

The Free Thinker

an alternative independent cultural magazine

Issue No. 13 in English

September 2000

Editor : C. Lanciai
Ankargatan 2 A
S - 41461 Gothenburg
Sweden
phone 46 31 24 78 87

Contents of this issue :

The Consumption Society	2
Concerning Einstein, <i>by Doctor Sandy</i>	3
Doctor Sandy's Lecture	4
One of the Most Exciting Books of Our Time (<i>Dr Edward M. Podvoll</i>)	6
<i>The Shakespeare Debate</i> - A Temporary Summary	7
Ventilating the Theories, <i>by Laila Roth</i>	9
Scrutinizing the Sonnets	10
Violence or Non-Violence? - a Tibetan Question of Destiny	12
Comments to Karmapa	14
Tibetan Seminar in Gothenburg, May 6th 2000	14
Letter from Bihar, <i>by Kim</i> .	15
The Leh Conference (<i>John Westerberg, C. Lanciai & Doctor Sun</i>)	16

These articles have appeared in the Swedish issues of
"The Free Thinker", issues nos. 81-90.

"The Free Thinker" on Internet : <http://hem.fyristorg.com/aurelio/>

This is the 95th publication of the Letnany Publishers.

Copyright © Christian Lanciai.

Gothenburg, Sweden, August 19th, 2000.

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 MacDonalds, 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.

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."

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.

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 Wriothsley 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.

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 TIPRA 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 than 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.)