficult to develop a "Kali mentality" looking forward to the end of the last days, especially now in the dry season, when all life and future depends on the coming monsoon, the constant uncertainty, which no one knows whether it will postpone doomsday or not.

I haven't seen John for a very long time. He is constantly busy up in the hills and never comes to Buddhagaya anymore. He was recently in Russia I believe, which would rather add to his unsuitableness to the plains. All Tibetans and Scandinavians are out of place here in India, except maybe for the mountains, where John has developed as much resistance to cold and altitude as any native Tibetan, while I prefer the plains, where I was born, and where I as a Buddhist am as much out of place in this chaotic and religiously anarchistic India as any Tibetan in the Hindu plains. I guess we're all out of place in this turbulent age.

What worries me is that things are getting worse, especially for us Buddhists, and especially for the Tibetans, above all the Tibetans in Tibet. The Chinese are actually winning the war but in a way which no one ever anticipated. They are losing it politically, economically and materially. Their army is totally out of place in Tibet and can't be supported: all the hundreds of thousands of soldiers are constantly starving and freezing to a slow torturous death. We don't know how many Chinese soldiers simply have vanished into nowhere in the mountains, out of the statistics, buried nowhere, completely forgotten and with no chance for any exoneration ever. They are the biggest losers. The Tibetans keep seeing them in reborn flies, which never existed in Tibet before the Chinese came. One cut in the life-line to China, and there is no hope for half a million Chinese soldiers abandoned in the mountains of Tibet. The Chinese settlers, who are being paid by their government to colonise Tibet, can't stand life there. They only want to get home, before they die, which many fail to, that is, to get home in time. They are also deserted by their government, paid by their lords to vanish and perish in Tibet, where no Tibetan wants them. They are also great losers. If they survive, they have wasted and lost their life anyway. And all this vain enterprise, sacrificing human beings for inhumanity, is costing China more than it can pay, and banks are going into bankruptcy. They are just starting.

But there is another frontier, and that is the most important and dangerous one. It's the mentality. What the Chinese are bringing into Tibet, what they have been educated in and taught to tackle life with by their masters, is hatred. They bring violence and hatred to Tibet, and their worst war is hating the Tibetans, for no reason at all, just for being obliged to live in Tibet. And this hatred many Tibetans are absorbing. There are many Tibetans (together with Uigurs, who are even better at it,) who look forward to the day when they will cleanse all Tibet (and East Turkestan) of Chinese. They are looking forward to an ethnic cleansing of an opposite and righteous kind. Of course, we have to understand them, the Chinese have killed millions of Tibetans and Uigurs and

got away with it, so why shouldn't they be punished? But they don't see the real danger: their minds have become infected with Chinese hatred. When they give way to that hatred, implanted by the Chinese, they have lost the war. That would be the ultimate defeat. Even if the Chinese leave Tibet, (which they very well might do one day,) if they pull out the army and leave all Tibetan business to the Tibetans, that victory will be worthless if Tibetans take any revenge.

This is my chief concern in the Tibetan problem as a Buddhist. And all I can do is to pray, pray that this will never happen, that Tibetans never will give way to Chinese hatred.

Maybe someone will hear my prayer.

Yours sincerely,

Kim, a Bihari Buddhist.

### *The Leh Conference.*

In the afternoon I looked up John, where he stayed close to the Moravian Church. His conference had taken place already on July 18th, that is the day before I arrived. I was one day too late. He had been unable to wait for me, since Doctor Sun had been obliged to leave yesterday already.

The participants had been Tibetans, Ladakhis, one Kashmiri, one Pakistani, one Hindu and doctor Sun from China except John himself. The man from Pakistan (Lahore) had been of no consequence since his position had been outside the entire problem. The Kashmiri (Srinagar) had been something of a comic ingredient with his good-natured complaisance and total optimism. To him it was a course of nature that both Kashmir and Ladakh would obtain more autonomy and independence both from India and from each other and that also Tibet would have her own way.

The main issue was Tibet under Chinese occupation and slavery. John and Doctor Sun had argued mostly, their arguments had been quite violent but in different ways. And although the conference had been strangely coloured by the recent issues of Chinese rage against Europe and the World Bank and by the unusual curfew in Leh, the arguments of John and Doctor Sun had completely dominated the conference.

The reason for the curfew in Leh was the atrocious murders of three monks in Rangdum, Zanskar, some days earlier. Moslem militants had taken a truck, its driver and a German trekker for hostages, when the truck reached Rangdum four monks had welcomed them, just to get shot at by the militants: only one of the monks had managed to escape and save his life. In the confusion the German tried to escape, and also the driver, who was later arrested alone on the road to Kargil. (The German was found one month later shot dead in the mountains.) The curfew in Leh was proclaimed before anyone knew anything about the fates of the German, the driver and the three militants. Leh was suddenly transformed into a ghost town, it had never happened before, and in that shadow John organized a secret conference about the future of Tibet and Central Asia.

John had with regret elucidated on the hopeless case of the Chinese never really understanding their own actions. They were unable to listen, it was impossible to reason with them, the policy of the governing Communist Party couldn't be criticized or called in question, and it was the duty of all Chinese to just blindly obey orders. Against this situation the best good-will in the world was of no avail and not even Dalai Lama's, who only wants the welfare of China and Tibet and who has the perfect formula:

Tibetan autonomy but under Chinese military, administrative and foreign policy control. This solution would be optimum for all parties and is politically ingenious. But China condemns it from sheer totalitarian stupidity.

John elucidated on this tragedy. Endless efforts have been made to bring China to reason, only constructive aspects and arguments have been tried, diplomatic efforts have been tireless, but the only Chinese to realize the sense and constructiveness of Dalai Lama's proposal have been students and opposition members, who pessimistically have given up like to a lethal disease, faced by the all-powerful Communist Party's refusal to compromise. One of these was Doctor Sun, a true Chinese democrat brought up with Doctor Sun-Yat-Sen's social democracy, with both interesting and risky contacts with the whole organized Chinese opposition.

His argument had shocked everyone. His conclusion was that the only solution was to kill every single member of the Communist Party all over China. He proposed this in dead earnest. He knew many who gladly would agree and partake in such an action, and that the number of these was steadily increasing.

The Union movement could do nothing. All trade and labour unions were forbidden and persecuted, and to join was criminal. That path was closed. The peaceful Falun Gong were stamped as enemies of the people, although they never had anything to do with politics, and the Christians and Buddhists were too kind. The Moslems made war on their own using their own methods and would never be able to make peace. Their war really went on outside the Chinese problem. And the only way to tackle the problem, Doctor Sun said, was to kill every single member of the Communist Party.

Thus far to radicalism had this arch democrat found it necessary to go, and he knew what he was talking about. He knew his China and had experience enough of all the mistakes of the Communist Party and of the hopeless opposition underdog situation since 50 years, which constantly has worsened after June 4th 1989. His word was all too heavy.

John's comment afterwards:

"We have done everything possible to make them understand what they have done. We have tried all diplomatic possibilities to make them realize the necessity to detach themselves from their insane, unhuman and paranoid policies, but every effort we have tried has only increased their transgressions. Their policy in Tibet to entertain a monstrous army and all the time pump Chinese into the country rewarded and paid for by the state, enforcing incredibly expensive mining and failing dam projects, is comparable only to the crazy Nazi policy against the Jews, when during the second world war immense fortunes and efforts were spent on death camps and trains rather were used to transport Jews to Auschwitz than to send vital necessities to the eastern front. We have tried to make the Chinese listen to reason, we have tried to make them understand, but they simply won't. They are terrified of losing their megalomaniac illusions of grandeur and infallibility, their paranoia increases like an avalanche, and any Chinese to utter the least critical word against the government or party is enough to stamp him for life as a traitor, which means all he has to look forward to in life, if he is allowed to live, is a life sentence in labour camps, if he isn't lucky enough to be exiled. We have tried everything and will continue to try everything. I don't believe in Doctor Sun's radical solution, even if constantly more Chinese find it the last remaining one. Like Dalai Lama I believe in a better and peaceful solution. They say that we Christians and Buddhists are far too kind unto naïveté in our tolerance, but I think the greatest realists are always to be found in the camps of goodness. The Communists of China are no realists, since they have chosen to see only what they want to see."

*(John Westerberg, C. Lanciai and Doctor Sun, August 2000.)*

## *Tibetan attitude toward death not mystical.*

by the Director of the Satori Foundation, *Rahayu Ratnaningsih.*

The most popular views of death are typically dualistic in nature: on one hand there are the spiritualistic, soul theories embedded in theistic belief systems, on the other there is the "modern", materialistic nihilism.

The former posits the eternalness of the soul, either jumping from one life to another through multiple births and rebirths, or from life to the hereafter, i.e. the blissful paradise or fiery hell.

The latter rejects all kinds of speculation of what might happen to the "soul" after a person dies, since the concept of soul itself has no grounds in the empirical scientific circle. It is regarded as something scientifically unverified, thus the question of its existence cannot be determined with reasonable certainty, therefore it is safer to believe that only nothingness embraces us after death.

Blissful nothingness. It sounds enticing, sounds much better than the emotionally draining and physically painful existence of life. But why do even those who believe in this theory dread death so much? Presumably, because deep down they do not really believe in it, not to mention that there is little credible evidence for their nihilistic belief.

No one has ever returned to report entry into nothingness. In fact, those who have had near-death experiences testified to a kind of realm resembling the religious or spiritualist view of the afterlife.

It is hard to believe the great souls we know, the people whose presence illuminate those around them, will one day just be a piece of nothingness; their greatness no more than a sum of atoms and molecules in the brain that will decay together with the rest of their physical existence.

It is absurd to think our mother's unique personality and strong, loving character is nothing more than an effect of atomic or molecular flux in her brain, that her consciousness is a matter of electric leaps among the neutrons in her central nervous system. If that were the case, why are we so different from one another? Why is each of us so marvellously unique? If consciousness were a matter of uniform biological and physical mechanisms, we should all be as boringly predictable as Japanese-made robots.

Buddhism, the tradition that is adhered to by the Tibetans, rejects the two extremes represented by the two opposite camps above. Although it acknowledges the continuity of consciousness from life to life -- as energy can neither be created nor destroyed -- it rejects all absolute soul theories -- postulations of a rigidly fixed identity or static personal essence -- with its cardinal doctrine of selflessness, or soullessness (*anatta*).

It, however, never rejects the relative presence of a living self and contrary to nihilists, it insists on the continuity of the changeable, fluid soul from life to life. During his time, the Buddha explicitly challenged the contemporary nihilism that reduced the relative, conventional, lived soul, self or identity to a random epiphenomenon of matter. He insisted on the relative self's reality, vulnerability, responsibility and evolutionary potential.

This process of continuity is sophisticatedly dealt with by "*The Tibetan Book of the Dead*", one of the most important books our civilization has produced. Written by the great master Padma Sambhava, it is a manual of useful instructions for people who are facing death, as well as for their relatives and loved ones, and has been quite popular for centuries in Tibet. It is connected with a large body of literature in Tibet that thoroughly investigates the phenomena of dying. The title is a free translation of *Bardo*

*thos grol. Bardo* means "between-state", which refers to the whole process between death and rebirth. Tibetans discern six betweens: the interval between birth and death ("life between"); sleep and waking ("dream between"); waking and trance ("trance between"); and three betweens during the death-rebirth process ("death-point", "reality" and "existence").

The words *thos grol* mean that this book's teachings "liberate" just by being "learned" or "understood", giving the person facing the between an understanding so naturally clear and deep that it does not require prolonged reflection or contemplation. So the more apt translation of the title would be "the great book of natural liberation through understanding in the between".

The Tibetan attitude toward death and the between is neither mystical nor mysterious. Their multilife perspective is no more (and no less) a religious belief system than our modern sense of the structure of the solar system, or of the pattern of the cycle of seasons in a year.

They considered it a matter of common sense and scientific fact that animate beings exist along a continuum of lives, and that the death, between and rebirth processes follow a predictable pattern. They have credible accounts by enlightened voyagers who have gone through the between experience consciously, preserved the memory and reported their experiences.

Tibetans accept these reports of their "psychonauts" just as we do those of astronauts who report what happened on the moon. Tibetans also believe that most people can recover memories of their former lives by a fairly elementary regime of meditation. Tibetans act on this Buddhist perspective in a practical manner, using their lifetimes to educate themselves to understand the world and to prepare for death and future lives by improving their ethical actions, emotional habits and critical insights.

Despite their seemingly unreal, "gay" acceptance of death, Tibetans celebrate lives to the amazing point that they will not harm worms when it can be avoided, for "those worms could have been their loved ones in their previous lives".

Tibetans are on the whole a cheerful, vibrant and lively lot. They cherish freedom in all respects and on all levels. They are very modern, indeed, in their heads and hearts. They have lived intelligently by their lights, have used human life well and extracted its fullest potential for evolutionary, not just material, progress.

With the surprisingly sophisticated age-long inner and death science of the Mahayana Buddhist tradition they have cultivated, they have so much to offer to their more "modern" counterparts, whose concept of achievement is heavily colored by a relentless pursuit of materialistic accomplishments. A distinct measure of the unparalleled beauty of their civilization comes from their vivid awareness of the immediacy of death and the freedom that awareness brings."

*Comment.* So this article denies both personal immortality in every possible form (both in Paradise and Hell and through reincarnation with the maintenance of an identity) *and* the materialistic concept that all is finished once you are dead. Instead it makes allowances for a kind of impersonal immortality through reincarnation in a form which we in a mortal shape can not grasp. This is a kind of compromise solution to the problem and something so genuinely Buddhist as another instance of *the golden mean* and *the middle path*. And this at least is very sensible.

*A Note of Warning, by Doctor Sun.*

Don't get fooled. China never means what she says, and all she says is a formula of lies meant to cover up her real intentions. She invaded Tibet in 1950 for the sole purpose of swallowing her up with her mountain riches, not caring one iota about the Tibetans. Since her successful occupation of Tibet in 1950 she has consistently carried out her plans, robbing Tibet of all her riches, pushing the Tibetans back, gradually taking over the country, aiming at a final result of having all the Tibetans exterminated or sterilised and the Tibetan Buddhist religion only maintained for show to fool tourists. Since 1950 China has only spoken well of Tibetans and their religion, claiming what they did was only for the welfare of the Tibetans, preaching tolerance and freedom, while in reality genocide has been practised consistently since 1956, and it has never slowed down except temporarily only to immediately renew its strength and harden its oppression. China always had only one policy in Tibet: Smash and grab. It wasn't pretty, so they always had to mask it behind lies and pretexts.

The Chinese are scared stiff, because they know they are losing their ground. Or should I say only the Chinese communists, the majority of the people being innocent and not aware of the schemes of the ruling party? But the whole Chinese people are accessories to the crimes of the regime, since they obey the regime.

One chief characteristic has dominated every communist regime in the world ever since Lenin, through Stalin and Mao, through Pol Pot and Milosevic. That characteristic has been the quality of evil. They have all been aware of their evil, they have practised evil, and they have been fully aware of the evil they have done all the way. When Stalin, Mao, Pol Pot and Milosevic carried through their genocides, they were perfectly aware of what they did, and so are the Chinese communists. When they speak peace, talk generosity, claim progress, preach human rights and profess benevolence they only mean murder. So don't get fooled, like the Russian peasants by Lenin and Stalin, like the farmers by Mao, like the world by Pol Pot and Milosevic, and like the Jews by Nazism and Hitler. It's more important to survive than to listen to politicians, take them seriously and believe in them. They are always wrong while only individual thinking is right.

China claims to have ruled Tibet for 700 years and to have rightfully reclaimed their own property. But before that Tibet conquered China with the result that Tibet and China made an everlasting agreement to leave each other in peace. But China has always broken all agreements and tried to rewrite and falsify history, because the Chinese government has never had anything else to stand on except lies.

And what about the 6000 monasteries and temples that China reduced to ashes and dust in Tibet, together with 60% of all books in the Tibetan language? What about the 1,2 million Tibetans, a fifth of the entire Tibetan population, that the Chinese purposely murdered? That's history for you. Don't you forget it ever.

Recognise evil when you see evil, or else you can't protect yourself from it.

*(Doctor Sun is intimately engaged in various freedom and democracy movements in China, like for instance the free trade union movement, the Falun Gong crisis, the suppression of Christians and Buddhists and the increasing unrest among the wronged farmers all over China.)*

*for 'The Free Thinker', Christmas 2000.*

### *The Situation.*

"As I was driving past Tiananmen Square in Beijing today, a small thought fired in my mind. This was the scene of the Tiananmen Square massacre, if you believe the sensationalist Western press. It was the Tiananmen "incident," if you prefer the Japanese press, which has long been craven to Beijing. Or it was the scene of a reactionary, illegal, destabilizing uprising by malevolent students who killed many noble patriotic soldiers of the People's Liberation Army, until their Western-influenced, anti-Chinese actions were finally ended by the just and correct actions of those troops as overseen by supremely wise patriarch, Deng Xiaoping, and much beloved hatchet man Li Peng.

Stuck in what seemed an intractable traffic jam on the broad boulevard beside the square of Heavenly Peace, I watched people flying kites over the open space as plain clothes police toured the perimeter on the lookout for Falun Gong protesters, whom they routinely round up and toss into vans that are conveniently waiting under the trees around the fringe of the square. Horns sounded as taxi drivers got impatient, and a car trying to jump lanes slammed into the side of a bus, causing a crowd of rubberneckers to gather around the damaged vehicles. Not so heavenly, and not very peaceful either. I started to feel my grip on reality loosening.

When I made it back to my hotel, I turned on CNN in an attempt to return to some reality. The lead news item was about the hostages in the Philippines, released through the intervention of known humanitarian and antiterrorist hero Muammar Gadaffi. Then there was an item about Nobel Peace Prize winner Aun San Suu Kyi, who had tried to drive up-country in Burma and was being blocked in her car on a small bridge by the Burmese army - they accused her of trying to "damage" the country. The third story concerned the opening of an international religious summit in New York under the auspices of the United Nations. Yes, China was there, with its seven-person delegation. Of course, none of the Falun Gong adherents were included - most of the leaders are in jail anyway.

But what really made me feel a migraine coming on - the Dalai Lama had been disinvited by the UN. It might have offended China, admitted Kofi Annan, secretary-general, TIME cover boy and renowned hero of the oppressed around the world. But guess who is on his way to New York, for a meeting of parliamentary heads? None other than the hero of the Tiananmen Square massacre/incident/unpatriotic crime, Li Peng. Kick out the Dalai Lama, and line up to welcome Li Peng. In the United States. Have I completely lost the plot here?"

- Terry McCarthy, August 30, 2000

Answer to Terry McCarthy concerning Li Peng plot:

"Here's another plot for you.

In 1971 the Nixon-Kissinger regime decided to launch a historical coup. They would abandon all support of Taiwan to instead start business with mainland China. It was a complete success. China is now one of the greatest markets in the world, especially for America.

Before the Nixon-Kissinger regime, America had been the only one to support the Tibetan freedom fighters, the Kham guerillas of Tibet. President Eisenhower introduced this policy by CIA in 1959. In 1974 all support to the last Tibetan freedom fighters was discontinued, and the freedom fighters were left to die. The last ones tried a heroic escape to Dharamsala but were betrayed by Nepal and killed to the last man by Nepali and Chinese troops surrounding them just as they reached the final pass to India.

The same Nixon-Kissinger regime gave Suharto-Indonesia full support in occupying East Timor in 1975.

But one thing Mr Kissinger had no hand in. Before the presidential elections in 1968 president Lyndon Johnson initiated peace negotiations with Vietnam. He wanted that peace settlement to be the last action of his presidential period. These negotiations were sabotaged by Nixon, who gambled for support of the army to continue the Vietnam war. He won the elections, and the Vietnam war continued for another 7 years. President Johnson and Hubert Humphrey knew about Nixon's manoeuvre, and Nixon was terrified that anyone would blow the whistle to let things out. It was to find documents in this matter that he ordered the Watergate intrusion.

So, Nixon and Kissinger helped to establish and confirm the two greatest autocracies in Asia, and America is still at it in China. Perhaps Nixon never knew about the Chinese mass destruction of 6000 Tibetan monasteries and the killing off of one fifth of the entire population. Perhaps he also didn't know about Mao Zedong killing off 43 million Chinese in his forced industrialization projects, his "Let a Thousands Blossoms Bloom"-campaign and the 10-year cultural revolution. Or was president Nixon just one of those too many politicians who only prefer to see what they want to see and nothing else, the main Chinese political line since 3000 years?

Here again are some other nasty statistics:

"Allegations of procedures forced on Tibetan women include infanticide, in which lethal chemicals are injected into a baby's brain, forced abortion after nine months of pregnancy, abortion via electrical rods inserted through the vagina, rusty IUDs that may bring on tuberculosis and other diseases and IUDs left in the uterus for eight years instead of the recommended three.

Quoting Dharamsala-based Tibetan Women's Association, the UNF also reported that "nearly 20 percent of Tibetans may no longer be able to reproduce because of sterilization procedures."

"One Tibetan woman interviewed by researchers at the Tibetan Administration in Dharamsala said 70 percent of women over age 18 in her village, including herself, were sterilized. In one district, 308 women were reportedly sterilized in 22 days."

Thus China continues her secret genocide on the Tibetans, which has been going on for 50 years along the same pattern without any reactions from the world outside. Of course, China always denies anything like this going on, and that's how they have always got away with it. And they will go on like this as long as Communist China remains backed up by western powers, first of all by major business interests in America.

And that is the most upsetting thing of all, that Tibet already 50 years ago, as it was occupied by Communist China, was unanimously betrayed and let down by the whole democratic world. It appears today that the only society to support Tibetan sovereignty over Tibet is the 'Ruckus Society', mainly represented by NGO's and demonstrators against globalization, like those starting a new universal peace movement in opposition to the world pollution of the oil industries and other World Bank projects:

"Beijing was recently graced with a visit by leading members of the Ruckus Society - the U.S. civil disobedience group at the heart of the huge demonstrations that shut down last year's World Trade Organization talks in Seattle.

The activists - veterans of anti-globalization protests, Amazon ecology campaigns and oil industry boycotts - were in China to represent their newest interest: a free Tibet."  
(David Rennie, The Daily Telegraph)

But what we need is something more than just the Ruckus Society to react against the betrayal of Tibet by the whole organized democratic world.

### **A BUREAUCRAT'S DIARY, by S. Shankar Menon: ROAD TO LHASA**

February 9, 2001

Kathmandu... Kodari... Zhangou... Xegar... Shigatse... Gyantzo and finally that holiest of holies - Lhasa. The journey on the Friendship Road is long, arduous, exciting and intensely emotional. In the early part, Everest is on your left and in that summer of June '98, you can almost reach out and touch the melting snows. At the talk about this, last week to an overflowing hall at the Y.B. Chavan Centre, it was impossible to even get to the essentials of genocide in Tibet.

Six thousand monasteries have been reduced to eight as mentioned in the 50-minute film shown by Pammi Pandey, before three of us began our experiences in Tibet. Lonely Planet says there are 2000 active monasteries.

There was no mention of nuns with their vaginas ripped out by court hangers or monks forced to rape them, after Chinese soldiers had their fill. I couldn't talk of precious religious artefacts, Tangkas, looted from monasteries and used as toilet paper. Over a million killed in recent years.

When the heat overflows at these horrors and the throat is dry with the drought for words that cannot be expressed, there is only bottled water in the darkened hall to keep an almost fluent flow.

To explain the slides taken by a travelling companion, Baban Govardhan, Nagpur's leading surgeon, whose early fumbblings with the camera would have lost him a lot of patients if they knew of such clumsy fingers. The first shot at the Friendship Bridge of trucks being repaired may well have been in Bhatinda or Bhubhaneshwar.

Baban blossomed in his art from this blue period to me near prayer flags on a wind-swept pass close to where the Panchen Lama was scuttled away recently by the Chinese to be kept under wraps.

With growing confidence the photographs captured the essence of my hollow cheeks, sunken eyes and a nose fleshy with remembered delights. Even the audience, numb with horror as the tale unfolded tittered in unexpected delight. The emotion all of us in a rattling van went through, came out in a simple slide. Of a beautiful young Tibetan girl by the roadside in a small town selling bits of machinery that will barely be of use in a bicycle.

I tried to talk of the Friendship Road with potholes that knocked out dentures and fractured axles. The claustrophobia in those vast expanses where we tried to look for our own Shangri La as visitors from all over the world hung thick and quiet for five whole days.

We endlessly wound past the Turquoise Lake, barren remote mountains that dipped and fell away, yak which ambled past like animals from pre-history.

Until, tired and tumbling out of the bus at Lhasa after six days on the road with few toilets and worse food and everywhere left-overs of a gentle, loving race vandalised and hugely diminished, a rainbow greeted us at the Potala.

Here was regeneration and hope. Spectacular in its depths and colour and the huge range of arc dipped straight into Dr Govardhan's head as he stood for a group photograph.

At the Potala itself there are hidden cameras which search our every move. We were cautioned many times not to even think of handing over our photograph of the

Dalai Lama. There were even instances in the past where some of the monks at the Tashi Limpo monastery near Shigatse turned out to be Chinese agents who got tourists arrested for asking questions out of turn.

The whole country of Tibet is under siege by gun-toting arrogant Chinese. An old and precious culture is disembowelled. Barkhor, the traditional part of Lhasa does not get any electricity in the evenings and somehow makes do with patched up generators.

The new part of the capital city could be Manchester or Nariman Point in Mumbai. There is hardly a new generation of residents. Tibetan women were forcibly sterilised between 1982 and '86. Genocide of an entire race close to the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century is one of the important causes of the new millennium. A conspiracy of silence has not brought this to the notice of anyone willing to hear.

Friends of Tibet in India are making an effort now, to touch our conscience. The most powerful man in the world, the President of the United States, is bothered about billions of dollars to be got from trading with the Chinese. The moral values are ploughed under by the purely economic ones. Our own stance is cautiously ambiguous.

The Philips radiogram given by Nehru to the Dalai Lama still sits in a barren room of the Norbulingka Palace from where His Holiness left in a hurry deep in the night of March 19, 1959.

Those of us in Mussourie for our first hesitant steps into the world of administration in the early Sixties saw Tibetan children who had fled kicking stuffed rags tied into tight balls with the expertise that Ronaldo or Beckham will envy even today. Their cheerful laughter floated across our valley.

That laughter is still cheerful today. For the pain behind, you have to travel on the dusty road to Lhasa.

Between tears and laughter with [sshankarmenon@hotmail.com](mailto:sshankarmenon@hotmail.com)

### *Remember Lithang!*

by John B. Westerberg,  
(Translated from Swedish by Christian Lanciai  
the Free Thinker - August 28th, 2002.)

"There was nothing more despicable in the West than its disgusting sympathy for Red China from the 60s and its loathsome Mao cult. While Mao exterminated people and villages and launched ethnic cleansings on a large scale in Tibet and Turkestan, using highly developed military violence and brutality against people that could not defend themselves and who owned nothing but their ancient Buddhist culture, which the Maoist army of gangsters just for that reason then systematically and with zealous force committed themselves to utterly destroy and annihilate, the West kowtowed to the Chinese communists and licked them in cajolery, bestowing on the small red book, the only permitted literary work of the cultural revolution, a mawkish veneration as a cult object. While Mao methodically and deliberately destroyed the entire culture of China and more than 6000 monasteries and temples in the brutally occupied and enslaved Tibet, even America fell to the temptation of oiling their way into Mao's favours to make business with him by the initiative of Nixon and Kissinger. Up till then, America had been the dominating bulwark against evil and autocracy in the world and had helped the Tibetan freedom fighters against the Chinese, but since Nixon and Kissinger decided to change that way of thinking and start kissing Mao's toes and do business with as great crooks as possible (including även the dictators Suharto and Pinochet among others), the Tibetan freedom fighters were betrayed together with the just cause

of Tibet in a treason worse than that of Chamberlain against Czechoslovakia in 1938. The situation is hardly much different now: also China pursues the "*Lebensraum*" policy of comprehensive ethnic cleansings against other peoples in order to make more room for Han Chinese. The communist regime of Beijing has nothing to stand on except lies, fraud and brute force. All their propaganda consists of lies, and they refuse to listen to anything else. If someone tells them the truth, like the Tibetans used to do for their only defence, they respond by their normal procedure of killing all critics and opponents at once. Ask the freedom fighters from Kham. The Chinese murdered 480,000 of them in order to fill up their country with loyal Maoist Han Chinese insects.

During the last ten years I have untiringly worked for the exit of the Chinese communist regime to prepare the path for independence in Tibet and Turkestan. I will continue these efforts untiringly but only by diplomatic peaceful means. The communist regime in Beijing must be ousted, it's a ghastly stinking cancer tumour to the whole world, and I don't care how it is removed as long as it is removed, but I will never even punch a Chinese on his nose. If I encounter crooks I get out of their way and rather ignore them than have anything to do with them, while of course I don't mind their disappearing through the proceedings of others, which though I will have nothing to do with myself.

In denouncing the Chinese communist regime I also denounce every politician in the world who co-operates with it and declare them to be crooks just as much as those crooks they co-operate with, thereby giving them legitimacy. Everything dealing with the Chinese communist establishment is rotten, and I will have nothing to do with it.

During the last twenty years, China has pathetically tried to clean their slate from the Mao era by introducing market economy, and they keep on saying: "Look, we have now a market economy, everything is now going in the right direction in China, so please come and do business with us, Mao is a concluded chapter of the past, and we should all forget and forgive." They can't get away that easily. It's easy to forgive but impossible to forget, the communist party now ruling in Beijing is the same as in Mao's time, the same old men are still there paying homage to the same inhuman materialistic principles, and they must not and shall not get away with it, as neither the Nazis did. What the Chinese did in Tibet was at least as cruel as what the Germans did in Poland. The only difference is that the Germans were ultimately stopped, while the Chinese carry on their covert systematic ethnic cleansing in Tibet still 52 years after their brutal invasion and occupation of this peaceful cultural people and their country.

The Lithang monastery was a large and important monastery in Kham but only a monastery of some wealth and lands, but within the monastery were also employed many women and children, who lived there. A Tibetan monastery is not only a monastery for monks and nuns but also a school and university for all ages. The Tibetan monastery system is the only educational system that Tibet ever had, but it has been quite sufficient and efficient and stable at the same time as it has been the world's best educational establishment.

In 1956 the Chinese communists demanded the monastery should render an account of all its assets including land properties and valuables in the monastery. The monks of Lithang would not do this. Why should they, celibate custodians of religious traditions and engaged only in prayers and education, submit themselves to the commands of foreign atheists? They took counsel with other men of the area, who felt the hour was come to start some resistance against the encroaching Chinese. So they raided a Chinese cantonment and took their weapons. When consequently the Chinese began hunting them, they sought protection in the monastery with the monks. The Chinese demanded their extradition. The monks demanded peace and claimed the monastery as a place of refuge, from which no one could be extradited who once had

sought asylum. The Chinese then suggested, that if the rebels were extradited the monastery would be spared new enforced collectivizations for two years. The monks did not agree to these terms.

Then the Chinese bombed the monastery. Bombers had never been heard of before in Kham, so the people were completely vulnerable and could not protect themselves. There were six thousand people in the monastery who believed the monastery would protect them, as it always had done against every peril, why they refused to leave it, while the Chinese bombed the monastery to cinders. Four thousand out of the six thousand perished, mostly women and children, monks and elderly people.

No news of this reached outside China. The world had all its attention on the Suez crisis, just like in 1950, when China invaded Tibet, the world was watching the Korean war, which it considered "more important".

Lithang was only one episode out of many and far from the only monastery to be bombed by the Chinese. Ganden and Tsurphu, two of the leading monasteries in the heart of Tibet, are two other examples. During the Second World War the allies bombed and destroyed the Italian monastery Monte Cassino south of Rome, but they had no choice, since the Germans had transformed the monastery into a strategic defence fortress. The Chinese bombed and devastated more than 6000 monasteries in Tibet just because these by their spiritualism constituted something alien to the Chinese established atheism and materialistic communism and therefore were considered hostile. The Chinese cultural massacres in Tibet were just as cruel as the premeditated effort of the Germans 1933-45 to exterminate the Jews with the difference, that the Chinese are still keeping at it today but with subtler means: instead of directly trying to eliminate the Tibetans by force they try to flood the Tibetan population in an enforced mass immigration of Chinese into Tibet, so that Lhasa, the capital, is hardly Tibetan any more. Two thirds of all Tibetan houses have been torn down, and half of the entire population of Lhasa is now Chinese, while the Tibetans constantly are bereft of more of their identity and human rights. Now they are no longer permitted to make a pilgrimage to their own holy mountain of Kailash without expensive special permits, and obvious human rights like education and work are being denied the Tibetans while the Chinese are given privileges. At the same time, one Chinese in Tibet costs Beijing as much as four Chinese in China. In Tibet Beijing has made its worst business deal and that by force.

The question is: did the monks of Lithang have any right to refuse a foreign occupational force the assets of their monastery or not? If they had no right to refuse, then according to the same precedent no one has any right to resist any tyranny or outrage. If they had a right to refuse, then you have to take your stand for Tibet against China - until China has left Tibet for good."

- John B. Westerberg.

### *Forced abortion and forced sterilization*

China, as a whole commits about half a million third-trimester (ninth month) abortions annually. Most of these babies are fully alive when they are killed, and virtually all of these abortions are performed against the mother's will. Women are often imprisoned, brainwashed, and refused food until they finally break down and agree to an abortion. The actual methods by which the doctors carry out the "procedures" are brutal. Injections of Rivalor, commonly known as the "poison shot" causes the baby to slowly die over the course of two to three days at which time the baby will be delivered dead.

Pure formaldehyde is also injected into the soft spot on the baby's head, or the skull is crushed by the doctor's forceps. Doctors in China are known to carry a few "chokers" in their pockets. These are similar to garbage-bag ties but longer. They are placed around the baby's neck and twisted, effectively strangling the child. Two other methods of aborting a child are by drowning the newborn in a bucket of water in plain view of the mother, and suffocation by towels forced into the baby's mouth as the doctor plugs the newborn's little nose. The latter two methods are used especially to "teach a lesson in obedience" and to act as a reminder that the People's Republic of China has strict family laws that are to be abided by its citizens.

- Human Rights Watch, Asia.

### *Greetings from Darjeeling*

by John B. Westerberg

China occupied Tibet and East Turkestan by force with no right as soon as the communists had taken over the leadership in Beijing in 1949. As a result of this enforced occupation, Tibet not only lost one fifth (more than 1,200,000) of all Tibetans by violence, persecution, abduction, starvation, deportation and mass executions, but did also China deliberately try to exterminate the whole national Tibetan culture and identity by methodically destroying almost all the temples and monasteries there was, in total 6246 out of 6259. Many of these monasteries were bombed by aircraft, for example Tsurphu, Ganden and Lithang, where thousands of women and children had sought refuge, who were bombed to death, about 2000 civilians in one monastery bombing in 1956. We must never forget this. The Chinese atrocities against Tibet, their people and culture during 50 years, is the most clear-cut possible argument for total Tibetan independence from China.

Thereby nothing has been said about China's crimes against their own citizens. The victims of the Mao Zedong regime are calculated to about 43 million especially by starvation catastrophes caused by aborted political reform programs and the inhuman systematic persecution of the Culture Revolution against all of China's own citizens during the last ten years of Mao. The communist regime boasts of having eliminated 125 million unborn children (mostly by forced sterilizations and abortions) in enforced birth control programs. Recently they also boasted the humanization of their executions from a bullet in the neck to specially manufactured execution buses. This is a kind of progress that the Nazis of Germany were proud of in the 30s.

But you mustn't tell the Chinese about these things, because it will upset them, and if you ask them with what right they keep Tibet and East Turkestan under forced occupation, they will accuse you of trying to split their mother country. Then you mustn't spare them, because the only way to teach the cat not to shit in the sofa is to put his nose into his own shit until he learns from his own mistakes. Such is the immensity of the disastrous results of China's aborted enterprises in Tibet and the western provinces of China, that lasting environmental problems might match what the Soviet Union left behind as a legacy of one immense environmental disaster from Vladivostok to Berlin after its fall. The same kind of gross environmental ruthlessness without considering the consequences has been forced on Tibet, East Turkestan and the western provinces of China which once Stalinism in the Soviet Union was responsible for turning all the Russias into a dump with. Moreover, this affects India, Burma, Thailand, Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam as well, since their rivers come from Tibet, where Chinese

deforestation has turned nature into a havoc of disasters across the entire Tibetan plateau; which gives us the strange impression of China accelerating their environmental destruction in panic as if to insist on destroying as much as possible before its regime has to fall, as did the same environmentally disastrous Soviet regime.

Recently Australia decided to invest \$1,4 million in human rights development in China, which China smilingly accepts while they continue to execute people on a larger scale than in the rest of the world together and boast the "humanization" of their execution methods. With equally humble flatulence and creeping encouragement, India kowtows to China, acknowledging Tibet to be part of China; and so does the US, who has helped the China regime to progress ever since the Nixon-Kissinger days in the beginning of the 70s, when they embarked on their global policy program to support and build up rogue states and autocracies like Chile, Indonesia, Nicaragua, Iraq and China for the sake of American business interests.

Recently president Bush announced there were still a number of rogue states left in the world to consider. These were pointed out to be Belorussia under Lukashenko, North Korea under Kim Jong Il, Zimbabwe under Robert Mugabe, Libya under colonel Khaddafi, Burma with its China-supported military rule, Iran, Sudan and Cuba. Not a word was in this context mentioned of China, the world's greatest autocracy and rogue state with possibly 200 million lives on their conscience and which democratic nations like the US and Australia humbly and enthusiastically continue backing up since they make money out of that business.

Here in Darjeeling there are intense discussions going on about the possible opening up of the old trade route between Darjeeling and Gyantse across Sikkim. No one knows as yet when and if it will happen, and here they don't quite believe in it. This opening is presumed to be a result of the latest negotiations between India and China, in which India made the concession to accept Tibet as part of China. Was it a tactical manoeuvre of India which will speed up the thaw of China and hasten the fall of its regime, or was it China that once more fooled India? That remains to be seen.

### *Raoul Wallenberg and Tibet*

The Swedish diplomat Raoul Wallenberg disappeared in Budapest January 1945 after a peerlessly heroic engagement to save tens of thousands, maybe up to 30,000 Jews from the Nazi holocaust in Hungary. He was last seen alive as he was escorted away by Russian officials of the Stalinist occupation. The Swedish government decided to be patient.

When two years later Moscow reported that Raoul Wallenberg was dead, this was swallowed by the Swedish government without comment. It also swallowed the Russian explanation that Raoul Wallenberg never had entered Soviet territory but had found his end in Hungary. It also swallowed that no evidence ever was produced by the Russians to confirm Wallenberg's death. Whatever could the Swedish government do? The more important then to watch what they did *not* do.

When later there were witness reports that Wallenberg was alive, that he had been seen in Moscow by other prisoners and that these had been tapping messages between themselves through the prison walls of Lubyanka, that psychiatrists happened to mention they had had him as a patient and other such stuff, the Swedish government became active but in the opposite way to what would have been expected as rational. They silenced the matter. The foreign minister accepted the Russian word that Wallenberg was dead (without evidence) and refused to accept any other version or even any other possibility, since he did not want to offend the Russians. "The Soviet

authorities are respectable. They wouldn't tell a lie. We must believe them, we have no choice. We must respect them." This cowardice even worsened during the years, during decades the cruelty of silence was the only policy allowed - there was a governmental effort to silence the matter to nothing, and this policy was maintained until the collapse of the Soviet Union.

Not until then, after 50 years, one acknowledgement after the other started gradually to turn up. The Soviet authorities had been lying from the start, and Sweden had not even questioned the lies. The governmental policy was admitted to have been cowardly false. The first official excuses from the government to Raoul Wallenberg's family were delivered - after 50 years.

This remarkable Raoul Wallenberg syndrome reappears in the even more revolting standpoint of the world in the Tibetan issue. Independent Tibet was occupied by military force by Communist China in 1950. Only El Salvador dared to raise the issue in the United Nations and was silenced. In 1956 the Chinese started their methodical destruction of Tibet with its culture and history by bombings and closing and looting of monasteries, the universities of Tibet, and their temples. Not until Dalai Lama's escape in 1959 did the Tibetan issue start some attention. A commission of international jurists in Geneva decided to investigate the case and arrived at the conclusion that China had already committed genocide in Tibet. Nobody did anything about it. In 1966 commenced the total devastation of Tibet, which was allowed to rave at large for ten years while the United States by the initiative of Henry Kissinger withdrew their support for the Tibetan resistance movement and abandoned Taiwan (which actually was governed by the only legal government of China), to instead start making business with Communist China and Mao Zedong, the murderer of at least 43 million of his own subjects. (Taiwan is today a developed and working democracy while China after 54 years is still the world's greatest dictatorship.) No one did anything for Tibet except specially invited leftist writers, like Han Suyin, who wrote books about Tibet depicting China as her benefactor and liberator. The first book to criticize China from inside Tibet was not written until 1979 (John F. Avedon's *"In Exile from the Land of Snows"*.)

Thereby at last an opposition started to make itself heard in one upsetting testimonial account after the other, the flow of which has never been interrupted; but still the political establishments of the world continue to support China with cajolery: "But China is a respectable nation. They do as well as they can. Although their execution statistics surpass the whole rest of the world they make progress in human rights. After all, they don't perform public executions any longer by shots in the neck but instead by injections in specially designed execution buses, so that the victims can die comfortably. We must respect China and acknowledge that Tibet is part of China, for the sake of China." (China stands for 20% of the world's population but 70% of the world's executions.) While at the same time China enforces mass immigration of Chinese into Tibet to definitely sinocize Tibet by drowning the Tibetan people in Chinese masses, who are not even constituted to live in such an extreme climate; so that Lhasa, the magical capital of Tibet, is now a circus of Chinese brothels, Karaoke bars and sterile business complexes of concrete blocks, where all the profits are Chinese, while the Tibetans are marginalized and sorted out like a lower caste without any rights of their own as citizens or even as human beings.

Unlike the Raoul Wallenberg case, no Chinese has ever made any Tibetan excuses or indemnified anything of the Chinese holocaust against the Tibetan people and culture, which process instead is just kept rolling on and even accelerated together with the Chinese executions, which also are speeded up after constantly quicker summary trials; while the world keeps disinterestedly looking on and lick China under her feet as if in a kind of voluntary blindness and refusal to recognize the evidence of a 50 year old

political problem, which by this neglect just keeps growing, given fresh fuel and dirt today in Nepal and France; as the authorities of Nepal in spite of international law returns Tibetan refugees to China (since China pays Nepalese policemen to do this) where the fugitives consequently are maltreated and vanish; and as the French president Jacques Chirac, duped by a Chinese economical charm offensive, tries to persuade the European Community to resume the arms trade with China, which export was interrupted after the massacres by the Chinese authorities on Tiananmen Square in Beijing, June 4th 1989. For what purpose will China use those arms? Shoot more Tibetans and Uighurs? Start war against Taiwan?

*The 27th Gothenburg Film Festival - "The Cry of the Snow Lion".*

One of the discussions was whether the most important film of the festival was "*The Khmer Rouge Killing Machine*" from Cambodia or "*The Cry of the Snow Lion*" from Tibet. Both were documentaries about recent genocides, and both had their Scandinavian first nights. The difference between them, however, was considerable.

The Cambodian film made by one of the rare survivors shows the automatic apparatus from the inside, set for systematic genocide without anyone being able to stop it. The film conveys an impression of maximal horror since, unlike recounts from Auschwitz, it has a more authentic touch by the fact that the real tormentors play their own parts in the film. We have only been able to look into Auschwitz after it was all over, with all the activities terminated and all the victims, living and dead, removed forever; but here the actual genocidal process goes on before our own eyes without there being anything we or the victims can do about it. The result is so heavy, that even professional and hardened self-tormentors must find it unendurable. And this occurred under a regime that was praised as an example all over the world by intellectuals of the left led by such infallible and intelligent prophets as Jean Paul Sartre, who obviously didn't care about what Pol Pot actually was busy at.

The Khmer Rouge and their murder of 1,5 million of their own subjects is however a finished story, while the Tibetan trauma goes on and has been going on for more than 50 years. "*The Cry of the Snow Lion*" is an objective documentary carefully compiled during 9 years, which deals with all the important milestones on the way: "the peaceful liberation" by military force of Communist China, the introductory destruction of the monasteries and the Tibetan university system during the 50s, the starvation crisis 1959-62 because of Mao's "agricultural reforms" which implied the deaths of 30 million Chinese during these three years only, the Tibetan uprising 1959 with Dalai Lama's consequential escape, how after that Tibet was hermetically closed up and shut for insight from abroad for 20 years while the genocide on the Tibetans ruthlessly went on, the total destruction during the cultural revolution advocated by Mao during his last ten years, the final opening of Tibet to foreign investigation in 1979 with shocking revelations of the heartrending sufferings of a tortured people, how CIA helped the armed resistance for 15 years to then under Henry Kissinger and Richard Nixon betray and abandon them, the new uprisings in Lhasa 1987 with the Chinese atrocities filmed in broad daylight and so on all the way up to the videofilmed Chinese destruction of Serthar in 2002 when 9000 monks and nuns were driven away and their homes systematically destroyed. Many renowned tibetologists are interviewed in the film, you can see what John F. Avedon looks like, who wrote the first critical book against China about Tibet in 1979, Stephen Batchelor, who wrote the first truthful Tibetan guidebook, Robbie Barnett of the TIN and many other legendary authorities on the Tibetan issue. Even some Chinese are interviewed who appear like completely brainwashed dummies

who have no thought of their own left in their heads but are only allowed to prattle propaganda. One of the most upsetting scenes is of a festival in Nagchu, where the Tibetans appear all dressed up flamboyantly for their festivities, but something is wrong. Not one Tibetan is smiling. In the next moment you see why: they are being watched by heavily armed troops who all have their machine guns ready. If anyone doesn't co-operate in this propaganda manifestation of the perfect harmony between Chinese and Tibetan, he knows what to expect!

In spite of its complete neutrality, the film makes a horrendous impression by its summing up of the situation, that this has been going on since 50 years and is going on still. This systematic genocide has never relaxed for 40 years. Every day a few Tibetans disappear, every day a few fugitives cross the Himalayas into India and get chillblains and black toes on the way, every day new innocent prisoners are murdered in Chinese prisons or torture chambers somewhere, and every day there are new executions and forced sterilizations. We can not see them, they occur behind bars on a low scale, but indefatigably they keep going on without China doing anything to stop it. On the contrary, the process is constantly encouraged and urged on by Beijing, where it is officially proclaimed that it doesn't happen with a beaming smile to charm the world, while the population of Lhasa day by day is getting less Tibetan and more Chinese, and where most Chinese are soldiers (at least 300,000 in Tibet) and implanted prostitutes (568 brothels in Lhasa 1999). The core of the Tibetan problem is that the unacceptability and injustice of the Chinese oppression only can worsen as long as nobody does anything about it. It's worse than Chinese torture; it is the Chinese form of genocide, as slowly and as unnoticeably as possible.

### *The Himalayas Updated*

- notes on the way, by Christian Lanciai.

There is a saying in the Himalayas, that "if man is to have a future at all, he must understand himself and his own past." Maybe that is why I keep returning to the Himalayas: in front of the face of the highest, purest and loveliest mountains in the world you stand naked, spiritually naked, and you have to confront your own nakedness and consider your situation carefully. Thus you are forced to get to know and understand yourself.

Man is much more than just his historical past. For me, the main attraction of India is her spiritual depth and the seriousness of her culture. Indian civilisation is probably the oldest in the world, it is impossible to date, but Hinduism is certainly the world's oldest living religion, and her main offspring is Buddhism. But Hinduism was born in the mountains of the Himalayas.

In the depth of the great Himalayas you find a valley called "the Valley of the Gods". It's in the heart of the land of Vishnu, but the geographical names of that area are rather of the predecessors to the well-known Indian gods Brahma, Vishnu and Shiva, that is, of Rudra, Karna, Indra and others. You find these valleys and strange places in Garwhal, western Uttaranchal, where the Ganges runs up, where also the sacred pilgrimage sites Gangotri, Kedarnath and Badrinath are found, all these representing different sources of the Ganga, the holy river of India.

But no matter how sacred these places are, for many modern people and thinkers the chief place of attraction in India is Dharamsala in Himachal Pradesh because of the Dalai Lama's presence there. He represents much more than just Tibetan Buddhism since he there leads an exile government of the suppressed Tibet and the persecuted

Tibetan people, who today face what the Jews stood against in the Second World War. The comparison is not far-fetched, though there are differences: the Jews did not have a country of their own when the Nazi persecution set in, but the Tibetans did have their own country which never had belonged to anyone else, when the Chinese occupied it by military force and compelled many Tibetans to choose between exile or death. Many who chose to remain perished in torture chambers or labour camps, at least about 500,000, probably much more. It's not a Chinese tradition to count casualties.

For this very special situation of the Dalai Lama and the Tibetans, he appears as the leading freedom fighter of the world together with the imprisoned Aung Sang Suu Kyi of Burma, especially since both strictly follow the principle of non-violence. Their method is wisdom and patience against the cruelty and folly of mundane politics.

You can feel this inspired freedom aspiration all over Dharamsala mixed with bitter memories and painful melancholy, but the optimism is there. Just as the Nazi terror became a driving force for the Jews with their greatest dynamic expansion since the times of king David and Christ for a result, so will the communist-atheist persecution of Buddhism and the Tibetan nation and culture transform into perhaps the greatest dynamic growth of Tibetanism and Buddhism in history - for the first time Buddhism will spread into all corners of the world.

A bit further away in Himachal you find a paradise of a different kind, where you find cannabis growing all over the country wild in nature around Manali, the Kullu valley and Manikaran. Those who find the best way to enjoy life through drugs will find many hippie paradises in the eastern areas of Himachal.

Further down is Shimla, the last Indian summer capital of the British, which still retains its style and is an agreeable spot to spend some days in. Another place like that is Mussoorie above Dehra Doon, one of the nicest hill stations, which is almost exactly as the British left it. Further down is Rishikesh on the Ganges, an entirely vegetarian town with many holy men: you can't find a drop of alcohol or a piece of meat for eating in the whole town. I never heard of anyone who didn't like it in Rishikesh.

But let's move up along the river to the sources of the Ganga and to the valleys of the gods. If you follow the river up west you will eventually reach Gangotri, the traditional temple at the main source of the holy river. But this river is now being controlled by a dam, which has caused much controversy. Several towns and villages have been drowned, like Tehri, and people refused to move from their family homes through many generations to alien places until they were forced to. If an earthquake will happen here and the dam will burst, all Rishikesh will be washed away.

But the eastern arm of the river is more interesting. It's called Aliknanda, and along it you will find a richer landscape with flourishing villages and communities to a much greater extent than on the main Ganga. Another riverarm leads up to Gaurikund, from where you can walk up to the temple of Kedarnath at 3500 meters, another source of the Ganga. It is set under wild mountains in the middle of the snows and is a quite fantastic place.

But if you keep following the Aliknanda you will eventually end up in the valley of the gods, where the small town of Joshimath has perhaps the wildest and most dramatic settings found anywhere in the world. It's right in the middle of the great Himalayas, where the river bursts through the mountains in gorges which you can't see the bottom of, while the mountains rise sharply and almost vertically straight up to 7000 meters and more. One of the mountains here is the Nanda Devi, the highest mountain of India, at 7800 meters. It's a sharp top with a hunch like a camel and is a very spectacular mountain and almost impossible to climb. You see it best from Auli, a small village above Joshimath, at 3000 meters.

Of course there are lots of places around here where you can retreat and philosophise in peace and quiet, like Gandhi did in Kausani, where he wrote his autobiography. There is an ashram there in his name with a museum and is a very peaceful spot, ideal for a retreat, and you can see all the Garwhal high Himalayas from there.

Lower down and more busy is Almora, the old capital of this part of the world, with the shrine of Kesaar Devi next to it, another hippie paradise; but for me Almora is too modern and hectic. I prefer the delightful oasis of Naini Tal, a small summer town constructed around a lake, which was the first summer capital of the British in the 1820s. The style and charm of those days is still there. It's a wondrous place where Christian churches, Hindu temples, Moslem mosques and a Buddhist Tibetan monastery exist together without any problem at all; but the centre of the town is an impressing cricket field just by the water. They always play there, and loudspeakers keep informing the whole town how the game goes. Together with Dharamsala and Darjeeling, it's one of my favourite spots in India.

Darjeeling lies on the other eastern side of Nepal and is geographically Sikkimese. The British leased it from Sikkim in the 1840s to start growing tea there, and after Indian independence 1947 Nehru continued the lease contract with Sikkim and even voluntarily doubled the fee. Not until India formally occupied Sikkim in 1974 there was no need for India to continue paying the rent for Darjeeling to Sikkim.

The main reason why Indira Gandhi decided to put an end to Sikkim independence was her fear that China would do it instead. Not until this year did China accept Sikkim as a part of India, while India at the same time formally accepted Tibet as a part of China. One can't help remembering the pact between Nazi-Germany and Soviet-Russia in 1939 before they cut up Poland between themselves.

-----

The main characteristic of the landscape and mentality of Sikkim is softness. It is a green lush country completely dominated by its sacred mountain the majestic Kanjenjunga, who generously spreads out her hills in all directions towards the east in grand green valleys and an extremely agreeable landscape incomparable with anything else. This geographical harmony also marks the people, who perhaps are the kindest in all India. It was an independent kingdom for many centuries until India decided to incorporate it into the Indian Union, thus making sure the Chinese would not invade it. Previously, Sikkim had only had troubles with Nepal, which consistently has been rather aggressive against Sikkim; and the main population of Sikkim today are Nepalese, whereas the original Sikkim people, the Lepcha, have withdrawn more and more into a rather obscure minority.

Geographically, Darjeeling belongs to Sikkim, although its characteristic is entirely different. The name '*Dorjeling*' means the 'home of the thunderbolt', and Darjeeling could be described as one of the most dramatic places in India, not only because of the very changeable and constantly surprising weather - you can have glorious sunshine in one moment to be immersed in fog the next, and then suddenly there are torrential showers and thunder. The main languages are Nepali, Hindi and Bengali, but the first language is English. More than any place in India, Darjeeling has retained its British stamp, and when Gandhi wanted to separate India from the British (and cause the secession of Pakistan, Burma and Ceylon as well) Darjeeling was not interested. Several of the small provinces east of Darjeeling shared that failure to be impressed by the activities of Gandhi, and some of them are still fighting to get rid of the Hindu dominance. The North East Territories are the most troublesome spot in India after

Kashmir, and foreigners are not allowed there without special permits. The people there are mainly Christian and Burmese.

Nepal, which produced the best soldiers for the British Empire, the famous Gurkhas, and which always co-operated well with Britain although never colonised, suffered a very traumatic tragedy the other year, when the heir to the throne shot his whole family dead except his uncle, who is now king. Behind this atrocious family quarrel was much more than the heir's displeasure at his parents' not allowing him to marry the girl he wanted. He was on drugs, mainly cocaine, which his uncle had initiated him into the use of, and the terrible royal family tragedy should be seen mainly as the result of a drug psychosis on behalf of the heir, who ended the massacre by turning his gun on himself. Since then there has been no real stability in Nepal. The king, the former uncle, is conservative and has little concern for his people. Being an orthodox Hindu, he doesn't like Buddhists and Christians much, and things have not improved during his rule. On the contrary, the Maoist guerrilla warfare has increased, and it's not safe anymore for anyone to journey by road. There are police checkpoints everywhere causing much trouble and delay, traffic doesn't work at night because of the curfew, and even tourists have become robbed by bandits.

China obviously plays some part in this, since she officially supports the Nepalese central government and the royal throne while at the same time she provides the Maoist guerrilla with weapons. I have heard this from several sources. China denies this, but the weapons of the guerrillas are Chinese. China claims Tibetans smuggle them across, or that Indian communists are doing it; but the only motive behind this must be a Chinese ambition to gain more control of Nepal, like she has of Burma, where the military dictatorship firmly maintains the economic control of the country by a monopoly on drugs, mainly heroin. Only the Chinese government has accepted the military dictatorial government of Burma, backing it up with weapons. One can see Chinese control of Nepal increasing: she wants to stop the refugee flow from Tibet to Nepal, and Nepal has started to return Tibetan fugitives to China, spiting the United Nations international agreement concerning political refugees. Nepal is in a bad fix between the giants India and China with no other bordering countries except these threatening mammoth states. Of course she is afraid of both and has a difficult diplomatic balance to keep by trying not to upset or anger any of them. But whatever Nepal does to please India will anger China, and vice versa, so Nepal can do nothing to improve her relationships without causing either of her two overbearing neighbours to start threatening again.

On the other hand, every traveller I have met to Burma has praised the country and her people. The trick in visiting Burma is not to change any money at the airport but to reserve all expenses for the people, so that the military government gets nothing. It's easy to travel alone, people are extremely helpful and want to speak English with you, it's ideal for a student of Buddhism, adorer of nature and lover of idylls; and the military autocracy will of course fall sooner or later to give way to the democratic opposition led by the most admirable Nobel Peace Prize winner Aung Sang Suu Kyi, who has devoted her life solely to serve and help her people. Burma (Myanmar) is definitely a country of the future.

If there are troubles in Nepal, there are no less troubles in main India, which was manifest as I travelled through Bihar. The same kind of strikes that paralyse Nepalese traffic sometimes occur in India. I was held up seven hours on a train because a local politician had felt insulted and in anger organised the local police to stop the trains indefinitely until he had obtained an excuse; and as I travelled by bus there was a corpse on the road, which also caused the police to stop the traffic on the main road in India to the North Eastern Territories for hours. Bihar is the most notoriously criminal

state of India, it is backward, illiteracy is high, it's difficult to find people who can speak English, so for us it is best avoided. The problem is that it is the heart of India, so it's difficult to avoid.

The capital Patna used to be the capital of the Indian Empire when it reached its highest expansion under the Buddhist king Ashoka the generation after Alexander the Great. It was then called Pataliputra and is still today an awesome metropolis of 3,5 million; but nothing is left of the ancient Buddhist imperial splendour - except the oasis Bodhgaya 100 kilometres to the south just off Gaya.

This is a fascinating spot where all Asia meets - here you find all Asian nationalities with Buddhist temples of their own, from Ceylon to Japan with all nations in between. The two most beautiful temples are the main Tibetan ones, but also the Thai and the Bhutan temples are startling masterpieces of architecture. Pilgrims from all over the world come here, even from the west, to study, meditate or just enjoy the peace around the Mahabodhi Stupa, built before the 7th century by the spot where the Buddha had his enlightenment, the holiest site of Buddhism in the world. It's impossible not to be impressed by the general atmosphere here of devotion, piety and respect.

-----

What then is to be said about Tibet and China? Let me quote the words of a good friend of mine in Darjeeling:

"Another obviousness is the absurd political existence of the China phenomenon as a single extreme monster state in a fairly democratic world, but the politicians and business men of the leading democratic countries in the west are so stupid that they keep backing up, investing in and fawning on China in the preposterous illusion that China is a golden calf to make the best and quickest money out of, while in fact the whole Chinese society stands on clay feet and is tottering as the economy might collapse at any moment, being overheated and completely corrupt. Their yuan is overrated, they invest tens of billions in megalomaniacal projects that destroy the environment instead of remedying the lacks and wants of the country; the railway to Tibet, their greatest project ever, can never pay itself off and is as absurd as the concentration camps project of Nazi Germany; and the second greatest, the Three Gorges Dam on Yangtse, may at any time burst in an earthquake causing all cities along the river to be washed away, while tens of millions of ordinary Chinese are evacuated by force to satisfy the vanity and inhumanity of the accountable bureaucrats. The situation in Tibet is the most flagrant manifestation of the hysterical madness of China. She does everything to extirpate the Tibetan people and culture to replace it with a Chinese one in order to forever confirm Chinese ownership of Tibet, while this only raises accelerating protests all over the world, highlighting China's catastrophic environmental destruction of Tibet. China is very well aware that she is making all efforts to destroy Tibet completely, and she does it on purpose, just because that villain Mao set China on that course, this Mao, whom the whole western world cherished and admired and kowtowed to just because America behaved badly in Vietnam, while everyone gladly closed their eyes to how badly Mao's China behaved in China and against their own people, the casualties being something about 150-200 million including all enforced abortions. China even opened fire against their own people on Tiananmen Square in the middle of the capital Beijing on June 4th 1989 - never has the cruelty and inhumanity of the governing party of China more clearly showed the nature of its real face of only cynical inhumanity and vanity; and still the Chinese continue to adore and cherish Mao and follow its beastly governing party, as if they refused to realise the obviousness of its absolutely and unacceptably criminal existence."

So the problem is not Tibet. The problem is China, and Tibet has wrongly been made to suffer for it.

But there is one more country in the Himalayas, which I have not dwelt on and even less been to visit - Bhutan. In a humdrum ordinary Indian canteen among locals I met a young lonely German lady with glasses who had been to Bhutan not as a tourist but on a special invitation and mission and thus got around the necessity to pay for her existence there by \$200 a day. She described Bhutan as the last Himalayan paradise - still completely segregated and untouched by the vitiation of modernism, mass tourism and mass immigration as well as completely free from civil wars and political crises - the monarchy still retains all power, and it's probably best that way. It's just to hope for the country's continued virginity and that she may continue like that in her own style as long as possible.

So there are still hidden and unknown Shangri-La-like paradises in the Himalayas although you have to search for them and they are getting more difficult to find. But they will always be there, they always were basically inaccessible, since they always were reserved for only those who really make an effort.

Thereby this Himalayan report is concluded for this time with this journey.

Christian Lanciai, five weeks in October-November, 2003.

### *The Defence for China*

The defence of China's occupation of Tibet and keeping it under occupation for 54 years is, that Tibet was a backward country where all power was with the monks in the monasteries who suppressed the people and kept it down by barbaric jurisdiction, which applied mutilation and other medieval atrocities to keep the people under control. The Tibetan society before 1950 may have been primitive and undeveloped, but it was not uncivilised, the monasteries were rather universities and educational centres than seats of power, and people did not lack food, did not complain and were at harmony with the Dalai Lama and his theocratic government. The jurisdiction and its methods may have been primitive, but it did not justify the overwhelmingly brutal outrage with which China assaulted Tibet by an almost total devastation of its entire thousand-year old and completely intact civilisation.

No matter how China keeps on defending her occupation of Tibet, China can never escape the fact that she methodically carried through as complete a destruction of the Tibetan cultural heritage, civilisation and identity as possible with permanent violence during 20 years 1956-76, which included the complete destruction of 6246 temples and monasteries together with the looting of their art treasures and the burning of their sacred scriptures - 40% of all Tibetan literature in the form of hand manuscripts were burned. As if this was not enough, the Chinese starvation catastrophe 1959-62 was also forced upon Tibet, during which 40 million Chinese perished due to the mismanagement of the Chinese communist regime and its political measures of madness to enforce a poorly planned industrialisation which generally failed. In Tibet the farmers were forced to cease the cultivation of barley to sow wheat instead, which could not grow in Tibet, which they found out when it was too late. Tibet had never before suffered from famine.

Of course, Mao Zedong was chiefly responsible for all this, but his communist party is equally responsible, since it is still today applying the same policy towards Tibet by a brutal occupation force which marginalizes and discriminates the Tibetan people in

order to gradually outmanoeuvre and replace it with Chinese. The Chinese mass immigration in Tibet is enforced by the government and runs over the Tibetans, who are excluded from the education and human rights which according to the regime are reserved only for loyalist Chinese.

As if this was not enough, China has also ruthlessly exploited the Tibetan natural resources of forests and minerals to replenish their own treasuries without giving the Tibetans one cent and to leave behind a totally clean-cut and plundered country with subsequent ecological disasters in the form of erosion and deluge, since the forests which earlier bound the earth no longer exist. The short-sightedness of this reckless exploitation has resulted in ecological catastrophes in all countries which have rivers coming down from Tibet, that is India with Sutlej and Brahmaputra, and the countries in Further India with Salween and Mekong, including China itself of course with Hwang Ho and Yangtse Kiang.

As if this was not enough, China has also interfered with the Tibetan theocratic reincarnation succession system by enforcing a Panchen Lama of its own choice on Tibet (the second highest spiritual leader of Tibet) although the regime is atheist and officially denies the possible existence of anything spiritual. Mao himself professed that all religion was poison, and still his communist party claims the right and competence to decide and establish reincarnations. An actual Panchen Lama was found by Tibetan monks in the traditional way according to ancient rules, which Panchen Lama immediately was abducted by the Chinese together with his whole family, the fates of which are still unknown today after eight years; while the Chinese instead established a boy from a communist family loyal to the regime, a Panchen Lama without any ties or any contact with the Tibetans.

As if this was not enough, the Chinese have also reduced the Tibetan people in Tibet with one fifth mainly through mass executions, (just during a few months in 1959 some 80,000 Tibetans were murdered according to actual Chinese statistics,) mass internment in concentration camps and the forcing of 130,000 Tibetans into exile from their home country - still today some 1500-3000 Tibetans annually are forced to flee across the Himalayas under inhuman hardship because of the constantly harder thumb-screws on Tibet. China annually carries out more executions by its jurisdiction than the whole of the rest of the world together. Compare such a jurisdiction of summary trials and executions on a mass scale with those few individuals who were treated badly by the old Tibetan society. Did China have any right to enforce on Tibet her much more efficient, severe and brutal jurisdiction?

The historical judgement on China and her now 55 year-old communist one-sidedly atheist terror regime must be severe, extremely severe, since there is no excuse for it. The only defence for China is that primitivism and very small portion of violence which took place in old Tibet; but violence is never an excuse for violence, and China's outrage has been a million times worse, deeper, more brutal, more unjust and more inhuman. China destroyed the Tibetan monasteries by dynamiting and aeroplane bombings, (for instance Ganden, Tsurphu and Lithang, three of the most important,) as if the monasteries were strongly armed fortresses, with the excuse that they were power centres that had to be destroyed. But the Tibetans were the last people on earth who bothered about power, and all the power that existed in the monasteries was knowledge. China replaced it by their power, which was only violence and oppression.

The Chinese power complex is universally criminal and started already with the emperor Shih Hwang Ti, the idol of Mao Zedong, who sacrificed a fifth of his country's population in building the Chinese wall and who tried to burn all the books in his country in an effort to make Chinese history start with himself. But vanity is powerless against truth, and historical criticism can never be silenced. Shih Hwang Ti and Mao

Zedong were the worst murderers and oppressors in Chinese history, and nothing can alter that fact, since they are both long since dead without having done anything to pay for their crimes; while the terrible results of their lives' work are being carried on by the monstrous Chinese power complex, which in vain nourishes itself through artificial breathing in the form of lies in an insane effort to excuse a universal violence and outrage which never can be excused.

Who wants to be part of such a China? At least no sensible or decent human being.

*And now, an apology from China.*

by Michael Trend, Daily Telegraph

(Filed: 24/04/2005)

This document was discovered last week on a photocopier of the State Council in Beijing and passed to me by a concerned official.

"Dear Tibet,

The People's Republic of China has, as you will have noticed, recently been insisting that Japan should repent for historical wrongs. Anxious not to be accused of hypocrisy and double standards, we have decided to set a good example by writing to you now to repent of our wrongdoing in your country.

It is a matter of much regret to us that we invaded your country in 1950. In particular, we offer a full apology for the way in which we put down the popular uprising of 1959, during which we recorded, in one of our own army documents, 87,000 deaths through military action (although this figure did not include, as has since been pointed out to us, those Tibetans who died at that time as a result of suicide, torture and starvation).

We also ask forgiveness for the hundreds of thousands of other Tibetans who have died since that time as a result of our deliberate policies. That we forcibly sterilised so many Tibetan women and subjected so many others to mandatory abortion is now a matter of deep shame for us. We unreservedly apologise to those women who have been raped, especially those, including nuns, detained in prison.

Indeed we are very sorry that we have held so many people in prison over the years. We deplore our lamentable failure to recognise the basic human rights of the Tibetans. We deeply regret our use of false detention and torture. Consequently, we will immediately release Tenzin Delek Rinpoche and all other political prisoners from jail and we undertake to return the Panchen Lama, whom we abducted 10 years ago, to Tibet.

Likewise, our abuse of Tibet's natural resources causes us great unease. What fools we were so aggressively to deforest such large tracts of your country. The effects of this for your ecology and economy are highly disturbing to us. Moreover, we now view with profound distress the destruction of almost all of your religious buildings during the Cultural Revolution. We confess that one of the main reasons why we have recently allowed some of these to be rebuilt is our desire to encourage dollar tourism.

We wish to withdraw our entirely fallacious argument that Tibet is an inalienable part of the Motherland. We recognise that the Tibetan people are a completely separate race from the Han Chinese, with their own history, language and culture, and have a right to autonomy. We acknowledge the leadership of the Tibetan people of the Dalai Lama, and offer him our warmest congratulations on the important reforms he has made in modernising and democratising Tibet's government in exile.

Above all, we recognise the most important contribution His Holiness has made to help us move away from our regrettable past. We now much appreciate the way he has insisted that his people deal with us only in a peaceful manner rather than follow the usual course of the oppressed with bombs and bullets. How much better it would be if all governments of the world actually practised what they preached in this regard and actively negotiated with the men of peace and stood up to the men of violence - rather than vice versa.

Moreover, we have taken to heart His Holiness's wise and generous advice on the serious problems we face reassuring the rest of the world that we are a peaceful, responsible, constructive and forward-looking modern country. We accept that our hosting of the Olympic Games in 2008 and the International World's Fair and Exposition in 2010 will not help dispel the concerns, suspicions and fears that the world feels as we emerge as a regional and global power. We now fully understand the need urgently to address the lack of basic civil and political rights and freedoms of our citizens, especially with regard to minorities.

We recognise that there are many other distinct peoples and religious groups we have abused in recent years, but our treatment of Tibet is a particular sorrow to us. We understand that the Dalai Lama has given us an opportunity to put right the wrongs of the past, an opportunity that might never come again.

We are, therefore, now committed to withdraw the ridiculous preconditions for the negotiations we have been holding with his representatives and move forward. We understand that it is ludicrous for us to insist that the Tibetans first agree to our desired conclusions of the talks before they even begin.

We have told many lies about Tibet. These lies have covered the revolting use of coercive power that we have deployed in your country for more than half a century. We now want to be open and honest about the past, recognising that violence and lying are inextricably tied together. We apologise; we will stop the violence and the lying; we will set the record straight.

Yours etc,

The People's Republic of China"

### *China's Zombie Countries Bringing Dictators Back to Life*

by Dana Dillon, National Review, May 10, 2005

In Haitian folklore, zombies are people reanimated from near death and enslaved to the witch doctor that revived them. Could it be that China's leaders are taking their cues from Haiti?

From Burma to Nepal to Zimbabwe, China is providing political, diplomatic, and security support to failing dictatorships. Beijing gives just enough help for the dictator to survive sanctions and domestic popular revolts, while the PRC gains a dependent state.

The faux-Communist witch doctors of Beijing are not propping up these unsuccessful governments for ideological reasons - quite the opposite. Nepal is an absolute monarchy, Burma is a military dictatorship, and Zimbabwe is governed by a once democratically chosen leader gone bad. In repayment for reanimating these near-dead regimes, the PRC is demanding - and getting - obedience to its nationalistic policies of creating strategic space around China, isolating Taiwan, securing critical resources, and guaranteeing markets for Chinese products.

The partial enslavement of the zombie countries is clearly demonstrated in China's newest acquisition, Nepal. Nepal is struggling through a bloody civil war with Maoist rebels. The Maoists have managed to gain the upper hand in a large part of the country and can, on occasion, isolate Kathmandu. King Gyanendra's response to his failing counter-insurgency strategy was to dissolve the government and declare his monarchy absolute. He then ordered the Nepalese security forces to suppress all opposition. Consequently, India, the United States and Britain all condemned the king's actions and cut off military aid to Nepal. China stepped up with a zombie-making potion of political acceptance and security assistance.

China's Foreign Minister, Li Zaoxing, visited Nepal and declared that the King's seizure of power was "an internal matter for Nepal." For his part, King Gyanendra announced that "China is a reliable friend of Nepal." On April 22-24, Gyanendra will visit China for an economic conference, his first visit abroad since he seized power.

In exchange for Beijing's diplomatic support, Nepal is turning on its defenseless Tibetan refugees. China's ambassador declared that "Nepal is very important to the stability and prosperity of Tibet." King Gyanendra replied to the Foreign Minister that "Nepal firmly supports the one-China policy of your government and will never allow any anti-China activities in Nepal's territory." Gyanendra subsequently shut down offices representing the Tibetan government-in-exile that had operated in Nepal since 1960 and began a pogrom of persecution of Tibetan refugees that included forced repatriations.

Furthermore, China is enslaving Nepal's economy as well. China is among the top-five donor countries to Nepal, but Chinese aid is largely aimed at supporting Chinese businesses and tapping Nepal's natural resources to the exclusion of Nepalese businesses. Nepal had been pushing for more equal trade terms to counteract its enormous trade imbalance with China, but since Gyanendra took over the country concrete remedies have failed to materialize.

Zimbabwe's descent to zombie status is no more mysterious than Gyanendra's near-death experience. Zimbabwe is a resource-rich southern African nation, suffering a major economic crisis, with inflation at 400 percent and unemployment at about 70 percent. Zimbabwe's per-capita income has nosedived over the past eight years from \$682 in 1998 to \$521 in 2002. President Robert Mugabe abused his office to suppress opposition parties and maintain his grip on power. His ruling party won an overwhelming victory in March 2005 in elections not believed to be free or fair by most Western countries.

Amid sanctions imposed by the European Union and the United States, China delivered \$240 million in military goods to Zimbabwe including thousands of AK-47 assault rifles, riot gear, and mobile water cannons. Mugabe's security forces used the weapons to break up opposition political rallies and demonstrations. Beijing also provided radio-jamming equipment to Harare, thwarting pro-democracy broadcasts during the last "election" campaign.

In return for China's military equipment, President Mugabe is said to have promised China land and access to mineral resources. In November 2004, Wu Bangguo, chairman of the standing committee of China's National People's congress, paid a visit to Zimbabwe and signed six economic agreements. Emmerson Mnangagwa, speaker of the Zimbabwean national assembly said the national assembly would lay down laws to ensure that high priority be given to the Chinese enterprises.

Although there are no Tibetan refugees to persecute in Zimbabwe, Mugabe does his best to please his new master by helping to isolate Taiwan. The ministry of foreign affairs of Zimbabwe said in March 2005 that Zimbabwe firmly supports China's anti-

secession law, which authorizes the use of military force to prevent Taiwanese independence.

Burma and North Korea have been zombies so long that they may now be in permanent vegetative states, but the persistence of these two regimes beyond their long-expected demise is a clear demonstration of the efficacy of China's policy. Burma has been under strict international sanctions since it violently suppressed a popular revolt in 1988, but there is no sign of the junta's imminent collapse. North Korea's economy completely failed in the 1990s, starving to death an estimated 1.5 million people, but Kim Jong Il blithely clings to power and is grooming his son as a successor.

Forced to compete with the American model of representative democracy, the government of the People's Republic of China offers the third world a non-ideological choice - liberty or tyranny. Of course, Beijing does not offer this option to the third world's people, who no doubt yearn for freedom and prosperity. Instead, the Chinese vision appeals only to failed despots whose regimes can survive only with Chinese resuscitation - the Zombies.

- Dana Dillon is a policy analyst at the Heritage Foundation.

### ***Anatomy of Political Communism***

*Excerpts from "Nine Commentaries to the Communist Party",  
written by Chinese for the Chinese,  
published in "Epoch Times" during december 2004.*

<http://english.epochtimes.com/jiuping.asp>

These excerpts constitute about 5% of the original texts.

*Since these articles were published, more and more Chinese have left the CCP (Chinese Communist Party), and the flight from the party continues by thousands each week.*

"Throughout its 80-plus years, everything the CCP has touched has been marred with lies, wars, famine, tyranny, massacre and terror. Traditional faiths and principles have been violently destroyed. Original ethical concepts and social structures have been disintegrated by force. Empathy, love and harmony among people have been twisted into struggle and hatred. Veneration and appreciation of the heaven and earth have been replaced by an arrogant desire to "fight with heaven and earth." The result has been a total collapse of social, moral and ecological systems, and a profound crisis for the Chinese people, and indeed for humanity. All these calamities have been brought about through the deliberate planning, organization, and control of the CCP.

Non-communist societies generally consider humanity's dual nature of good and evil and they rely on fixed social contracts to maintain a balance in society. In communist societies, however, the very concept of human nature is denied, and neither good nor evil is acknowledged. Eliminating the concepts of good and evil, according to Marx, serves to completely overthrow the superstructure of the old society.

Communism has done many things with absolute cruelty. The CCP promised the intellectuals a "heaven on earth." Later it labeled them "rightist" and put them into the infamous ninth category of persecuted people, alongside landlords and spies. It deprived landlords and capitalists of their property, exterminated the landlord and rich peasant classes, destroyed rank and order in the countryside, took authority away from local figures, kidnapped and extorted bribes from the richer people, brainwashed war prisoners, "reformed" industrialists and capitalists, infiltrated the KMT and disintegrated it, split from the Communist International and betrayed it, cleaned out all

dissidents through successive political movements after it came to power in 1949, and threatened its own members with coercion. Everything it did left no leeway.

The above-mentioned occurrences were all based on the CCP's theory of genocide. Its every political movement in the past was a campaign of terror with genocidal intent. The CCP started to build its theoretical system of genocide at its early stage as a composite of its theories on class, revolution, struggle, violence, dictatorship, movements, and political parties. It encompasses all of the experiences it has embraced and accumulated through its various genocidal practices.

The essential expression of CCP genocide is the extermination of conscience and independent thought. In this way a 'reign of terror' serves the fundamental interests of the CCP. The CCP will not only eliminate you if you are against it, but it may also destroy you even if you are for it. It will eliminate whomever it deems should be eliminated. Consequently, everyone lives in the shadow of terror and fears the CCP.

A veteran official who had suffered torments in the Yan'an Rectification movement recalled that when he was under intense pressure, dragged and forced to confess, the only thing he could do was to betray his own conscience and make up lies. At first, he felt bad to be implicating and framing his fellow comrades. He hated himself so much that he wanted to end his life. Coincidentally, a gun had been placed on the table. He grabbed it, pointed it at his head and pulled the trigger. The gun had no bullets! The person who investigated him walked in and said, "It's good that you admitted what you've done was wrong. The Party's policies are lenient." The Communist Party would know that you had reached your limit, know that you were "loyal" to the Party, so you had passed the test. The CCP always first puts one in a deathtrap and then enjoys one's every pain and humiliation. When one reaches the limit and just wishes for death, the Party would "kindly" come out to show one a way to live. It is said "better a live coward than a dead hero." One becomes so grateful to the Party as one's savior. Years later, this official learned about Falun Gong, a Qigong and cultivation practice that started in China. He felt the practice to be good. When the persecution of Falun Gong started in 1999, however, his painful memories of the past revisited him, and he no longer dared to say that Falun Gong was good.

The experience of China's last Emperor Pu-Yi was similar to this officer's. Imprisoned in the CCP's cells and seeing people killed one after another, he thought that he would die soon. In order to live, he allowed himself to be brainwashed and cooperated with the prison guards. Later, he wrote an autobiography *The First Half of My Life*, which was used by the CCP as a successful example of ideological remolding.

Today the Chinese Communist Party (CCP)'s violence and abuses are even more severe than those of the tyrannical Qin Dynasty. The CCP's philosophy is one of "struggle," and the CCP's rule has been built upon a series of "class struggles," "path struggles," and "ideological struggles," both in China and toward other nations. Mao Zedong, the first CCP leader of the People's Republic of China (PRC), put it bluntly by saying, "What can Emperor Qin Shihuang brag about? He only killed 460 Confucian scholars, but we killed 46,000 intellectuals. There are people who accuse us of practicing dictatorship like Emperor Qin Shihuang and we admit it all. It fits the reality. It is a pity that they did not give us enough credit, so we need to add to it."

In 2004, the China Information Center analyzed a survey done by the China Sina Net, and the results show that 82.6 percent of Chinese youth agreed that one can abuse women, children and prisoners during a war. This result is shocking. But it reflects the Chinese people's mindset, and especially that of the younger generation, who lack a basic understanding of either the traditional cultural concept of benevolent rule or the notion of universal humanity.

On September 11, 2004, a man fanatically slashed 28 children with a knife in Suzhou City. On the 20th of the same month, a man in Shandong Province injured 25 elementary school students with a knife. Some elementary school teachers forced students to make firecrackers by hand to raise funds for the school, resulting in an explosion in which students died.

Recently, to promote the Forest Law, the State Bureau of Forestry and all its stations and forest protection offices strictly ordered a standard amount of slogans to be put out. Not reaching the quota would be treated as not accomplishing the task. As a result, local government offices posted a large number of slogans, including "Whoever burns the mountains goes to prison." In the administration of birth control in recent years, there have been even scarier slogans such as, "If one person violates the law, the whole village will be sterilized," "Rather another tomb than another baby," or, "If he did not have a vasectomy as he should, his house will be torn down; if she did not have an abortion as she should, her cows and rice fields will be confiscated." There were more slogans that violate human rights and the Constitution, such as "You will sleep in prison tomorrow if you don't pay taxes today."

Was the long-term struggle to keep the CCP members free from corruption? No. 55 years after the CCP has been in power, corruption, embezzlement, unlawful conduct, and acts that damage the nation and the people are still widespread among the CCP officials throughout the country. In recent years, among the total number of approximately 20 million party officials in China, eight million have been tried and punished for crimes related to corruption. Each year, about one million people complain to higher authorities about the corrupt officials who have not been investigated. From January to September of 2004, the China Foreign Exchange Bureau investigated cases of illegal foreign exchange clearance in 35 banks and 41 companies, and found US\$120 million in illegal transactions. According to statistics in recent years, no less than 4,000 CCP officials have escaped China with embezzled money, and their stolen funds from the state add up to tens of billions of U.S dollars.

Engels stated that everything during or before the Middle Ages had to justify its existence before the trial of human rationality. As he made this remark, he regarded himself and Marx to be judges in such a trial. Mikhail Bakunin, an anarchist and friend of Marx, commented on Marx this way, "He appeared to be God to people. He cannot tolerate anyone else as God except himself. He wanted people to worship him as they would God, and pay homage to him as their idol. Otherwise, he would subject them to verbal attack or persecution."

### **Brutal Acts of Torture and Wanton Killing**

The gruesome policy of "destroying [Falun Gong practitioners] physically" has been primarily carried out by the police, procuratorate and the court system in China. Based on statistics gathered by the Clearwisdom website, at least 1,143 Falun Gong practitioners have died from persecution in the last five years. The deaths have occurred in over 30 provinces, autonomous regions, and municipalities under the direct leadership of the central government. By October 1, 2004, the province recording the greatest number of deaths was Heilongjiang, followed by Jilin, Liaoning, Hebei, Shandong, Sichuan, and Hubei. The youngest to die was only 10 months old, the oldest 82 years old. Women accounted for 51.3%. Those over 50 accounted for 38.8%. CCP officials have admitted privately that the actual number of Falun Gong practitioners who have died from persecution is much higher.

The brutal tortures used on Falun Gong practitioners are many and varied. Beating, whipping, electric shock torture, freezing, tying with ropes, handcuffing and shackling

for extended periods, burning with open flame, lit cigarettes or hot irons, being cuffed and hung up, being forced to stand or kneel down for a long time, being jabbed with bamboo sticks or metal wires, sexual abuse, and rape are just a handful of examples. In October 2000, guards at the Masanjia Forced Labor Camp in Liaoning province stripped the clothes completely off 18 female Falun Gong practitioners and threw them into the prison cells for male inmates to rape and abuse at will. All these crimes have been documented in full and are too numerous to list.

Another common form, among many, of inhumane torture is the abusive use of "psychiatric treatment." Normal, rational, and healthy Falun Gong practitioners have been unlawfully locked up in psychiatric facilities and injected with unknown drugs capable of destroying a person's central nervous system. Some practitioners, as a result, have suffered partial or complete paralysis. Some have lost the sight in both eyes or lost hearing in both ears. Some have experienced the destruction of muscles or internal organs. Some have lost part or all of their memory and become mentally retarded. The internal organs of some practitioners have been severely injured. Some have suffered complete mental collapse. Some even died shortly after being injected with the drugs.

Statistics indicate that cases of Falun Gong practitioners being persecuted with "psychiatric treatment" have spread to 23 out of 33 provinces, autonomous regions, and municipalities under the direct leadership of the central government in China. At least 100 psychiatric facilities at the provincial, city, county or district level have engaged in the persecution. Based on the number and distribution of these cases, it is clear that the abuse of psychiatric drugs on Falun Gong practitioners has been a well-planned, systematically carried out, top-down policy. At least 1,000 mentally healthy Falun Gong practitioners were sent to psychiatric facilities or drug rehabilitation centers against their will. Many of

them were forcibly injected or force-fed numerous drugs capable of destroying someone's nervous system. These Falun Gong practitioners were also tied with ropes and tortured with electric shock. At least 15 of them died from excessive abuse alone.

The traditional "scholarly class," exemplars of social morality, was thus obliterated.

Mao Zedong said, "What can Emperor Qin Shi Huang brag about? He only killed 460 Confucian scholars, but we killed 46,000 intellectuals. In our suppression of counter-revolutionaries, didn't we kill some counter-revolutionary intellectuals as well? I argued with the pro-democratic people who accused us of acting like Emperor Qin Shi Huang. I said they were wrong. We surpassed him by a hundred times. "

Indeed, Mao did more than kill the intellectuals. More grievously, he destroyed their minds and hearts.

Since 1949, the CCP has persecuted more than half the people in China. An estimated 60 million to 80 million people died from unnatural causes. This number exceeds the total number of deaths in both World Wars combined.

By the end of 1952, the CCP-published number of the executed "reactionary elements" was about 2.4 million. Actually, the total death toll of former KMT government officials below the county level and landowners was at least 5 million.

The capitalists could not possibly afford to pay such "taxes" even with all their fortunes. They had no other choice but to end their lives, but they didn't dare to jump into the Huangpu River. If their bodies could not be found, the CCP would accuse them of fleeing to Hong Kong, and their family members would still be held responsible for the taxes. The capitalists instead jumped from tall buildings, leaving a corpse so that the CCP could see proof of their death. It was said that people didn't dare to walk next to tall buildings in Shanghai at that time in fear of being crushed by people jumping from above.

According to *Facts of the Political Campaigns after the Founding of the People's Republic of China* co-edited by four government units including the CCP History Research Center in 1996, during the "Three Anti Campaign" and "Five Anti Campaign," more than 323,100 people were arrested and over 280 committed suicide or disappeared. In the "Anti-Hu Fang campaign" in 1955, over 5000 were incriminated, over 500 were arrested, over 60 committed suicide, and 12 died from unnatural causes. In the subsequent suppression of the reactionaries, over 21,300 people were executed, and over 4,300 committed suicide or disappeared.

*Facts of the Political Campaigns after the Founding of the People's Republic of China* reported that, "In May 1984, after 31 months of intensive investigation, verification and recalculation by the Central Committee of the CCP, the figures related to the Cultural Revolution were: over 4.2 million people were detained and investigated; over 1,728,000 people died of unnatural causes; over 135,000 people were labeled as counter-revolutionaries and executed; over 237,000 people were killed and over 7.03 million were disabled in armed attacks; and 71,200 families were destroyed." Statistics compiled from county annals show that 7.73 million people died of unnatural causes during the Cultural Revolution.

### **Massacre in Northern China during Sino-Japanese War**

When recommending the book *Enemy Within* by Father Raymond J. De Jaegher, former U.S. President Hoover commented that the book exposed the naked terror of communist movements. He would recommend it to anyone who was willing to understand such an evil force in this world.

In this book, De Jaegher told stories about how the CCP used violence to terrify people into submission. For instance, one day the CCP required everyone to go to the square in the village. Teachers led the children to the square from school. The purpose for the gathering was to watch the killing of 13 patriotic young men. After announcing the fabricated charges against the victims, the CCP ordered the horrified teacher to lead the children to sing patriotic songs. Appearing on the stage amid the songs were not dancers, but rather an executioner holding a sharp knife in his hands. The executioner was a fierce, robust young communist soldier with strong arms. The soldier went behind the first victim, quickly raised a big sharp knife and struck downwards, and the first head fell to the ground. Blood sprayed out like a fountain as the head rolled on the ground. The children's hysterical singing turned into chaotic screaming and crying. The teacher kept the beat, trying to keep the songs going; her bell was heard ringing over and over in the chaos.

The executioner chopped 13 times and 13 heads fell to the ground. After that, many communist soldiers came over, cut the victims' chests open and took out their hearts for a feast. All the brutality was done in front of the children. The children went all pale due to the terror, and some started throwing up. The teacher scolded the soldiers, and lined the children up to return to school.

After that, Father De Jaegher often saw children being forced to watch killings. The children became used to the bloody scenes and numb to the killing; some even started to enjoy the excitement.

When the CCP felt that simple killing was not horrifying and exciting enough, they invented all kinds of cruel tortures. For example, forcing someone to swallow a large amount of salt without letting him drink any water—the victim would suffer until he died of thirst; or stripping someone naked and forcing him to roll on broken glass; or creating a hole in a frozen river in the winter, then throwing the victim into the hole—the victim would either freeze to death or drown.

De Jaegher wrote that a CCP member in Shanxi province invented a terrible torture. One day when he was wandering in the city, he stopped in front of a restaurant and stared at a big boiling vat. Later he purchased several giant vats, and immediately arrested some people who were against the communist party. During the hasty trial, the vats were filled with water and heated to boiling. Three victims were stripped naked and thrown into the vats to boil to death after the trial. At Pingshan, De Jaegher witnessed a father being skinned alive. The CCP members forced the son to watch and participate in the inhumane torture, to see his father die in excruciating pain and listen to his father's screams. The CCP members poured vinegar and acid onto the father's body and then all his skin was quickly peeled off. They started from the back, then up to the shoulders and soon the skin from his whole body was peeled off, leaving only the skin on the head intact. His father died in minutes.

### **The Red Terror during "Red August" and the Guangxi Cannibalism**

After gaining absolute control over the country, the CCP did not end its violence at all. During the Cultural Revolution, such violence became worse.

On August 18, 1966, Mao Zedong met with the Red Guard representatives on the tower of Tiananmen Square. Song Binbin, daughter of communist leader Song Renqiong, put a Red Guard sleeve emblem on Mao. When Mao learned of Song Binbin's name, which means gentle and polite, he said, "We need more violence." Song therefore changed her name to Song Yaowu (literally meaning "want violence.")

Violent armed attacks soon spread quickly to the whole country. The younger generation educated in communist atheism had no fears or concerns. Under the direct leadership of the CCP and guided by Mao's instructions, the Red Guards, being fanatic, ignorant, and holding themselves above the law, started beating people and ransacking homes nationwide. In many areas, all the "five black classes" (landlords, rich farmers, reactionaries, bad elements, and rightists) and their family members were eradicated according to a policy of genocide. A typical example was Daxing County near Beijing, where from August 27 to September 1 of 1966, a total of 325 people were killed in 48 brigades of 13 People's Communes. The oldest killed was 80 years old, and the youngest only 38 days. Twenty-two entire households were killed with no one left.

Beating a person to death was a common scene. On Shatan Street, a group of male Red Guards tortured an old woman with metal chains and leather belts until she could not move any more, and still a female Red Guard jumped on her body and stomped on her stomach. The old woman died at the scene. ... Near Chongwenmeng, when the Red Guards searched the home of a "landlord's wife" (a lonely widow), they forced each neighbor to bring a pot of boiling water to the scene and they poured the boiling water down the old lady's collar until her body was cooked. Several days later, the old lady was found dead in the room, her body covered with maggots. ... There were many different ways of killing, including beating to death with batons, cutting with sickles and strangling to death with ropes. ... The way to kill babies was the most brutal: the killer stepped on one leg of a baby and pulled the other leg, tearing the baby in half. (*Investigation of Daxing Massacre* by Yu Luowen)

The Guangxi cannibalism was even more inhumane than the Daxing Massacre. Writer Zheng Yi, author of the book *Scarlet Memorial* described the cannibalism as progressing in three stages.

The first was the beginning stage when the terror was covert and gloomy. County annals documented a typical scene: at midnight, the killers tip-toed to find their victim and cut him open to remove his heart and liver. Because they were inexperienced and scared, they took his lung by mistake, then they had to go back again. Once they had

cooked the heart and liver, some people brought liquor from home, some brought seasoning, and then all the killers ate the human organs in silence by the light of the fire in the oven.

The second stage was the peak, when the terror became open and public. During this stage, veteran killers had gained experience in how to remove hearts and livers while the victim was still alive, and they taught others, refining their techniques to perfection. For example when cutting open a living person, the killers only needed to cut a cross on the victim's belly, step on his body (if the victim was tied to a tree, the killers would bump his lower abdomen with the knee) and the heart and other organs would just fall out. The head killer was entitled to the heart, liver and genitals while others would take what was left. These grand yet dreadful scenes were adorned with flying flags and slogans.

The third stage was crazed. Cannibalism became a massive widespread movement. In Wuxuan County, like wild dogs eating corpses during an epidemic, people were madly eating other people. Often victims were first "publicly criticized," which was always followed by killing, and then cannibalism. As soon as a victim fell to the ground, dead or alive, people took out the knives they had prepared and surrounded the victim, cutting any body part they could get hold of. At this stage, ordinary citizens were all involved in the cannibalism. The hurricane of "class struggle" blew away any sense of sin and human nature from people's minds. Cannibalism spread like an epidemic and people enjoyed cannibalistic feasts. Any part of the human body was edible, including the heart, meat, liver, kidneys, elbows, feet, and tendons. Human bodies were cooked in many different ways including boiling, steaming, stir-frying, baking, frying and barbecuing ... People drank liquor or wine and played games while eating human bodies. During the peak of this movement, even the cafeteria of the highest government organization, Wuxuan County Revolutionary Committee, offered human dishes.

Readers should not mistakenly think such a festival of cannibalism was purely an unorganized behavior by the people. The CCP was a totalitarian organization controlling every single cell of the society. Without the CCP's encouragement and manipulation, the cannibalism movement could not have happened at all.

The internal fights of communist parties are well known. All members of the Politburo of the Russian Communist Party in the first two terms, except Lenin, who had died, and Stalin himself, were executed or committed suicide. Three of the five marshals were executed, three of the five Commanders-in-Chief were executed, all 10 of the secondary army Commanders-in-Chief were executed, 57 of the 85 army corps commanders were executed, and 110 of the 195 division commanders were executed.

Liu Shaoqi, a former Chinese president who was once the No. 2 figure in the nation, died miserably. On the day of his 70th birthday, Mao Zedong and Zhou Enlai specifically told Wang Dongxing (Mao's lead guard) to bring Liu Shaoqi a birthday present, a radio, in order to let him hear the official report of the Eighth Plenary Session of the twelfth Central Committee, which said, "Forever expel the traitor, spy, and renegade Liu Shaoqi from the Party and continue to expose and criticize Liu Shaoqi and his accomplices' crimes of betrayal and treason."

Liu Shaoqi was crushed mentally and his illnesses rapidly deteriorated. Because he was tied to the bed for a long time and could not move, his neck, back, hip, and heels had painful festering bedsores. When he felt great pain he would grab some clothes, articles, or other people's arms, and not let go, so people simply put a hard plastic bottle into each of his hands. When he died, the two hard plastic bottles had become hourglass shaped from his gripping.

By October 1969, Liu Shaoqi's body had started to rot all over and the infected pus had a strong odor. He was as thin as a rail and on the verge of death. But the special

inspector from the central Party committee did not allow him to take a shower or turn over his body to change his clothes. Instead, they stripped off all his clothes, wrapped him in a quilt, sent him by air from Beijing to Kaifeng city, and locked him up in the basement of a solid blockhouse. When he had high fever, they not only did not give him medication, but also transferred the medical personnel away. When Liu Shaoqi died, his body had completely degenerated, and he had disheveled white hair that was two feet long. Two days later, at midnight, he was cremated as a person with a highly infectious disease. His bedding, pillow and other things left behind were all cremated. Liu's death card reads: Name: Liu Weihuang; occupation: unemployed; reason for death: disease. The CCP tortured the president of the nation to death like this without even giving a clear reason.

\*\*\*\*\*

### **Exporting the Revolution, Killing People Overseas**

In addition to killing people within China and inside the Party with great delight and using a variety of methods, the CCP also participated in killing people abroad including the overseas Chinese by exporting the "revolution." The Khmer Rouge is a typical example.

Pol Pot's Khmer Rouge only existed for four years in Cambodia. Nevertheless, from 1975 to 1978, more than two million people, including over 200,000 Chinese, were killed in this small country that had a population of only eight million people.

The Khmer Rouge's crimes are countless, but we will not discuss them here. We must, however, talk about its relationship with the CCP.

Pol Pot worshipped Mao Zedong. Beginning in 1965, he visited China four times to listen to Mao Zedong's teachings in person. As early as November 1965, Pol Pot stayed in China for three months. Chen Boda and Zhang Chunqiao discussed with him theories such as "political power grows out of the barrel of a gun," "class struggle," "dictatorship of the proletariat," and so on. Later, these became the basis for how he ruled Cambodia. After returning to Cambodia, Pol Pot changed the name of his party to the Cambodian Communist Party and established revolutionary bases according to the CCP's model of encircling cities from the countryside.

In 1968, the Cambodian Communist Party officially established an army. At the end of 1969, it had slightly more than 3,000 people. But in 1975, before attacking and occupying the city of Phnom Penh, it had become a well equipped and brave fighting force of 80,000 soldiers. This was completely due to the CCP's support. The book *Documentary of Supporting Vietnam and Fighting with America* by Wang Xiangen says that in 1970 China gave Pol Pot armed equipment for 30,000 soldiers. In April 1975, Pol Pot took the capital of Cambodia, and two months later, he went to Beijing to pay a visit to the CCP and listen to instructions. Obviously, if the Khmer Rouge's killing had not been backed by the CCP's theories and material support, it could not have been done.

For example, after Prince Sihanouk's two sons were killed by the Cambodian Communist Party, the Cambodian Communist Party obediently sent Sihanouk to Beijing on Zhou Enlai's orders. It was well known that when the Cambodian Communist Party killed people, they would "even kill the fetus" to prevent any possible troubles in the future. But at Zhou Enlai's request, Pol Pot obeyed without protest.

Zhou Enlai could save Sihanouk with one word, but the CCP did not object to the more than 200,000 Chinese who were killed by the Cambodian Communist Party. At that time, the Chinese Cambodians went to the Chinese embassy for help, but the embassy ignored them.

In May 1998, when a large-scale killing and raping of ethnic Chinese took place in Indonesia, the CCP did not say a word. It did not offer any help, and even blocked the news inside China. It seems that the Chinese government couldn't care less about the fate of overseas Chinese; it did not even offer any humanitarian assistance.

### Conclusion

Due to the CCP's information blockade, we have no way of knowing exactly how many people have died from the various movements of persecution that occurred during its rule. At least 60 million people died in the foregoing movements. In addition, the CCP also killed ethnic minorities in Xinjiang, Tibet, Inner Mongolia, Yunnan and other places; information on these incidents is difficult to find. The *Washington Post* once estimated that the number of people persecuted to death by the CCP is as high as 80 million.

Besides the number of deaths, we have no way of knowing how many people became disabled, mentally ill, enraged, depressed, or frightened to death through the persecution they suffered. Every single death is a bitter tragedy that leaves everlasting agony to the family members of the victims.

As the Japan-based *Yomiuri News* once reported, the Chinese central government conducted a survey on the casualties inflicted during the Cultural Revolution in 29 provinces and municipalities directly under the Central Government. Results showed that nearly 600 million people were persecuted or incriminated during the Cultural Revolution, which comprises about half of China's population.

Stalin once said that the death of one man is a tragedy, but the death of one million is merely a statistic. When told that many people starved to death in Sichuan province, Li Jingquan, the former Party Secretary of Sichuan Province, remarked, "Which dynasty didn't have people die?" Mao Zedong said, "Casualties are inevitable for any struggle. Death often occurs." This is the atheist communists' view on life. That's why 20 million people died as a result of persecution during Stalin's regime, which constitutes 10 percent of the population of the former USSR. The CCP has killed at least 80 million people, which is also nearly 10 percent of the nation's population [at the end of the Cultural Revolution]. The Khmer Rouge killed two million people, or one quarter of Cambodia's population at that time. In North Korea, the death toll from famine is estimated to be over one million. These are all bloody debts owed by the communist parties.

Today's CCP has become the largest ruling "party of embezzlement and corruption" in the world. According to official statistics in China, among the 20 million officials, officers or cadres in the Party or government over the past 20 years, eight million have been found guilty of corruption and disciplined or punished based on party or government regulations. If the unidentified corrupt officials are also taken into account, the corrupt party and government officials are estimated to be at over two thirds, of whom only a small portion have been investigated and exposed.

While the CCP constantly brags about its economic advancement, in reality, China's economy today ranks lower in the world than during the Qianlong's reign (1711-1799) in the Qing Dynasty. During the Qianlong period, China's GDP accounted for 51 percent of the world's total. When Dr. Sun Yat-sen founded the Republic of China (Kuomintang or KMT period) in 1911, China's GDP accounted for 27 percent of the world's total. By 1923, the percentage dropped, but still was as high as 12 percent. In 1949, when the CCP took control, the percentage was 5.7, but in 2003, China's GDP was less than 4 percent of the world's total. In contrast to the economic decline during the

KMT period that was caused by several decades of war, the continuing economic decline during the CCP's reign occurred during peaceful times.

In a tree farm in eastern Sichuan province, upper level authorities distributed 500,000 yuan (approximately US\$ 60,500) for a reforestation project. The leaders of the tree farm first put 200,000 yuan in their own pockets, and then allocated the remaining 300,000 yuan to tree planting. But as the money was taken away when passing through each level of the government, very little was left in the end for local peasants who did the actual tree planting. The government did not need to worry that the peasants would refuse to work on the project because of inadequate funding. The peasants were so impoverished that they would work for very little money. This is one of the reasons that products made in China are so cheap.

As a matter of fact, the Communist Party leaders transmitted empty words when they promulgated the "communist moral quality" or the slogan "Serve the people." The inconsistency between communist leaders' actions and words can be traced all the way back to their founding father Karl Marx. Marx bore an illegitimate son. Lenin contracted syphilis from prostitutes. Stalin was sued for forcing a sexual relationship on a singer. Mao Zedong indulged himself in lust. Jiang Zemin is promiscuous. The Romanian communist leader Ceausescu made his entire family extravagantly rich. The Cuban communist leader Castro hoards hundreds of millions of dollars in overseas banks. North Korea's demonic killer Kim Il Song and his children lead a decadent and wasteful life.

*Since this article series was published during December 2004 almost two million party members (out of 65 million, 5% of the population,) have left the party. They continue to leave it by thousands every day.*

Gothenburg, May 25<sup>th</sup> 2005.

Published on the Internet July 20<sup>th</sup> 2005,

the Stauffenberg day,

with sincere thanks to our host.

More arguments will follow.