

neutralized *Mittleuropa*. Might there be the possibility of a new type of federation of the Baltic nations, including the so-called republics of Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania—of course, under Swedish hegemony, as in the days of old?

The role of the churches

In the fantasies of certain Baltic oligarchs, this is perhaps not as outrageous an idea as it appears to the normal observer. The historical reference is clear: a couple of centuries ago, Sweden actually did rule all of these areas. But there is also a much more recent precedent, one which has a continuity until today. A modern Baltic Regional Federation would be the realization of a plan proposed by the leading Swedish geopolitician of this century, Lutheran Archbishop Nathan Söderblom, ordinarily better known as one of the founders of the World Council of Churches movement. In intimate collaboration with the networks of Swiss-Venetian intelligence operative Alexander Helphand/Parvus during and after World War I, Söderblom had the goal of establishing a regional bloc of the countries around the Baltic Sea, thus making the Baltic, as he put it, *mare lutherum*—a Lutheran lake—with Söderblom himself as the political-religious patriarch.

Indeed, there is good reason to take a close look at the role of the Lutheran Churches of Sweden and Finland in this whole scenario today. At the same time that Palme launched his border dispute with Denmark, the state church of Finland, the Evangelical Lutheran Church, was just finishing a summit meeting with top representatives of the Russian Orthodox Church in Leningrad and Moscow. The Finnish delegation was headed by the new Archbishop John Vikström, of Swedish heritage. Vikström's talks with Metropolitan Antony of Leningrad and Patriarch Pimen in Moscow centered on the topic of creating a nuclear-free zone in Northern Europe.

In this light, a couple of other revealing Baltic-Russian links should be mentioned:

- The number-two man in the Russian Orthodox Church, the Chancellor of the Moscow Patriarchate, is Metropolitan Aleksiy of Tallinn and Estonia. Aleksiy's real name is Aleksey Mikhailovich von Ruediger. The von Ruediger family was one of the leading Baltic German noble families, and as such, one of the most important Lutheran families in that part of the Russian Empire. Today, one of Aleksiy's special functions in the Russian Orthodox Church is to maintain contact with the Lutheran Churches of Eastern and Western Europe.

- Olof Palme himself is a direct descendant of Baltic German nobility. His mother, Elisabeth von Knieriem Palme, was born on an estate about 80 miles northeast of the Latvian capital of Riga, then as now part of the Russian Empire. Palme spent his childhood summers on the family estate in the 1930s. Just a few years ago, Olof Palme's older brother Claes—a lawyer specializing in maritime law and the chief legal counsel for the Soviet state in such cases in Sweden—appealed to the Soviets to return the von Knieriem family estate to him and his brother.

French response to return to politics of

by Mark Burdman

The response of the French government to Libyan dictator Muammar Qaddafi's aggression in Chad has reintroduced a certain word into the vocabulary of Europe: appeasement. The Mitterrand regime has shown a combination of military posturing and political underhandedness which could be compared to the Daladier government's lie-down-and-die attitude in the face of Adolf Hitler's 1938-39 assault on Europe.

Munich, 1938. . .

A continental European source who is not usually hard-line on defense matters told *EIR* Aug. 17: "What the French have been doing in weakening opposition to Qaddafi and in driving a wedge between the Europeans and the Americans is absolutely unacceptable. This represents a new tendency in Europe. What the French are doing now with Qaddafi is appeasement."

A chorus of voices in the French press blasting Mitterrand began with an Aug. 12 front-page article in *Le Monde* by influential commentator Jacques Amalric, titled "The Price of Indecision." Amalric stated that Mitterrand's actions had convinced Qaddafi of one thing: "aggression pays," and warned that Mitterrand may have opened the door to massive Soviet influence in Africa.

Doubts are multiplying that the expanded French military deployment since the Aug. 13-14 weekend is serious, as opposed to a cynical attempt to satisfy pressure from the United States for France to act in Chad, while trying to prevent America from gaining influence in Africa in the face of French inaction.

Even on the French left, the alarm is being raised. Over the Aug. 13-14 weekend, the French newspaper *Liberation* published a statement by singer Yves Montand and others comparing the French government's reflex in the case of Chad to "Munich, 1938."

The French political force most outspoken and straightforward in its criticism has been the fast-growing Parti Européen Ouvrier led by Jacques Cheminade, a former candidate for the French presidency.

In a statement issued Aug. 18, Cheminade stressed: "The military deployment that we putting in place in Chad is at the best only a new Maginot line. It is not of the quality that will

invasion of Chad: appeasement

stop Colonel Qaddafi, who is encouraged by the visits that he receives in Tripoli and the intrigues that are unfolding in Paris. Three thousand men and combat airplanes do not constitute a dissuasion, but a veil masking reality, if their presence on the terrain consecrates a partition of the country. . . . The Hitlerian dictator of Tripoli, made use of by the KGB, only knows the language of force.”

Cheminade insisted that only French deployment of aircraft against “the troops, the tanks, and the Libyan MIGs” could be effective at this point, necessarily coupled to a development policy for Africa to shield it from the financial depredations of the International Monetary Fund.

In response to an earlier statement by Cheminade along the same lines, the Chad government’s chargé d’affaires in Paris, Allam Mi Ahmad, in a statement issued Aug. 17, described the POE’s demand as “worthy of the great France in which the Chadian people place their hopes of firm support. . . .”

As of Aug. 19, the prevailing viewpoint in Paris appears to be that a double game can be played with Qaddafi. On the one hand, France is rapidly expanding its military intervention into Chad; it is now expected that it will soon have 3,000 troops and advisers in Chad within days, backed up by Mirage and Jaguar jets and by extensive anti-aircraft missile defense capabilities around the capital of N’Djamena.

On the other hand, envoys of Mitterrand and of the Quai d’Orsay are actively involved in negotiations with Qaddafi that converge on the strategy of partitioning Chad into Libyan and French spheres of influence, and/or creating a new Chad “government of national unity” that will represent a compromise between French and Libyan versions of Islamic fundamentalism in Africa. The latter option centers around one Asheikh Ibn Omar, a French-trained Islamic fundamentalist who is being mooted as a potential “alternative” to both Chad leader Hissen Habré and rebel leader Goukkouni Oueddei, and who personifies the merger between the mystical Senussi Brotherhood sect behind Qaddafi and the French branches of the Islamic mystical cult known as Sufism.

The two strategies are in fact the same: French military deployments are centered on the towns of Salal (north of N’Djamena in southwest Chad) and Bittine (north of the city of Abeche in east-central Chad). If one draws a line from one

to the other, one more or less divides Chad in half, in a somewhat lopsided north-south division.

As Yves Lancien, the African affairs envoy of the opposition RPR (Gaullist) party, pointed out Aug. 19 following a visit to Chad, the French deployments may mean that “N’Djamena will not fall, but the country is still cut in two pieces.” Lancien pointed out that only a French decision to provide massive air cover in defense of Habré and against Qaddafi’s forces in northern Chad, as part of a systematic effort to reconquer what Qaddafi has captured, will restore Chad’s national sovereignty.

Unless Paris decides to confront Qaddafi with adequate air power, the price of appeasement will be the fall of new “dominoes” to Qaddafi and his Russian imperialist and Nazi International backers. New African flashpoints will explode, probably including Cameroon, Mali, Niger and Sudan.

. . . and Berlin 1884

EIR correspondents in Paris say the city is rife with Byzantine intrigues that have little to do with the strategic realities now posed by Qaddafi and his Russian controllers.

One point of intrigue centers around Foreign Minister Claude Cheysson. According to the authoritative correspondent for the weekly *Paris-Match*, Georges Menant, Cheysson was “very moved” by Cuban leader Fidel Castro during an early-August trip to Cuba, and arranged a secret geopolitical deal with him to weaken American influence in Africa! Further, a gaggle of Freemasonic operatives has been traveling in and out of Tripoli, or have otherwise been secretly colluding with Qaddafi and the KGB around a partition deal in Chad. These include Mitterrand’s son, Jean-Christoph, an adviser to the presidential palace on African affairs; “the red millionaire of France,” Jean-Baptiste Doumenc; Mitterrand’s personal lawyer, Roland Dumas; pseudo-Gaullist former Minister Michel Jobert; French ambassador to Algeria Guy Georgy; and presidential adviser on African affairs Guy Penne (see *EIR*, Aug. 23).

This jaded atmosphere converges with Europe-wide fantasies about reconstructing colonial empires in Africa as the current political structures collapse under the pressure of economic austerity and foreign aggression. Imagine these European nations attempting to reconstruct the “*partage*” of Africa that occurred at the notorious colonialists’ romp known as the Berlin Conference on Africa in 1884, during which Britain, France, Germany, and Belgium received their respective “spheres of influence” on the continent. Today, in the face of Russian imperial expansion, these dreams would be the subject of a Gilbert and Sullivan-like farce, were they not so tragic in their consequences for human lives.

The cleverest players at this game are the Israelis. As France deserts its former allies and as President Reagan defers to France’s sphere of influence in Chad, Israel has emerged as the “protector” of African regimes. An Israeli representative told *EIR* bluntly, “What Qaddafi is doing in Africa is good for us. He is driving wedges between our enemies and