

## Chapter 56 : “The Reluctant Monarch”

On November 4, 2010, a fourth biography of CG, “The Reluctant Monarch”, was published by the trio of writers Thomas Sjöberg, Deanne Rauscher and Tove Meyer. Meyer, however, more peripherally involved - mainly with CG's school days. This chapter begins with the compositional history of the biography, continues with the crisis management and ends with the denials and rebuttals in “From a secure source...” (2012).

\*

### The scandal 1.0 : The book

The book contract with Sjöberg was signed in April 2008. The publisher Kristoffer Lind was a Republican but not a member of the Republican Association. During the marketing, Lind contacted the association but this was not particularly interested in being associated with a book that was so obviously an attempt at character assassination. There was some involvement though.

The Christian Democrat Peter Althin, since 2010 chairman of the Republican Association, says that before the publication he was contacted by both Deanne Rauscher and Kristoffer Lind at Lind & Co and read the raw script about the king's private life. Mona Abou-Jeib Broshammar, the then Secretary General of the Association, confirms that she arranged a collaboration with the publishing house [so that the association's members could buy the book at a reduced price] because, according to her, it was in the Republican Association's interest to reach out with the book to as many people as possible. She also says that she had discussions with Thomas Sjöberg about him campaigning on behalf of the association, but that Sjöberg wanted to keep a low profile.<sup>1</sup>

The reception from the cultural establishment was measured, roughly like this: “This book contains much that is both true and new, but the new is not true and the true is not new!” The most controversial point in the biography was that CG really had had a relationship with “The Courtesan” = Camilla Henemark. The readership of the biography was rather large even though half the population thought it should never have been written.<sup>2</sup> One suspects a double standard. But as Marshal of the Realm Stig H:son Ericson put it in his time: “If the public loses interest in the publicity, it is a sign of declining popularity.”<sup>3</sup>

Sjöberg was the agreed on author II on the book. Chairman of the Board Per Gedin: “I told him that I had already had a deal with another very good journalist who is the editor-in-chief of an established newspaper. But in these circles there is a total loyalty, and he did not succeed.”<sup>4</sup> Gedin seems to have envisioned a commemorative book based on interviews. Because of CG et consorties' aversion to journalists, Sjöberg was forced into using written sources and sources outside CG's circle of friends. To put it bluntly. CG's ambitions to put a lid on his private life led to total disclosure of ditto. One cannot enough emphasize CG's total incompetence at handling the affair. The right way would have been to drown author I in biased or conflicting information. It would to have been a different book than the biography

---

<sup>1</sup> Dick Harrison & Desirée A Schein. Från en säker källa... ICA-bokförlag, 2012.

<sup>2</sup> Inti Chavez Perez. Varannan svensk: Låt kungen ha sitt privatliv i fred. SVT debatt, 2010-11-04.

<sup>3</sup> Stig H:son-Ericson. Memoarer: Vita havet. Segling i kungliga farvatten. Bonniers, 1976.

<sup>4</sup> Christopher Friman. De skrev boken om kungens okända privatliv. Expressen, 2010-11-01.

of Herman Lindqvist and Elisabeth Tarras-Wahlberg, a portrait in the marzipan, but definitely more flattering than what was now the result, CG as stud.

In January 2010 he [Per Gedin] was awarded a royal medal for “outstanding achievements as a book publisher”. Ironic considering that Gedin is chairman of the board of directors of the publishing house Lind & Co, which published that year's most talked about non-fiction book: The reluctant monarch.

- Yes, if the king finds out, he'll tear the medal away from me, clucks Gedin.

Gedin's idea was to publish a book about “the king as a human being”.

- Give a comprehensive view of him, no original idea really. Then Thomas Sjöberg, who had previously written a book for me about Kamprad, came across the whole Mille Markovic story... We censored some of it, he should really take care, to go to those sleazy nightclubs...<sup>5</sup>

Since the book was quickly translated into German, there has been speculation that it was partially funded by German money. Because of the costs, the salaries of three authors, and an uncertain edition, it was not at all clear that a scandal book had a market, it does not seem entirely incredible. In 1983, Annette Kullenberg published an article in the Swedish Publicists' Association's Yearbook “The art of liking our own gossip press” about the Swedish market for scandals. She quoted the folklore researcher Bengt af Klintberg who believed that if the market for gossip became saturated, the audience could demand slander because its news value. Sjöberg agreed with the interpretation. “There was a pent-up need to read something real for once, instead of cheery weddings or servile homelies”.<sup>6</sup>

Sjöberg's point of departure for his portrayal of CG was that CG had never had the chance to grow into his royal role: “He was only 27 when he took office, in mid bachelorhood with broads, cars, male friends and booze. Then he would suddenly become king and promise the people to be like a father to them. It was a completely unreasonable request. That's what I originally wanted to find out: how would so young a king handle a role he had not had the time to grow into.”<sup>7</sup> Publisher Lind wanted above all to appear respectable: “My greatest fear is that the book should be regarded as a tabloid; that it be branded as a piece of scandal mongering. For it is also a deeply serious book with a very fine portrait of its protagonist. In the title there is almost a tenderness, which runs through the entire story. The king has not always had an easy time. He has not been as privileged as one would like to think.”<sup>8</sup>

Two-thirds of the book dealt with CG's family, upbringing, and conflicting feelings about his future. The rest was about his partying. One criticism of the book was that one learned more about the sources than about the subject himself and that the chronology was unclear. In particular, the party fixer Christer Gustafsson and the Serbian gangster Mille Markovic were described in great detail. A lot of ink was spilled in the debate afterwards on the young party girls and whether they could be regarded as victims of the patriarchy or big business. The opinions of the “girls” themselves were divided. There were those who enjoyed dancing their socks off and those who cried.

What the writer Thomas Sjöberg himself experienced as most troubling, however, was not the relationship with Camilla Henemark but CG's visit to the speak easy “Club Power” at

---

<sup>5</sup> Björn af Kleen. Familjen Bok. Expressen, 2012-03-07.

<sup>6</sup> Karin Eriksson. Mission för monarkin. Sydsvenskan, 2011-06-19.

<sup>7</sup> Christopher Friman. De skrev boken om kungens okända privatliv. Expressen, 2010-11-01.

<sup>8</sup> Christopher Friman. De skrev boken om kungens okända privatliv. Expressen, 2010-11-01.

Kungsholmen in the corner of Hantverkargatan and southern Agnegatan in the early 1990s. The restaurant was owned by Mille Markovic. He had several prison sentences under his belt, most recently for tax fraud, concealed weapons and drugs. It could have opened up CG to blackmail. In reality, it seems to have been the other way around. Markovic appeared on TV4's television debate on November 3, 2010, claiming to have very revealing pictures that he had in store if anyone intended to accuse him of anything. He also claimed to be planning a book. Markovic's motivation for being interviewed was unclear. He did not get paid. He claimed to take part "because he wanted the truth to be told about how young girls were treated by powerful men".<sup>9</sup> More likely he felt flattered by the attention but worried about the consequences. Hence his threats.

Co-author Deanne Rauscher also claimed to be planning a book on Silvia, a sequel to her Brazilian & German experience with the tentative title "Silvia - Queen at any price". (As it seems an allusion to Husmodern's Silvia-edition from 1977: "Queen Silvia Female of the Year - but at what price. How do you think it feels to lose your personal freedom?" There are echoes of the German debate of the 1970s in which Silvia and her mother were actually criticized for having worked too actively to bring about the marriage. Now, Rauscher would apparently dole out a well-deserved punishment.)

An astonishing consensus from left to right marked the debate about the book, that part of the debate that took place before the book was published and consequently no one knew what it was about. Thomas Sjöberg complained afterwards:

What is it about the Swedish royal house that so totally turns the head of so many in other contexts reasonably talented people? What is it that makes Dick Harrison compare my book Carl XVI Gustaf - the reluctant monarch with witch trials of the 1600's? What leads Jan Guillou to categorically dismiss it as untrue and irrelevant "bedchamber gossip" - without even reading it? What leads Herman Lindqvist to call me a "muckraker" who "hopefully soon will retire to my sewer"? What leads Leif GW Persson against better judgment to claim that the book is so "obscure, diffuse and generally difficult to interpret - lacking such dull details that were, when, how, why and who did what - that it essentially excludes ordinary simple fact-checking" and call my work "bollocks"?<sup>10</sup>

The publication had the concrete result that CG at least temporarily interrupted his dealings with the most high-profile members of Gubbtolvan [The Dirty Dozen]: Noppe Lewenhaupt, Aje Philipson, Anders Lettström and party fixer Christer Gustafsson. Besides Silvia not suffering to see them, they had become a political embarrassment.<sup>11</sup> The SOM Institute divided its 2010 measurement in before and after the publication of the book and found that the confidence in the royal house measured as a balance measure (percentage positive minus percentage negative) fell from 21 to 8 percent. Further opinion polls showed that CG's personal popularity during the year decreased by 20 percent but then recovered:<sup>12,13</sup> February 2010 64 percent wanted him to remain as king, November 2010 it was 51 percent, May 2011 it was 44 percent, December 2011 it was again 64 percent. The monarchy as an institution remained popular. At the last poll, however, 30 percent wanted CG to resign before he

<sup>9</sup> Christian Holmén & Michael Syrén. Ökänd torped huvudkälla i boken om kungen. Expressen, 2010-11-02.

<sup>10</sup> Thomas Sjöberg. SVT borde inte låta kungens bekanta sköta kungabevakningen. Newsmill, 2011-01-07.

<sup>11</sup> Johan T Lindwall & Diamant Salihu. Silvias stenhårda krav efter "skandalboken". Expressen, 2010-12-19.

<sup>12</sup> Jens Kärrman. Fler vill att kungen ska abdikera. Dagens Nyheter, 2011-05-28.

<sup>13</sup> Erik Wiman, Josefin Sköld & Niklas Eriksson. Var fjärde svensk vill att kungen granskas. Aftonbladet, 2011-12-06. [Sifo-mätning 2011-12-05.]

turned 75. There was a certain backlash effect in 2009-2011 so that support for the monarchy actually increased among immigrants and left-wingers.

\*

The reluctance to follow up allegations seems to be a consistent feature among TV4's journalists. Perhaps it is considered pointless. The court reporter Daniel Nyhlén was interviewed on November 4 on the program Förkväll. He claimed to have a photograph of CG together with several women in a jacuzzi and that he wrote an article in Aftonbladet about the matter in 2002-2005 that was censored by editor-in-chief Anders Gerdin, who later denied that this was the case.<sup>14</sup> However, it seems that Nyhlén 2006 was censored by Expressen. During a party night at Stureplan, Prince Carl Philip was said to have been heavily intoxicated and wrestled one of his friends on the dance floor. Responsible publisher Bella Tidblad at Expressen.se removed the article for a fact check with Nina Eldh at the court's information department. Eldh spoke to Prince Carl Philip, who said that the description was exaggerated.<sup>15</sup> The Flashback version was that he had participated in a really wet bachelor party: Sturecompagniets outdoor restaurant and then the nightclub The White Room.<sup>16</sup> Annette Kullenberg also claims to have been censored by Gerdin. She resigned in 2002 after the latter changed the text in which Kullenberg claimed that Princess Madeleine was an alcoholic. Emotions ran high. The case was pursued in court and Kullenberg was even deleted from Aftonbladet's article database.

A recent example of defamation of CG, with features of urban legend, comes from the author Ramona Fransson:

According to my sources, both Aftonbladet and Expressen had already in 1970 and 1980 in their possession embarrassing pictures of our king, but then he was crown prince. Sometime in the late 1970s or early 1980s, a well-known prostitute came up to the night office at Aftonbladet and wanted to sell these sex pictures of a wild young naked crown prince chasing other naked women. The night editor declined and when the woman left him, he called his colleague at Expressen, who received the woman and the pictures, copied them and returned them with the words "no thanks". But the copies of the pictures should still be at Expressen, unless no one took them.<sup>17</sup>

The DN-journalist Johan Crona traces much of the early gossip to the criminologist and writer professor Leif GW Persson who during a summer replacement at Expressen in 1980 is supposed to have passed on information originating from CG's bodyguards but which was then "improved" in several stages.<sup>18</sup>

\*

The parties described in the book and in Expressen and Aftonbladet had often taken place long ago. The interviewees had settled down and were eager to distance themselves from their previous party girl life. The depictions of the feasts were therefore unexpectedly moralistic, probably a contributing factor to the large edition, what sells better than sinners who repent?

---

<sup>14</sup> Magnus Helander. "Aftonbladet stoppade bilderna". Resumé, 2010-11-05.

<sup>15</sup> Hasse Burström. Berättade om en "vild festnatt" på kändissajt. Expressen, 2006-08-14.

<sup>16</sup> Flashback. Den stora skvallertråden om H.K.H. Prins Carl Philip, "Jafo", #76, 2006-08-15.

<sup>17</sup> Ramona Fransson. Blogg, 2011-05-21.

<sup>18</sup> Johan Croneman. TV-krönikan. Dagens Nyheter, 2013-01-15.

Express went looking for more of the same. There had been many parties and consequently many party girls. Whether they sat in at the dinner or arrived afterwards was a little unclear. Those who arrived afterwards were nicknamed “coffee girls”. The pros were girls à la carte. The parties were organized in the manner that Christer Gustafsson called around and gathered participants. Who accepted to come was an argument for others to come. CG was the main attraction. No one seems to have been paid but food, wine and entertainment are worth a lot. In return, something was expected. This something seems to have been playing along and not taking it too seriously. It happened that the women stripped and some intercourse must have taken place even though no one afterwards wanted to acknowledge it. There is no record that men were similarly invited or that anyone was obliged to invited the host's back. It was about sex. Not about personal relationships.

Gubbtolvan denied that the parties took place in the way depicted in the book and in the interviews. In addition, in order to have credible deniability, they claimed to know only what was rumoured, because it was beneath their dignity to read the trash. Deanne Rauscher thought afterwards that both they and CG behaved like typical sex addicts. Aje Philipson, Anders Lettström and Noppe Lewenhaupt tried to reciprocate. They hired or encouraged a freelance researcher Desirée Ahokas Schein to compile inaccuracies and to dig up compromising information on the authors. Both Sjöberg and Rauscher were clean as snow it turned out. Sjöberg was regardless accused of being a paedophile, and the larger newspapers were informed about a series of crimes he was supposed to have committed. Rauscher was reported to the National Board of Health and Welfare for arranging sex orgies at her home for abused women. A number of newspaper editorials received falsified recordings that were supposed to prove the matter. SR for some vague reason reassigned co-author Tove Meyer to the archives – she was supposed to spend her time categorizing jokes – but that decision was overturned.

\*

Sjöberg felt uneasy about CG's bodyguards allowing him to attend an illegal porn club and even let him be filmed. He began to worry about what Säpo would do when he went public with the information and discussed the matter with former national crime chief Tommy Lindström who Sjöberg knew after he had written his memoirs. Sjöberg wanted a meeting with the head of protection to assure him of his good intentions “that he was not looking to accuse the bodyguards of shortcomings in their professional practice, rather portray the difficulties of their mission.”<sup>19</sup> Perhaps not quite consistent with the truth. He seems to have wanted Lindström to convey a request for an interview with the then head of the bodyguards section Bert Melén. Melén said he had never heard anything about Club Power but hedged himself with the bodyguards, of course, screening the information. He also pointed out the obvious: That the bodyguards were young police officers with no authority to determine the lives of the subjects they protected. If the subjects wanted to do something dubious, the bodyguards had to accept the situation.

All communication between Sjöberg and Lindström was in confidence. Lindström was, however, acquainted with several of Gubbtolvan. In August 2010 Sjöberg learned that Lindström had mentioned two of the sources for them, which he perceived as a betrayal. On October 4, one month before the book was published, Sjöberg, CEO of the publishing house Kristoffer Lind and its chairman of the board Per Gedin had a follow-up meeting with

---

<sup>19</sup> Christian Holmén & Michael Syrén. Författarna till skandalboken: Kungens vänner försöker hämnas. Expressen, 2011-03-12.

Lindström. He warned them that too much trust was placed in Markovic's information and advised them to obtain prepaid cards because Säpo would probably intercept their phones. Lindström also sent an e-mail on November 1 where he expressed his concern:

My purpose has been to protect Thomas, my ghost writer. I think that Thomas should not be exposed to discomfort (slander, etc.) and should not fall out of favour with those who are to defend our country's security. I believe that if someone attacks or smears our Head of State and/or questions the protection of our Head of State, I, as a responsible person, would be ill disposed towards him and would take appropriate action. I can never interfere in what you and others want to publish, just express an opinion on the appropriateness of Thomas's participation in rumours and smut. I see Thomas as a serious and capable writer and hope that he will be able to maintain this reputation.

I hope that the book will be a true and fruitful description of the Head of State and his associates. I have told one of these acquaintances about my contacts with Thomas and my concern about his commitment.

Sincerely

Tommy Lindström<sup>20</sup>

Sjöberg and Rauscher were indeed the victims of a defamatory campaign. Sjöberg even had a bodyguard during a lecture in Lund because after the paedophile accusations he feared he “might be molested by angry royalists or Narva associates.” However, this did not happen. Any monitoring from Säpo has not been reported either. Flashback made heroic attempts to excavate something compromising without success. The most compromising was that Rauscher had visited Egypt to take part in the demonstrations in Tharir Square there.

Neither Sjöberg nor Rauscher claimed to have written the book to earn money. Sjöberg said he was interested in “looking behind the medias cliché images of mighty men.”<sup>21</sup> Rauscher claimed to be a truth seeker: “I like to open closed doors where everyone hears that it rumbles inside but no one dares to open it.”<sup>22</sup> Eventually it became clear that Sjöberg was a moralist rather than a Republican. Lars Werner (vpk) would probably have this to say about him: It would have been good if Sjöberg had been against the monarchy as such, not only against its consequences. Regardless of the intentions the book came to make a lot of money. CG's mistress Camilla Henemark also made a lot of money: 200 thousand to be interviewed in Expressen and probably as much for the television interviews. Mille Markovic did not receive a penny for his part in the exposé. However, it does not appear that Markovic was looking for money. It was attention he wanted, and he got it. Neither did Ahokas claim to be working for money. She was not a monarchist but a Republican!

On November 4, 2010, at 16 o'clock at Nyruud in Hunneberg in connection with CG's annual elk hunt, CG issued a short comment that everything in the book was old, that he himself had moved on, and that the journalists should do so too. There was no point asking him questions because he had not read the book yet. Whether this was a denial or a confession was not

---

<sup>20</sup> Michael Syrén. Tommy Lindström hotade kungabokförfattarna med Säpo. Expressen, 2010-12-02.

<sup>21</sup> Cecilia Hagen. ”Allt är ett spel för gallerierna.” Expressen, 2010-11-07.

<sup>22</sup> Cecilia Hagen. ”Allt är ett spel för gallerierna.” Expressen, 2010-11-07.

entirely clear. CG kept in touch with friends and discussed how the matter developed in the media.

\*

### The scandal 2.0 : The crisis management

Meanwhile, several of CG's sympathizers, with or without his knowledge, discussed whether it was possible to get Markovic to deny his information. They were also concerned about the pictures. A total of eight people are said to have been prepared to pay for them. Among these were Anders Lettström and Anders Philipson who had been present at the parties. One of the group, Lars Axelsson, knew a Croatian who had previously lived in Sweden and who knew Milan Sevo, a Yugoslav gangster with Swedish citizenship but who no longer lived in Sweden and who was known as a “fixer”. At the beginning of November, five people travelled to Zagreb, Croatia, to meet Sevo and agree on the conditions for “stopping” Markovic.

The five were the lawyers Fredrik Ramberg, Björn Rosengren and Thomas Martinsson and the businessmen Anders Philipson and Lars Axelsson.<sup>23</sup> Fredrik Ramberg was a member of Gubbtolvan. Björn Rosengren and Thomas Martinsson were known for defending high-profile criminals. Lars Axelsson spent time in the same circles as Crown Princess Victoria and Princess Madeleine – not with the princesses themselves however. He was there to give the group some sort of credibility in gangster circles. Axelsson had, for example, been in prison for drug offences and made a lot of money by selling hard core pornography by mail order. Philipson was the only one wealthy.

The five met Milan Sevo and his former bodyguard Daniel Webb. Milan left the assignment to Webb who now ran a café in Stockholm and needed money. Both said they were flattered to help out. The Swedish group handed over the practical matters to Anders Lettström. He, Axelsson and Webb met at Lettström's workplace. Lettström wanted a rebuttal and to know what kind of pictures Markovic had spoken about. Webb was supposed to handle the negotiations. Lettström spoke at length about how dangerous these pictures could be to CG. When Webb contacted Markovic on November 10, Markovic did not want to let him see them. Instead, it was Markovic's lawyer who presented them to the king's lawyers, unknown who. On his second visit, Webb was allowed to see the pictures, but he was not allowed to make copies. Neither was the king's lawyer allowed to take copies - although this is not entirely clear. Then everyone met at Noppe's to discuss Markovic's terms. Webb would have preferred more discretion.

\* Did any of them see the images?

- The lawyer would [after paying] show them to the royal friends and promise that they would be destroyed. And not get lost. I picked out the most important pictures, which showed “the honcho”. The others were his errand boys, they were unimportant. Deputies. But when they did not [get to see the images] themselves, interest cooled. They betrayed their king. “Since we do not appear in the material, it is no longer important with the images”, I have been told that they said, retrospectively.<sup>24</sup>

Lettström had seemed so worried that neither Webb nor Sevo, although they had not seen the pictures, doubted their existence. But when the group through Webb or their lawyer

---

<sup>23</sup> Flashback. Skvaller om kungens polare Anders Lettström. ”bbbrn”, #471, 2011-11-03.

<sup>24</sup> Beate Hansson & Deanne Rauscher. Mille Markovic : biografien. Vertigo, 2012.

realized what Markovic was selling, they withdrew. No denial was ever made, and Markovic asked for such fairy tale sums, amounts up to 50 million have been mentioned, that Lettström withdrew. Both Sevo and Webb, apparently through Markovic, got the impression that the mission after all this talk about defending CG's good name and reputation had in fact been about Lettström's and Philipson's good name and reputation. They assumed that the reason for hiring them had been to intimidate Markovic and thus bring down the price.

\*

Now it so happened that while all this was going on the journalist Nuri Kino was writing a biography on Milan Sevo.<sup>25</sup> Sevo told Kino about the royal affair and he decided to include it in his book. To exclude such a juicy piece of action could open him up to suspicions of what else was left out. Said and done. Sevo and Webb handed over eight hours of recorded business negotiations. Webb had recorded all of his meetings so that he and Sevo would be covered if there were any disagreement. He claimed that it was not the first time that they had performed similar missions for the Swedish elite and that they learned from experience that things could go wrong. In view of future missions, it was important not to appear to appear naive. (Lettström later claimed that Webb was equipped with the tape recorder on the initiative of Kino, since it seemed incredible that Sevo & Webb were in the habit of documenting their shady activities. If it became known they were dead.<sup>26</sup>) Webb participated in a press conference in connection with the release of the book but refused to answer questions. The reception of the book was mixed. Journalists Jan Guillou, Hanne Kjöllner, Herman Lindqvist and lawyer Anne Ramberg laughed Kino out of court, naming him a combination of “nutcase, clown, lapdog, amateur hood, groupie & gossip collector”.<sup>27</sup> Kino left a copy of the recordings to Dagens Eko and from there they seem to have spread to others.

According to Kino's publisher Annika Bladh, Kino had seen the pictures. “Images that we had access to several months ago but chose not to mention in the book because they could not be evaluated.”<sup>28</sup> When Kino afterwards was asked about the pictures he refused to speak. According to his book, however, he did not see the pictures but had trusted Webb & Sevo that they existed and these in turn had trusted Lettström who trusted Sjöberg & Rauscher who trusted Markovic. Sigh!

On Thursday, May 19, 2011, TV4 showed an odd report with journalist Johan Stambro who gravely inspected Markovic's pictures without the audience seeing what they portrayed. Stambro assured the audience that CG, or someone who looked like CG, was on two of them and that there was some lesbian sex. Markovic refused to inform him when, where and in what context the pictures were taken. Journalists at Expressen and Aftonbladet were also permitted to inspect them. Johan Stambro & Dan Norrå at TV4, Michael Syrén at Expressen and Martin Ekelund at Aftonbladet stated that the pictures were credible even if the quality was too bad for them to be sure that it was CG.

Markovic was invited to a debate on TV4 but refused to come because Stambro in the broadcast described the pictures in too much detail. The court's CIO Bertil Ternert said that he had asked all the employees of the court if they knew anything about the pictures or

---

<sup>25</sup> Nuri Kino. Den svenske gudfadern. Stockholm : Bladh by Bladh, 2011.

<sup>26</sup> Michael Syrén. Anders Lettström: ”Jag blev lurad”. Expressen, 2011-07-19.

<sup>27</sup> Annika Bladh. Kungagranskaren tvingas leva under hot. Aftonbladet, 2011-12-09.

<sup>28</sup> Annika Bladh. Förlagschef: Otäcka påhopp mot journalisten Nuri Kino. Newsmill, 2011-06-06.

Lettström's contacts with Markovic but no. As usual, there was no reason to believe a word of what was coming from the court because CG never confided in it. The whole thing ended with Lettström taking the fall. The blogosphere expressed admiration for Lettström's readiness to throw himself unto the medias mercy or not, but did not believe that CG deserved such loyalty.

\*

Apparently, Tommy Lindström's warning not to trust Mille Markovic had been justified. The gossip said thus: "Hmm the credibility of the book is hardly raised when Mille has been on the go, the man is a compulsive liar. I have met and listened to his conspiracy theories and his alleged contacts with the US President, the UN Secretary-General, etc... If he is a strong source then the authors and the publisher are in trouble."<sup>29</sup> - "I have heard of him and his antics. Fucking oddball who wants to make extra money. Strange that everyone in the book is such a muppet."<sup>30</sup>

An anonymous person on Flashback who had read Ahoka's report, perhaps Lettström himself, targeted Deanne Rauscher whose fact-checking did not seem as diligent as Sjöberg had suggested. In some cases, it boiled down to which party to trust:

For me it is inconceivable that one of the authors of the book Den motvillige monarken (DMM), Deanne Rauscher (DR), has collaborated with this man and that his information is used as a source. When Mille Markovic (MM) was in custody in mid-2009, DR contacted the prosecutor Christina Voigt who was in charge of the case. DR sought permission to visit MM in custody because she wanted to write a book about him. DR was granted two visits.

In October the same year, MM was transferred to Mariefred prison and DR visited him there too. On December 29, 2009, a lawsuit (which DR helped MM with) was filed with the District Court in Stockholm where MM sued the National Police Board. MM then demanded 50 million in damages for psychological and physical suffering caused by his imprisonment (Case B 20894-09), May 31, 2010, the case was dropped "without action".

DR has also in 2010 arranged a meeting with the media and MM, several months before the book DMM was published and where also Michael Badelt (owner of strip club Privé) at Grand Hotel in Stockholm was present. They then tried to sell pictures/films of the King and his circle of acquaintances to the media, but they had nothing to show, they just talked about such material being for sale. [Either this information refers to the the contacts with Janne Josefsson at SVT's Uppdrag granskning, with Bild Zeitung that was interested in publishing the pictures or with Bunte who later published an interview with Rauscher. Dagens Nyheter has also been mentioned.]

DR has been in contact with several people who dismiss as impossible that the King and his friends, in the manner stated in the book DMM, would have been at the "Monday club at Club Power", as MM claimed to DR. That it's pure fantasy of MM that originated as recently as 2009.

---

<sup>29</sup> Flashback. Den stora skvallertråden om H.M. Konung Carl XVI Gustaf. "moraltanten", #2582, 2010-11-03.

<sup>30</sup> Flashback. Den stora skvallertråden om H.M. Konung Carl XVI Gustaf. "jimzet71", #2583, 2010-11-03.

The same people who clearly deny this, also say that the “Monday club” never had any regular booking at MM's Club Power. Members of the Monday club say that they have never been to MM's Club Power. But this has not been taken into account by DR who only believed and embraced what MM told her. DR apparently omitted this information when reporting to the head writer of DMM Thomas Sjöberg and also to Lind & Co.

It is to me a riddle, that DR can believe a person like MM and refuses to listen to those who really should know - the King's friends - but uncritically accepts what MM tells her and publishes it as truth. MM then becomes the book DMM's source. For me, it's totally insane!<sup>31</sup>

Having pondered the subject, I myself thought that these Yugoslav and Irish gangsters were not as altruistic as suggested. After all, they had a background of economic crime, beatings and general unscrupulousness. My suspicion was that the three colluded in squeezing money out of Gubbtolvan but that it all fell foul of the fact that the pictures were too innocent. Mille Markovic, Milan Sevo and Daniel Webb instead colluded in advertising their biographies.

\*

On May 30, 2010, CG issued a long oral denial of virtually everything related to Sjöberg's book. However, the accusations against him were by then so all-embracing but at the same time so diffuse that, as a listener, one could no longer judge what he was talking about. He seemed strangely unprepared and uncommitted. Regarding Lettström, however, it was crystal clear: Perhaps they would be reconciled before death. Definitely not before. The denial was followed by further revelations. Deanne Rauscher was not writing a book about Silvia, but together with journalist Beata Hansson Mille Markovic's memoirs. Markovic himself was in Serbia “because he felt safer there” but would put the pictures on a payment server when the memoirs were published. Rauscher was however unable to guarantee this because she had not seen the pictures herself and had taken his word for that they existed. (However, Aftonbladet's editor Jan Helin was able to confirm that the pictures were about CG and in a compromising situation even if he personally could not vouch for their authenticity.) Henemark also worked on a book.

CG's rebuttal was interpreted as a gamble. If he lied, he'd lose his crown. Maybe so. There was nothing that spoke against it. “Straight ahead and damn the torpedoes” was always CG's solution to complicated situations. However, it seemed less likely that CG, if caught in a lie, would be dethroned or forced to abdicate. The common view was that he would “continue until death or after”. His denial was also described as unique. Wrong though. It was only too reminiscent of when, in the late 1960s, CG as crown prince was asked to deny that he was as stupid as he gave the impression. Superhuman if you can pull it off. “Plus ça change, plus c'est pareil”, as the French say. There was something of a carnival atmosphere over the whole thing:

I love the whole news event with the king! There is so much meta over it. An introvert journalistic Christmas.

---

<sup>31</sup> Flashback. Mille Markovic - vad har han gjort och vad gör han nu? ”Moralgubben”, #4, 2011-05-22.

A king who has immunity from prosecution is accused of something that is not illegal and the entire Sweden media goes bananas. He chooses to give an interview to TT, and Twitter begins to boil in anticipation. "Now the interview should be over," someone tweets. "The interview is now sent to TT's FTP but have embargo until 19.00", someone else tweets. "No newflash yet," tweets a third. Everyone retweets. Lashes out. Flogs his living or dead horse.

So comes the interview. As decapitated hens we media nerds wander the sites, compare and tweet reviews.<sup>32</sup>

Jan Scherman wrote an unflattering article: "But I wonder how Bertil Ternert thought when he allowed his boss, a person who isn't known as a master of the spotlight, to appear in a TV interview? Shifty eyes, incoherent speech, wrinkled forehead, constant twitching. The mouth said one thing and the devastating power of the whole TV medium said something else. I think a lot of people outside his closest supporters were embarrassed by the interview. Suffered through it. ... The court jester Ternert has made an almost world-unique mistake that has dragged the king into something that today appears to be his actual place of execution."<sup>33</sup> Ternert's comment was: "It's almost flattering when a senior media executive attacks one's person in such a way. It means that he is out of arguments."<sup>34</sup> As to the decision making Ternert stated that interview had been entirely on CG's own initiative. Ternert himself had advised against it because the facts were so unclear. "But I have obviously failed when I do not get a hearing for my arguments."<sup>35</sup> He was also critical of TT releasing the interview without editing.

Jan Guillou summarized CG's situation as "The hounds win - but only if he has lied. The media hounding of His Majesty the King is as volatile and ever-changing as spring weather. The focus is constantly shifting from one trifle to another so that the scandal seems to be evolving into something even if nothing special happens. It is a strange spectacle for lookers on and guaranteed a complete nightmare for the various targets."<sup>36</sup>

The writings the first half of the year were so extensive that their advertising value, the cost of buying the corresponding advertising space, in the print media alone was estimated to be SEK 25 million.

\*

Then there was a summer break. Lettström was dismissed from the board of directors of the event company 2Entertain AB, as chairman of the subsidiary Oscarsteatern AB, from the board of directors of the construction company Reinhold Polska AB and as chairman of Baden Powell Swedish Chapter. He sent letters to his closest friends and acquaintances to explain himself. Neither he nor as far as he knew CG had ever been at Club Power. He perceived Mille Markovic as somebody obsessed with redress.<sup>37</sup> Webb billed Lettström with

---

<sup>32</sup> Emanuel Karlsten. Meta-analys om #kungen - och varför svaren blev så olika. Bloggen Emanuels randanmärkningar om det som inte finner annan plats, 2011-05-30.

<sup>33</sup> Expressen, 2011-06-01.

<sup>34</sup> Fredrik Emdén. "Allt kan hända i den här rollen". Chef, 2011-10-12.

<sup>35</sup> Lisa Röstlund. "Vi vill inte smussla undan någonting". Aftonbladet, 2011-05-27.

<sup>36</sup> Jan Guillou. Drevet vinner - men bara om han har ljugit. Aftonbladet, 2011-06-06.

<sup>37</sup> Anders Lettström. "Jag blev tvingad att ingå en uppörelse med kriminella." Dagens Nyheter, 2011-12-08.

two million for expenses and lost earnings due to exposure in the media.<sup>38</sup> After renegotiation, Lettström et consorties escaped with 500 thousand + VAT.<sup>39</sup>

As with other major CG scandals, the basis for this scandal had been brewing for a long time. Similar stories about parties and women had appeared and been denied throughout his adult life. The journalists and their readers had, in accordance with an increasingly outdated etiquette, accepted the courts denials without researching the allegations. Senior editors Karin Lennmor at Svensk Damtidning and Jan Helin at Aftonbladet were interviewed. Despite the fact that nearly a year had passed, they still doubted CG's extra marital affairs, but neither they nor anyone else had attempted to check on them. Lennmor: "Of course we've known about them, but only through the rumours. I have often thought, if there are so many women, why has nobody come up to my office and told me about them? On the other hand, we cannot pay the same amounts as they do in England, for example." Helin had previously been offered an interview with Camilla Henemark but declined when she demanded money: "If Expressen paid her for an interview, it is no longer journalism. In her particular case, it is her word against the kings. You can not give her an incentive to lie. I mean that her story becomes corrupt if you pay for it."<sup>40</sup> Now he did not know what to think: "There have been rumours, but I have heard 20 other rumours too. I do not have the faintest idea whether they are true or not."<sup>41</sup> In the absence of forensic evidence, everyone seems to have started to doubt everything.

During the year Sjöberg's publisher Kristoffer Lind moved to London. His reaction to the book's reception was much like Sjöberg's: "I understood that the book would be controversial but I naively believed that the discussion would be about the role of the head of state and his actions. That people would be upset about what the king had done and not that it was published. Nor could I have imagined the establishment that much fearing the publication."<sup>42</sup> Sjöberg wrote some articles that breathed frustration that their criticism of CG's actions was ignored. None of them seems to have grasped that CG as a person could not be distinguished from CG as king. Any attack on CG was by definition a personal attack.

In the meantime Ahokas and the historian Dick Harrison wrote a fact-checking of Sjöberg's biography, which they intended to publish. Sjöberg was surprised. He did not believe that the interest in such a book justified the publication. Henemark and Markovic worked on their respective biographies. Nuri Kino worked on a documentary for SVT. On July 26, he received a threatening email that his computer had been hacked:

Nuri

A little presentation. We're your worst nightmare, a nightmare you'll never wake up from. We have received from anonymous sources a variety of information that has been collected about you. It is common knowledge that we hate everything you've done lately. We now have evidence that you and your "friends" have falsified the truth and engaged in serious criminal activity.

---

<sup>38</sup> Erik Högström. Lettström fick brev: "Är ett förtäckt hot". Expressen, 2011-06-01.

<sup>39</sup> Christian Holmén & Michael Syrén. Kungavännen pressad av "Gudfadern". Expressen, 2011-10-31.

<sup>40</sup> Magnus Helander. Henemark fick 200 000 av Expressen. Resumé.se, 2010-11-12.

<sup>41</sup> Karin Tideström. Ny kungajournalistik efter boken. Scoop - tidskriften för grävande journalistik, 2011:3.

<sup>42</sup> Johan T Lindwall, Michael Syrén & Christer Holmén. Nu dras Daniel in i kungaskandalen. Expressen, 2011-09-25.

We can't believe you've been as careless as you have been. Here's a little sample of what we got, we have a lot more. I wonder how your friends would react if they find out that you have secretly bugged them and that all that information is now with us. You should explain in the national media why you falsified the truth and immediately cease all further smearing. This should happen immediately! Return immediately with a reply e-mail so we know you understand your situation.<sup>43</sup>

The email attached a list of hijacked files. These included Kino's interviews with Sevo, party pictures of them together, Webb's recorded business conversations with Anders Lettström, two of Thomas Sjöberg's recorded interviews and various business agreements. Kino felt threatened and changed residence several times. He received bodyguards. On October 24, Lettström received a copy of the material, 14 GB, on a USB memory stick with an accompanying letter signed "Some friends". Lettström submitted it to SÄPO. Several other members of CG's circle of friends also received a copy.

The same week Aftonbladet and Expressen received a copy of the threat email and the files from Daniel Webb. The press identified Lars Axelsson. Aftonbladet found information that Lettström had kept CG informed about his contacts with Markovic.<sup>44</sup> There was also a statement that the National Criminal Investigation Department, apparently in good faith, had contacted Lettström and wondered if he was being blackmailed. Lettström didn't understand how they could know about his situation and thought they were tapping CG's phone. When Aftonbladet reporter Anders Johansson later played these parts of the sound files for Bertil Ternert, the latter refused, whatever Johansson asked about, to talk about anything other than this supposed telephone interception. He sounded like Bosse Ringholm in the notorious press conference about Inga Britt Ahlenius. The meeting also took place outdoors in one of the galleries instead of at Ternert's office room. Apparently, the tabloid jackals was to be kept at bay. The following week, Lettström went public with a debate article about his and CG's innocence.<sup>45</sup> He said he during the meetings with Webb had said things about CG's involvement (and about the group's conduct and bad finances?) that did not correspond to reality. After all, it was a business negotiation and with crooks.

The ensuing debate was about who to trust.<sup>46</sup> Deanne Rauscher had now seen the pictures and was able on SVT Debatt December 9 to guarantee the sexual content. As to whether CG was in the picture, however, she, like everyone else on the case, prevaricated. On December 16, blimey however! Expressen had somehow got hold of the image of CG that Markovic intended to include in his book. The editor-in-chief Thomas Mattson was asked how, but did not want to tell. (There were reports of a police leak after Markovic had had his luggage searched and computer confiscated on his return from Serbia on June 18. Alternatively, the computer of Beata Hansson or Deanne Rauscher had been somehow hacked.<sup>47</sup> A third version was that Markovic had tried to sell the image to Expressen.) Before the photo was published, Expressen ordered three separate expert reviews of their veracity.<sup>48</sup> These were done during the summer but Expressen held on to the information for as long as they could.<sup>49</sup>

---

<sup>43</sup> Anders Johansson & Josefin Sköld. Här hotas kungagranskaren. Aftonbladet, 2011-10-29. [E brev till Nuri Kino 2011-07-26 och bilaga Nuri.rar (1.2 MB).]

<sup>44</sup> Erik Wiman & Anders Johansson. "Jag pratade med kungen". Aftonbladet, 2011-12-03.

<sup>45</sup> Anders Lettström. "Jag blev tvingad ingå en uppgörelse med kriminella." Dagens Nyheter, 2011-12-08.

<sup>46</sup> Debatt. SVT1, 2011-12-08, kl 22:00.

<sup>47</sup> Expressens etik. Vertigo förlag, 2011-12-17.

<sup>48</sup> Christian Holmén, Michael Syrén & Johan T Lindwall. Experternas dom över kungabilden som skakat hovet. Expressen, 2011-12-16.

<sup>49</sup> Christian Holmén. Vad var kungens vänner rädda för? Expressen, 2011-12-31.

“CG” sat alone in the background of what appeared to have started life as a frame of black-and-white analogue video which Markovic subsequently thoroughly photo-shopped: Sharpened it and enhanced the contrast. Added a frame around the face and increased the brightness. Maybe cloned in a new face. Painted the shirt white and the hair and suit black. Also painted over the two strippers' faces and the two windows or paintings in the background. In the foreground, one could see a pair of trouser knees, chinos, of a person who most probably was the photographer. “CG” relaxed with what looked like an arm behind the head, possibly painted, but he sat so that the sexual content, some lesbian love with a dildo was hidden behind a couch. Due to the low resolution it was difficult to distinguish his facial features. Since Markovic had “improved” his hair, it was also not possible to see the shape of the hairline. There was no similarity to other 1992 images however. That year, CG had slimmed down. Here he or whoever it was had round cheeks as in the 1970s. The women's underwear was current though.

Markovic responded by saying that it was entirely correct that he changed the background so that one could not see where the film was shot, he wanted to protect the “girls”, but it was CG in the picture. Incidentally, he himself knew that his pictures were genuine, then the experts were free to think what they wanted. This caused Peter Eriksson (mp) chairman of KU and the authors Sjöberg and Rauscher to distance themselves from the evidence: The serious thing was not whether CG was guilty of a porn club visit but that he could with any credibility be accused of it because of his choice of friends. You may think this unfair, but as a politician you really have to be careful with who you deal. Sjöberg later regretted his retreat and claimed at a meeting at the publisher's association the following year that the image falsification must be considered a slip up of Markovic who otherwise was credible in everything.

The following day, Expressen interviewed a person who had actually seen the original film. According to him, it was a 15-minute amateur video from the summer of 1991:

The witness details what was played out on the film.

- There were two men and three women plus one person who filmed and one who steered the boat. The boat was a rented luxury yacht. At first I got to see some views from the deck. Then they drove by Fjäderholmarna and towards Slussen.

- The rest of the time they filmed inside the boat. Two of the girls in the picture I recognize, says the person to Expressen.

The witness mentions their names and they match information that Expressen received from others who claim to have identified the people in the picture.

- On the film, however, I also saw two men - one I recognized and an unknown man, but it was definitely not the king, says the witness.<sup>50</sup>

The next day, the Flashback community weighted in (the pseudonym Stig-Britt, self-taught hacker). Stig-Britt published a long post that made it likely that Markovic had copied the face of CG from SVT's engagement video on March 13, 1976.

\* Can you tell me exactly how you went about searching the clips for the movie?

---

<sup>50</sup> Christian Holmén & Michael Syrén. Vittne till sexfilmen: ”Kungen var definitivt inte med”. Expressen, 2011-12-18.

- I programmed a script that searched on various terms containing the word king (the king in 1970, the king in 1971, the king in 1972 etc, plus a whole bunch of other combinations) and saved all the pictures. While the script was being executed I pulled up two browsers, side by side, and ran video after video on the king. After a couple of hours the script had saved a whole bunch of pictures, whereupon I sat down and went through them quite quickly. I didn't go through all of them, some of them were so easy to sort out because there was no way they could be right. I continued in the browser by checking video after video. In the end, I found a frame that really seemed to fit. When I found it, I probably played it 30 times at repeat to capture the exact frame.<sup>51</sup>

The story died. A contributing factor to their extent was assumed to be the vulnerable situation of the tabloids in competition with the internet, an equivalent to the situation in the 1970s when the weeklies were competing with TV.

\*

### The scandal 3.0 : Denials, rebuttals & “putting the lid on”

Kino didn't want to continue with the documentary. The his sources had been revealed, the news value was gone and his nerves were exhausted. Noppe's tavern also fared badly. Few wanted to be associated with the place anymore. Anders Philipson withdrew from the board. Aftonbladet was convicted by PON for stating that Philipson had participated in the meetings with Sevo and Webb. It could not be considered proven by open sources and the newspaper did not want to disclose its anonymous sources (i.e. Daniel Webb).<sup>52</sup> Aftonbladet would according to the rules have to publish the ruling in the newspaper. When they didn't do so, Philipson bought a full-page advertisement in Svenska Dagbladet on December 27 with a short preamble in which he wondered why not more people did as he - sued for defamation. The following day, Aftonbladet published a counter-advertisement with a photocopy of Webb's account showing that Philipson was one of the three financiers. But then CG and Silvia were already on New Year's holiday in Thailand.

In his New Year's speech, CG pretended that nothing had happened but was grateful for the (small) support he had received during the year. In that years Året med kungafamiljen, Silvia was asked why she or CG did not issue a denial. Silvia preferred not to talk about it but said: It was too pejorative, it went on too long and it was always someone else who had the last word. It was a media hounding and against such you are always the loser even if you belong to the royal house. As my own review should by now have shown, this is not correct. It was always false or unverified information. As soon as some verified facts appeared, the hounding was over. Or in plain language - the press routines of the royal house must be reviewed. It was long time since it sufficed to deny something out of hand. The public demands facts. Such a thing is unlikely to happen though, as the royal family regarded the hounding as a personal attack, not as politically motivated. Journalists thought that the conflict in its excitement had elements of a theatre play: “The Bernadotte family is fictionalized to such an extent that even the scandals turn out to be fictional.”<sup>53</sup>

On January 16, 2012, the Publicists' Association discussed Markovic's photos. The Expressen's editor-in-chief, Thomas Mattsson, stated that, regardless of the truth, the photos

<sup>51</sup> Andreas Johansson. Så hittade datahackern ”Stig-Britt” rätt kungabild. Expressen, 2011-12-20.

<sup>52</sup> Allmänhetens pressombudsman, ärende 2011:110.

<sup>53</sup> Karin Olsson. Fiktionen och Flashback. Expressen, 2011-12-20.

had a public interest. The PO believed that Expressen was in the wrong but referred to the workload when the audience then wondered why he had not acted. This angered the journalist Jan Gillberg enough to publish a list of Expressen and Aftonbladet colleagues who had participated in the hounding, 38 of them it turned out.<sup>54</sup> On February 20, 2012, the publisher's association in Gothenburg was supposed to continue their self-criticism. The report from the meeting indicates that this did not happen then either. With so many people involved, it is difficult to apportion responsibility. With the information I have, Expressen's researcher Michael Syrén seems most unfit for duty among the 38 but the competition was razor-sharp.

\*

Mille Markovic's memoirs of January 25, 2012, contained so many incredible details that the writer Beata Hansson relinquished responsibility for it. It was Mille's story - not hers.<sup>55</sup> She and Markovic had met in 2010 and then agreed on a book about Markovic's upbringing and family life. Then Rauscher got involved in the project and the focus changed in the direction of Markovic's "legal pathos". He seemed to identify with Mike Hammer, Mickey Spillane's hero. Sentimentality and excessive violence across the board. The reception of the biography was very lame. There were criticisms that Markovic was permitted to say anything that came to his mind without any attempt at independent fact-checking. Rauscher defended herself by saying that Markovic had always kept to his story. No further details on CG were included in the book, and Camilla Henemark and Desirée Ahokas had yet to publish anything they had promised. Anders Lettström participated in the interview program Skavlan and took the opportunity to deny everything. The interview had a strange tone. Lettströms's motive for participating seemed to be to show that he was not cracked by his adversity. The atmosphere was tired even on Flashback. A 13-month scandal seemed to be coming to an end. Not entirely though. In the spring Camilla Henemark and then Daniel Webb announced their memoirs.<sup>56,57</sup>

Daniel Webb's memoirs arrived on the National Day of June 6. According to Webb, Markovic had bought the images of Christer Gustafsson and they would have been taken by a surveillance camera on board a luxury yacht in connection with the Barcelona Olympics July 25 to August 9, 1992.

This seems to be something of a urban legend last hawked by journalist Bo Holmström: Some Swedish companies had hired a Finnish ferry through a foundation called the Olympia boat, founded in 1988 under the patronage of CG, which was run down to Barcelona with various exhibitions on board and was also used for representation. The profits went to the Swedish Olympic Committee. The Olympic boat and about 10 other passenger ships served as floating hotels during the Olympics. CG arrived in Barcelona on August 5 and appears to have spent the night on the boat. He and Silvia were also invited to dinner, but CG lacked a lady partner at table. He and the adjutant went out into the bar where there were five ladies, according to what the journalists present thought luxury prostitutes. CG pointed out one of them to the adjutant who conveyed CG's invitation.<sup>58</sup> [Since CG at the time had the whole family with him, the scenario of luxury prostitutes seems unlikely. Similar allegations were made about the Summer Olympics in Atlanta four years later.]

<sup>54</sup> Jan Gillberg. Drevjournalistiken styr Sverige. DSM, 2012:1.

<sup>55</sup> Beate Hansson & Deanne Rauscher. Mille Markovic : biografien. Vertigo, 2012.

<sup>56</sup> Camilla Henemark & Carina Nunstedt. Adjö det ljuva livet. Forum, 2012.

<sup>57</sup> Daniel Webb & Anders Johansson. Livvakt - vägen till monarken. Lind & Co, 2012.

<sup>58</sup> Bo Holmström. Lägg ut! : episoder ur ett journalistliv. Natur & Kultur, 2011.

Also the artist Elisabeth Ohlsson Wallin, (in)famous for the photo exhibition *Ecce Homo*, felt compelled to enter the debate. On October 2, she allowed the Social Democratic magazine *Tiden* to publish a collage of Camilla Henemark lying naked on a table covered with pizzas (!) and surrounded by CG and the leading players in the scandal. Silvia lay on the floor and scoured a swastika.<sup>59</sup> “A satire subtle as a tractor” was the comment. Professor emerita in criminal law Madeleine Leijonhufvud, by now something of a friend in the family, wrote a post in which she claimed that the picture was adult bullying “aimed at people who actually have no possibility to defend themselves”.<sup>60</sup> One must surely with a fool's obstinacy repeat that CG does not want to defend himself and that Silvia first ignored the Sommerlath's past and when she was forced to do so hired a researcher to whitewash it.

Wallin had imagined herself having some kind of artistic immunity. No such luck. Scanpix's image agency announced that she would no longer be allowed to use their images for her montages - this because Scanpix's photographers believed that it would lower their own credibility if the photo objects were to appear in her satires. *Expressen*, *Aftonbladet* & *Sydsvenskan* also published the satirical picture. Silvia reported all four to the PO. Wallin convened a press conference at which she apologized to Silvia (as a private person) but stressed that she did not change her mind. Scanpix may have prostrated but not she! Proud words. The newspapers were later acquitted but it was unpleasant anyway. Wallin: “I was terrified. Shut down. Hit the wall. Now I'm recovering: I'm glad the papers were acquitted. I haven't made an artistic picture since December. Of course it takes its toll.” - Her finances had taken a beating. No one wanted to hire her any longer, as it could be interpreted that they took a stand on the dispute with the royal family.<sup>61</sup>

*Expressen* and *Aftonbladet* published Silvia's notification to PO. Silvia also notified this to the PO, who convicted them under Section 4 of the PO's constitution that the notifier should not be disclosed during the investigation. Small revenge is also revenge.

Meanwhile Leijonhufvud explained that all attacks on CG, Silvia and the rest of the family were by definition treason with its specific legal framework: The Chancellor of Justice had to bring charges which the government had to approve.<sup>62</sup> About this can be said: CG has stopped the two prosecutions that JK wanted to initiate. Perhaps on the advice of his lawyer because blasphemy & slander are hardly treason. It is also not certain that the legislation on treason applies to the rest of the royal family. For example, they have no immunity from prosecution. Prince Bertil, Princess Sibylla and Prince Carl Jr were prosecuted as any other citizen.

Thomas Sjöberg was interviewed about the personal consequences of the book. The reluctant monarch had sold 150,000 copies, which was good, but as a consequence of all the writings around it he was perceived as so controversial that it was now far between assignments. He claimed that the sources of the book had been persecuted and threatened to silence: “It was not the king who threatened them, but the threats were uttered in his name. It's extremely serious and fucking unpleasant.” - “Sweden is a small country. Writing a book as controversial as this has consequences.” But he did not regret it.<sup>63</sup>

---

<sup>59</sup> Ny politisk satir av Elisabeth Ohlsson Wallin. *Tiden*, 2012-10-02.

<sup>60</sup> Madeleine Leijonhufvud. *Kungabilden är vuxenmobbing*. *Svenska Dagbladet*, 2012-10-06.

<sup>61</sup> Elisabeth Ohlsson Wallin om den tuffa tiden i kylan efter bilden på Silvia och hakkorset. *Nyheter P4 Skaraborg*, 2013-06-05.

<sup>62</sup> Madeleine Leijonhufvud, *Nej, kungen kan inte väcka åtal*. *Svenska Dagbladet*, 2012-11-19.

<sup>63</sup> Josefin Sköld. ”Boken var förödande.” *Aftonbladet*, 2012-10-12.

Who threatened who and how was unclear. To some extent, it seems that the sources and their relatives experienced the attention as unpleasant. For example, body guard Ola Selin had been interviewed by Dick Harrison (as it seems about his reliability as a source), contacted by a variety of people who wanted to publish his diary and also asked by his children to stop telling about his employment as the king's bodyguard in order not to embarrass them. He had not experienced any threats, however.

Thomas Sjöberg also participated in a radio debate with Madeleine Leijonhufvud about the way CG & Silvia were criticized. The debate came to focus on the role of the Royal House:

ML: The attack is not about the King and Queen's way of doing their job. They are two people who have now reached retirement age and who, as far as I know, have never ever displayed any power. But even if they had power, this attack [of yours] is not be a review of their power. It is not at all a review of how they have carried out their duties.

TS: I do not really agree with that. If one is to try to find some kind of informal job description of the Head of State's mission, the key point is surely that he or she should represent the values that Sweden as a nation stands for and there I can state that our current Head of State does not fulfil the job description. So I surely think [my book] is a way to review the Head of State.<sup>64</sup>

If you add up all the information on the consequences of criticizing, gossiping or even having opinions about CG, the conclusion is that the consequences may be quite serious: unpleasant attacks; social ostracism & economic blacklisting. CG may not pursue his enemies in court but he uses his influence to squeeze them so it hurts.

\*

On October 25, Dick Harrison & Desirée Ahokas published their book "From a Secure Source...". Both had from day one dismissed *The Reluctant Monarch* as fiction. Ahoka's trolling, rumour-mongering, hacking and intrusive researching for the "royal gang" made her role as an impartial truth-teller problematic. Probably the reason she approached Harrison for a collaboration. In the book Harrison wrote about royal scandals in a historical perspective. Ahokas, for her part, wrote detailed counter-proofs of CG's alleged visits to "Club Power" in 1992, "Gold Club" in 1996 and "Carat Club" in 2008, and also described the sequence of events surrounding the publication of *The Reluctant Monarch*. Ahoka's technique was to incriminate the authors and their sources. The myriad of details makes the book difficult to describe. Most of it was already known, though here were sources. An unexpected effect of the online debate afterwards was that Ahoka's unbalanced postings made Thomas Sjöberg and Deanne Rauscher look like models of calm and reason.

Dick Harrison summarized CG's situation in three points: (1) The change in the status of the monarchy towards symbolic and moral supremacy. (2) Political developments resulting from the Torekov compromise. (3) The escalating medialization of society. "The concrete result of the three processes mentioned above is a new type of royal publicity, which can be likened to a double-edged sword. On the one hand, the Swedish king has never had as much informal influence over the Swedish people as today. On the other hand, he has never been so

---

<sup>64</sup> Hur ska kungafamiljen behandlas i media? Studio ett, P1, 2012-10-10.

vulnerable. The new public space creates both optimal conditions for reaching out to the people and greater risks of being attacked.”

\*

#### The scandal 4.0 : Final remarks

In 2021, the podcast Motiv published a summary of the scandal in 6 parts where the authors told about their experiences: What in hindsight feels a bit strange is that none of the authors seemed familiar with the weeklies but based their book on information from Flashback. As shown in previous chapters the royal gang's parties & women were well known and had been magazine fodder for the last 40 years, but this is not mentioned. The authors also had no network of contacts among those who attended the parties but must completely rely on Markovic. He mentioned about 40 women by name, but only seven are interviewed. One had met CG at Alexandra's in 1985. Another had attended Lettström's dinners. Three stated that they (at unclear date) had had group sex with him in a hunting lodge. The publisher is supposed to have censored the printed edition, possibly to avoid prosecution for naming them. Since Markovic was married to one of the women, Lotta Moss, she seems to have been his and therefore Sjöberg's main source of information.<sup>65</sup>

The authors were anxious to downplay the book, which they considered quite innocent, and preferred to speak about Lettström's failed crisis management and about how unpleasantly affected they had been by the attacks on the books veracity. Meyer expressed it as “The purpose was not to overthrow our king or to establish a republic, but to describe the structures that exist in the top tier of Swedish society, and how they never needed to take responsibility for their actions.” The publisher Kristoffer Lind had the same attitude: The book was an early case of the Metoo movement.

Because Sjöberg & Rauscher were so dependent on Markovic's credibility, they tried to explain away his forgery by him selling the original images to Lettström and then replacing them with counterfeits in order to hide this transaction. The crisis management of their own gullibility feels at this point quite far-fetched.

\*

The podcast actually seems to have inspired a sequel. January 2 to February 19, 2022, occurred “intense rumours” about Daniels & Victoria's impending divorce - 35 articles in the online magazine “Stoppa Pressarna”. This was something of a private project by the celebrity journalist David Nyhlén and considered itself - by not adhering to current press ethics rules - free to publish made-up and defamatory information in the English tabloid-manner. The series of articles, a series of linked fragments, in which Nyhlén on made-up grounds repeatedly claims that Daniel Westling is an insensitive cad and that the Crown Princess wants a divorce is more rhetoric than journalism. Nyhlén claimed the articles were widely discussed, but the “discussion” seems to have been Nyhlén himself publishing under various pseudonyms on Flashback and other forums. The next year Svenska Dagbladet published the anticlimactic ending. Nothing had happened. It was all a joke.<sup>66</sup>

---

<sup>65</sup> Moss, Lotta & Sjöberg, Thomas. (2020.) Gift med Maffian. Min nakna sanning, Mondial.

<sup>66</sup> Marcus Lundblad-Joons. Så fick ryltet medierna att gå i spinn. Svenska Dagbadet, 2023-08-27.