

The Free Thinker

*an alternative independent cultural magazine
dealing mainly with the undercurrents of present history,
like a spiritual world barometer.*

Issue No. 10 in English

September 1998

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

Contents of this issue :

The Empire of Evil	page 2
The Sikorski Case	4
Concerning Drug Liberalization, <i>by John B. Westerberg</i>	5
Talks with my Doctor	6
The Most Important Authors of the 20th Century	10
Concerning Genocide	13

Unfortunately, there was no space in this issue for the latest news in our great Shakespeare debate, a long treatise called *The Strange Case of Christopher Marlowe*, in which we present various facts to indicate that Marlowe was the real author behind all the works in the name of Shakespeare. Next issue will commence with this long treatise.

All these articles have appeared in the Swedish issues of "The Free Thinker", issues nos. 66-70.

The English issues of "The Free Thinker" are free of charge and distributed to friends and allies all over the world.

This is the 67th publication of the Letnany Publishers.

Copyright © Christian Lanciai.

Gothenburg, Sweden September 1st, 1998.

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 Brezhnev and Kosygin, 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 Solzhenitsyn'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 Khrushchev 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 Khrushchev had to be stopped and silenced at once. Among these men were Brezhnev and Kosygin, 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.

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."

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 theosophic 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."

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.

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.

Gothenburg, September 1st, 1998.