



## REPORT ON THE NATO 2022 SUMMIT IN MADRID

**The 32nd NATO summit will be held in Madrid on 29 and 30 June. This will not be just<sup>1</sup> another summit.** A redefinition of the Alliance's role is envisaged to bring it into line with the Great Reset doctrine promoted by the major Western supranational powers and, in addition, NATO will be seen as a necessary instrument to subdue Russia and China.

This text aims to shed light on (1) **the importance of the summit and** (2) **the significance it will have for the lives of the majority of the world's population.**

In addition, we will focus on the two war mechanisms: the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation (NATO) and the US military bases in Spain.

Reporting is not simply to tell the facts, the causes and their consequences, but to analyse the underlying reasons of these. We need to have the judgement to become aware and to act with rigor and determination. The military industrial complex, of which both organizations are an essential part, is a complex network which is difficult to understand, it cannot be summarized in a few words, nor simplified in a few ideas, but it must be understood in its entirety if we intend to act towards its elimination.

This year will see two particularly important events: the NATO 2022 Summit in Madrid and the renewal of the agreement on US military bases in the Spanish State.

The summit will not be a formality: the lack of unity and cohesion of member states is recognized, at a time of growing difficulties, the economic and institutional crisis requires a reordering of which NATO will be a fundamental part, the development of Russia and China threatens US hegemony, and in all of this, military power is a key element.

The Spanish state is an important element in military and political geostrategy, its strategic location makes it ideal as a military enclave and its links with Latin America make it the best vector for US policies in that region towards Europe and for the introduction of NATO in Latin America, as has been seen in the case of Colombia.

To facilitate the understanding of this complexity, **we will look at NATO's historical trajectory, its internal structure, the role it plays in the system, the contradictions to which it is subjected to, the 1986 referendum, the importance of the forthcoming summit, the risks involved in its outcome and the need to react to the barbarism it represents.**

Similarly, we will address the case of the US bases in Spain, their origin, their history as a legacy of the dictatorship, their current role and the subordination they represent. Finally, we will refer to the movements that have historically responded to these aggressions and to the need of relaunching them.

### **1.- NATO, much more than an armed organisation.**

<sup>1</sup> [Spain will host the next NATO summit in 2022](#). Cadena SER, 14 June 2021, with news agencies.

To understand the importance and significance of these changes, we need to understand the trajectory and logic of this armed organisation, its internal order and its involvement in the economic, political and geostrategic spheres.

NATO has followed a linear trajectory established even before its founding: to remove any impediments to Western extension and hegemony under US command.

It is commonly believed that NATO was conceived and promoted by the United States, but in fact it was the British Empire. In May 1945, Winston Churchill commissioned the British armed forces to develop a plan to invade and subjugate the USSR, **"to impose on Russia the will of the United States and the British Empire"**, said the prime minister, that is, to liquidate socialism on the planet, destroy its army, seize that nation's immense resources and thus perpetuate its imperial destiny.

The plan was called Operation Unthinkable and was developed in detail. It envisaged the participation of the US, Canada, the UK, Poland and 100,000 captured German and SS troops, the same troops who had caused between 60 and 100 million deaths, more than 25 million of them in the Soviet Union. What would have been World War III was not carried out because of the strong opposition of several senior British military officers who doubted its success.

Another path had to be tried. This operation having been discarded, in 1946 and 1947 the campaigns to criminalize the USSR were intensified and various plans were developed to "counter the Soviet threat", with various "defensive operations" being carried out against the USSR.

The idea of making the USSR disappear, or at least subjecting it to permanent harassment, persisted and on 12 March 1947 US President Harry Truman addressed Congress to ask for troops and economic resources to be sent to Greece and Turkey to "help free and independent nations to maintain their freedom". The **Cold War began: the shift from an isolationist US policy to an expansionist and therefore interventionist policy aimed at imposing its hegemony on the entire planet.**

It was not just a matter of replacing the British Empire's tutelage in these two countries: it was the first step in an offensive for world domination and the subjugation of the Soviet Union was the central objective. Greece and Turkey were the gateway to the Black Sea and thus to the heart of the USSR (both joined NATO in 1952). In the words of US editorialist Walter Lippman, "Greece and Turkey were the excuse to dominate the Soviet Union".

In 1948, the Treaty of Brussels was signed between France, the United Kingdom, Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg. A cast of European colonial powers that would form the embryo of NATO. These five members were to be founding partners of the Alliance and the Brussels Treaty already included the principle of mutual defence, NATO's structuring principle. The secret armies created by the United States and the United Kingdom, the CIA and MI6, under the name *Stay Behind*, were integrated into this treaty and then transferred to NATO.

The North Atlantic Treaty Organisation was created on 4 April 1949; the five members of the Brussels Treaty were joined by Iceland, Norway, Denmark, Portugal, Italy, Canada and the United States.

The start of US imperial expansion as a hegemonic force had to overcome domestic obstacles: the Cold War doctrine, which entailed huge economic expenditures, troop movements and heavy casualties, only two years after the end of World War II, needed a solid justification. It was found by Democratic Senator Arthur H. Vandenberg: "**to scare the American people to death**"; and it was achieved by asserting that "measures to defend free peoples from threats to US capitalism" were necessary; the survival of the "American way of life" was at stake.

NATO was created as the armed wing of this doctrine in perfect harmony with what was developing in Europe. In order for the United States to join the alliance, it was necessary to violate its constitution, which expressly forbids membership in a military alliance in peacetime. It was again Senator Vandenberg who, in June 1948, promoted Resolution 239, the Vandenberg Resolution, in which, appealing to collective security in Europe to ensure the defense of the free world, he obtained its approval.

NATO was formed as a Western political-military alliance to meet the political, social, economic and military challenges posed by the USSR and the emerging socialist camp.

Despite the propaganda justifying its foundation as a guarantee of peace on the European continent, its actions were in the opposite direction. The USSR, which had applied for membership in 1954 as an ally against the Axis powers and had ceded West Berlin in order not to enter into conflict with the other allies, was not admitted to NATO. This exclusion, in addition to the clear signal that the US had expressly sent to the USSR with the nuclear explosions in Hiroshima and Nagasaki and the entry of the Federal Republic of Germany, put an end to any hope of peaceful coexistence and led the USSR to develop its nuclear weapons and to the formation of the Warsaw Pact in 1955.

## **2.- NATO, a global force outside international law and the United Nations Charter that is expanding across the whole planet.**

Throughout its history, which has lasted more than seven decades, this instrument of world domination has been constantly developing, its power and its extension has not ceased to grow so as to become today a global force present all over the planet, acting outside international law and the United Nations Charter. NATO has always been driven by the interests of the Western developed world and especially the Anglo-Saxon axis, and its allies are subordinate actors in a hierarchical and disciplinary military organization under the statutory command of the USA.<sup>2</sup>

NATO's founding charter, also called the Washington Treaty, is a military treaty of economic, political and military cooperation and protection. Its founding members accepted the permanent hegemony of the United States, which was set up in its regulations: the commander-in-chief must be American and therefore appointed by the US president. Article 5 of the founding text states that any aggression against one of its members will involve the rest in its defense. The combination of these two precepts fixes the subordination of the rest to US interests, without any democratic instance.

Within the first few years since its founding, NATO was the world's only political-military alliance. As it expanded in the 1950s, it integrated Greece, Turkey and the Federal Republic of

2 See at the end of the text the [collection of leaflets "For peace. NOT TO NATO , NOT TO BASES"](#).

Internationalist Anti-imperialist Front, November 2019.

Germany. It was no longer just about controlling access to the Black Sea and thus to the heart of the Soviet Union, but also about placing the Western alliance's troops on the border of the socialist camp. The response was the creation of the Warsaw Pact, a military alliance comprising the USSR and seven Eastern European countries, including the German Democratic Republic. As it was the case throughout the Cold War and continues to this day, history was told in reverse chronological order: NATO was created in the face of the threat from the USSR and the Warsaw Pact.

The Warsaw Pact was dissolved in 1991 but not NATO, which doubled its membership. **So one would have to conclude that the Warsaw Pact was not a real threat but an impediment to NATO's global expansion, just as today neither China nor the Russian Federation is a threat to the West but an impediment to US dominance in the world.**

Since then, NATO has not stopped expanding territorially, militarily and economically, nor has it renounced any kind of war.

In its external area, NATO has continued to grow<sup>3</sup>. The twelve founding Members were joined by three more in the 1950s, one in the 1980s, three more in 1999, nine in the first decade of the 21st century and two in the second decade, the latest being North Macedonia in 2020, in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic.

Today there are 30 NATO partners, all of them, since 1999, stemming from the dismemberment of the socialist bloc and the dismemberment of the former Yugoslavia, expressly violating the West's commitment as a condition for the dissolution of the Warsaw Pact. An **steel siege** has been created around the Russian Federation, and the current attempt to include Ukraine as a NATO partner is the West's latest provocation and real threat to the above Federation, which has been harassed uninterruptedly since 1945.

NATO's expansion has not been limited to the number of members: the Atlantic Alliance has developed a wide range of partnership offers: nine countries (including Colombia, Japan and Australia) are Global Partners; 20 countries are members of the Euro-Atlantic Partnership Council; 7 countries (including Israel) are members of the Mediterranean Dialogue; 4 countries from the Persian Gulf are members of the Istanbul Cooperation Initiative; In all, 40 countries. Between partner members and various affiliations, **70 countries are linked in some way to NATO and live under US influence or control.**

NATO's actions have not been limited to the external sphere of its members; in order to guarantee subordination to the US, it was not considered sufficient to discipline governments and states; it was considered necessary to guarantee like-minded forces in power and to eliminate anyone who questioned this situation, whether or not they constituted a real threat. This doctrine followed by the US in Latin America for two centuries extends to the whole world.

### **3.- NATO promoted, organised and financed criminal organisations that operated throughout Europe.**

It has been proven that NATO, for four decades, promoted, organized, financed and trained criminal organizations that carried out attacks in Europe in the service of the USA and its closest allies. Although their existence was recognized, they were only investigated in Italy, Belgium

<sup>3</sup> [The Atlantic Alliance \(NATO\): structure and objectives](#). Website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, European Union and Cooperation.

and Switzerland. **No one was convicted, investigations were not pursued and it is suspected that these networks still exist, more protected and under other names.**

However, these lesser-known actions are very well documented. The Stay Behind<sup>4</sup> network developed as NATO's secret army, which for decades was trained, financed and protected by NATO and the CIA, its men, linked to the European far right, carried out hundreds of terrorist acts. The structure of these secret armies, with the participation of prominent Nazi and fascist militants and even Belgian mercenaries in the Congo, spread across most Western European countries; in 8 of the 15 alliance countries these networks were active from the late 1940s. The network was designed with the aim of creating covert forces to deal with a "Russian invasion".

Although it was confirmed that such an invasion never took place, nor was there any indication that it might take place, the operational base was created and was reconverted. It was called the "strategy of tension": to provoke false flag attacks, to accuse communists and left-wing organizations, to demand repression of these organizations and to implement restrictive laws against any demands. The aim was always to "prevent any slide to the left"; in most cases it was about to prevent any communist or even socialist forces from coming to power.

Hundreds of people were killed in these actions and three times as many were injured. During the so-called "years of lead", 375 attacks took place in northern Italy alone, with 21 people killed, the most significant being the attacks on the Banca Nazionale d'Agricoltura with 16 dead and the Bologna train station with 80 dead and more than 200 wounded. There are also well founded suspicions of involvement of the network in the assassinations of Swedish Prime Minister Olaf Palme and Italian Prime Minister Aldo Moro.

The President of the Council of Ministers Giulio Andreotti made public its existence, the so-called *Gladio Network*, which was responsible for the Bologna train station bombing in 1980, an action designed to prevent the Italian Communist Party from entering government.

Terrorism at the hands of NATO, with the collaboration of the CIA, is not an exercise of the imagination, nor a suspicion: in November 1990, NATO Secretary General Manfred Wörner admitted to 16 European ambassadors that NATO coordinated the Gladio Network; in that same year, the European Parliament passed a resolution condemning "the existence of a clandestine network of intelligence and armed operations" "which may have interfered in the internal politics of several European countries in addition to acts of terrorism and crimes".

Despite this evidence, Europe's level of dependence and subservience to the US through NATO remains an essential pillar. This is evidenced by the long-standing and unsuccessful efforts to create a European army of its own, with its own political decision-making and military command structures. Despite serious contradictions in the interests of the various alliance partners on both sides of the Atlantic, European nations have been unable to throw off the yoke of the US, which has ultimately made their intervention in support of US military adventures inevitable.

#### **4.-NATO at the service of exploitation and capitalist accumulation.**

NATO is not only a political-military organization, which would explain its existence as an instrument of domination over other countries, but plays an essential role in the processes of capital accumulation. **Outwardly, it provides low-cost raw materials, deregulated markets**

4 [NATO's secret armies](#). Daniele Ganser. Éditions Demi-lune (2007)

**and ensures trade and investment on favorable terms. All this under the banner of providing "stability". Internally, it is a key part of the military-industrial complex, essential to the logic of internal accumulation in the Alliance countries.**

NATO also belongs to the institutional economic sphere: the war industry handles huge amounts of money, not only in the production and marketing of armaments, but also of their derivatives (ammunition, fuel, personnel, "contractors", research, technology and, above all, finance).

This conglomerate, known as the *military industrial complex*, was denounced by Eisenhower on 14 January 1961 in his farewell address to the US Congress. In it, he said: "We must be vigilant against the development of undue influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex. Circumstances exist and will exist that will make it possible for powers to emerge in undue places with disastrous effects", "we must never allow the weight of that combination to endanger our liberties or our democratic process". It should be added that the original speech referred to the "military industrial congressional complex", referring to the political links of this network. This was eventually deleted, but the speech was given not in Congress but in the President's Oval Office.

These are not the words of a pacifist, as in the same speech it was said "we use our strength in the interests of world peace and human progress" and added "a vital element in maintaining peace is our military class".

**The military industrial complex and all that is linked to it also involves a constant flow of public money to the private sector - nothing else in the world can match this transfer.** By its very nature, the military industrial complex **is a shielded crisis environment, since the arms race is essential for the growth of the system**, as it acts under the protection of the state and operates in a "market" where demand and prices are predetermined, its external links open up export control and secure foreign markets. This has been made clear in the recent case of the sale of French submarines to Australia and the breaking of that contract by the US imposition on Australia to buy its submarines. The Anglo-Saxon axis takes precedence in the Asia-Pacific and US industry has the upper hand.

It should be noted, however, that there are internal contradictions within the military industrial complex. In the US, the military industry is strictly private, while in Europe it is public-private. European countries are concerned about their technological dependence on the US, which imposes limitations on the integration of their systems and arms exports. This poses an insurmountable challenge to the coordination of an autonomous defense, which subjects Alliance countries to subordination to the US.

**The importance of the role that science and technology play in this business must be emphasized.** The techno-scientific development of armaments involves a constantly growing spiral that ensures supremacy in technological innovation; leading in this aspect is a way to lead the world.

The US was convinced of this when it dropped the Hiroshima and Nagasaki bombs on Japan at the end of World War II. A single plane, a single flight, a single bomb could wipe out an entire city and hundreds of thousands of people, which only a few months earlier required thousands of planes, days of siege, tens of thousands of tons of bombs and heavy casualties among the attackers. However, this preponderance was short-lived: its antagonist, the USSR, soon had similar weapons at its disposal and shortly afterwards took the lead in the space race, which meant long-range missiles carrying nuclear weapons.

Eisenhower in his address to Congress also denounced scientific-technical dependence: "while having due respect for scientific research and discovery, we must also be alert to the opposite and equally serious danger that the policy which is to look after the public interest will become captive to a scientific-technological elite".

**Today, both the Western economic powers and NATO determine both economic recovery and military hegemony in techno-scientific development, but also as a socio-labour paradigm; this, together with the axiom of efficiency, depicts the perspective of a highly technical world at the service of economic accumulation and subjected to the domination of arms.**

#### **5.- The Spanish state is a key player in Western warmongering strategy.**

The Spanish state has been a prominent element of Western warmongering strategy, especially that of the US. **The main interest of this superpower until the 1980s was the permanence of its bases as military enclaves. Since then, this interest has remained, but-it has been associated to its interest in a greater involvement in NATO by the Spanish state's and in the implementation of Spanish influence in Latin America.**

The Spanish state has been unique in its ties to the West. It was never invited to join the European Economic Community or NATO until after the Transition, essentially because of the refusal of European countries to include a dictatorship that had fought with the Nazis. For the US, this did not represent a major problem, as in 1953, it had already agreed with Franco to install military bases on Spanish territory under US sovereignty and jurisdiction. This solved the problem for the US, ensuring an enclave at the entrance to the Mediterranean sea, at the crossroads of the East-West (America-Mediterranean) and North-South (Europe-Africa) axes. The importance of the agreement was reflected in the visit of US President Eisenhower to Spain in 1959, when he was portrayed embracing the dictator. The accidental fall of nuclear bombs on the town and coast of Palomares (Almería) on 17 January 1966 highlighted the enormous risk that these bases entail.

The good relations with the dictatorship and the staging of the fraternal greeting between the US president and the dictator concealed, and conceal, the nature of those relations.

Between November 1957 and June 1958, Spain went to war in the southern Moroccan enclave of Sidi Ifni. Irregular Moroccan troops, calling themselves the Liberation Army, encouraged by the Alaouite monarchy, attacked the enclave, which lacked adequate defense. During the months of fighting, there were 8,000 casualties among the irregulars and 300 in the Spanish ranks, with more than 100 missing and 600 wounded.

Spanish war materiel was "very poor", the soldiers paraded in espadrilles, the weapons were German scrap material from the Second World War, and the aviation, indispensable to the defense of the enclave, suffered several fatal accidents on take-offs and landings. Despite this hardship and the casualties it costed, the US banned the use of the military equipment it had given to Spain in payment for its bases on the peninsula.

Admiral Carrero Blanco, vice-president of the government, settled the issue with the following phrase: "The Liberation Army is an instrument of the USSR, with which it seeks to create difficulties for Westerners in Africa". It was not a derangement of the vice-president of the Spanish government, it was the way of showing himself as an unconditional ally of the United States in the Cold War, while at the same time showing his submission to the great power by accepting the prohibition to use weapons that he had and needed.

A similar story occurred in the Palomares event. The US forces deployed to the area investigated the accident and recovered the nuclear weapons, but neglected the affected population and to this day, 56 years later, have not fulfilled their commitment to remove the contaminated land.

Also present is the exclusion of Ceuta and Melilla from NATO protection because they are considered overseas territories. In 2017 the US and the UK banned the docking of Russian Federation warships in these ports, without any legal support and against the criterion of the Spanish Navy, which argued that if it was not NATO territory these countries had nothing to say.

It should be added that the Spanish Navy is also annoyed that US ships use UK escorts when they pass through Spanish territorial waters.

These are all examples that no sign of respect can be expected when relationships are marked by subordination and dependence.

## **6.- The US bases in the Spanish state, a Franco's regime legacy that is still very much alive.**

**The US bases in the Spanish state was one of the four great legacies from Franco's regime that were not questioned neither by the institutional political process known as "the transition" nor in its result, the 1978 Constitution; the other three were the Concordat with the Holy See, the unity of Spain and the head of state; of the four, three of them are linked to the military establishment.**

In 1970 Richard Nixon visited Spain on a tour to ensure the loyalty of the four northern Mediterranean dictatorships: Portugal, Spain, Greece and Turkey. At no time was the democratization of these countries considered, nor their plight regarding freedom or human rights, the only interest was to safeguard their loyalty and subordination to the US.

In 1973, US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger visited Spain, meeting with the dictator and the then Prince Juan Carlos; the visit was motivated by the dictator's precarious health and the aim was to ensure that the succession to power would in no way affect his bases in Spain. **His demands were met to the letter and the transition did not question either the existence of the bases or US sovereignty over them.** The transcripts of these interviews do not reveal any interest other than the permanence of the bases as military enclaves; the political transition, the democratic path, human rights and a supposed freedom were not an object of interest, as they had not been in previous decades.

At that time, although Spain did not belong to NATO, it was not spared from the actions of the Alliance's covert armies. There are well-founded suspicions that the Gladio network and the CIA would have committed acts of terrorism, collaborated in the attack on Carrero Blanco; in a note from the US State Department, declassified in 2008, referring to the transition, it is stated: "The best outcome that could emerge... would be for Carrero to disappear from the scene". Also in the fascist intervention in Monte Jurra, the massacre of the Atocha labour lawyers and other similar actions.

## **7.- The NATO referendum or the history of a farce and the cession of sovereignty.**

Spain's entry into NATO was irregular and at times grotesque, plagued by contradictions that show that **there was never any popular mandate or criteria of our own regarding our**



**foreign policy, much less our involvement in the international military sphere, but that we have acted under a US mandate.**

In 1977 the UCD, in its programmatic declaration, referring to NATO, stated that "any decision should be taken after a thorough parliamentary debate". On 23 February 1981, an attempted coup d'état took place during the inauguration of the new president, Calvo Sotelo, who replaced the resigned Adolfo Suarez, thus legally assuming the presidency, but without popular legitimacy. Three months later, still under the effects of the coup attempt and with a poll showing 18% of the population in favour of joining NATO and 52% against, and without any popular consultation, Spain joined NATO.

The following year general elections were held and the PSOE, aware of the massive popular rejection of NATO, launched the electoral slogan "NATO no from the outset" and proposed a popular consultation on our permanence if it won the elections; it won by an absolute majority and began to retrace the path. A non-binding referendum was called for on remaining in the Alliance, for which **a yes vote was asked, subject to three conditions: not entering the military structure, a ban on the transit and storage of nuclear weapons and a reduction in US military presence.** Felipe González, president of the government at that time, who in 1981 had said that "NATO gave cover to dictatorships such as Portugal, Greece and Turkey", in 1986, during the referendum campaign, claimed that NATO "was a grouping of democracies", a phrase that is repeated to this day.

The "Yes" vote had the support not only of the political majority, but also of the most important economic sectors and the entire state apparatus. No resources were spared and no form of manipulation, coercion or blackmail was renounced. The question was biased, since NATO was not mentioned, the "Yes" vote had three conditions, not subjected to any verification or control process, and the wording of the question was tested in a careful study by a team of sociologists led by the academic Jesús Ibáñez. The media in favour of a "No" vote were censored, all kinds of well-known personalities were used in favour of a "Yes" vote, threats were made of economic hardship that would endanger pensions and the rejection of Europe, and the president himself declared that he would resign if a "No" vote came out, referring to the chaos experienced in 1981.

Nevertheless, a week before the Referendum was held, the polls were favorable to the No by a large majority; however, the official result was a narrow victory for the Yes, although **in four communities the No triumphed (Catalonia, the Basque Country, Navarre and the Canary Islands)**; and for many, this result was neither reliable nor legitimate.

In 1997 Aznar officially reversed the three conditions of the "Yes" vote in the referendum, but they had already been de facto breached. The 1988 Defence Agreement already provided for the prohibition of US nuclear weapons in Spain, although no mechanisms for their control were established. US and NATO troop and armament contingents continued to increase. In 1999 the Spanish state joined the Integrated Military Structure. Today, Spain is a key strategic partner of NATO and Rota, Morón and Torrejón are essential NATO enclaves, command, troop and strategic arms staging areas. Spain has participated in military strikes, countries occupations and missions in the Eastern Mediterranean, the Middle East, Africa and Eastern Europe and contributes 5% of the Alliance's budget.

**The 1986 referendum was a farce; it was never intended to comply with the will of the people, which was supposedly its objective.** NATO membership and the servitudes of the Defence Agreement with the USA subordinate not only the armed forces themselves, but the

whole of the state apparatus, **implying a cession of sovereignty that leaves the Spanish constitution itself a dead letter.**

In the military sphere, Spain's membership of NATO conditions not only the structure of its armed forces, orienting them towards intervention abroad and attacking countries with which we have no conflict, but also their size, their own weapons systems and their maintenance costs are far beyond the defence needs of the Spanish state and its economic capacity.

It also implies a high level of technological and logistical dependence on the member countries in which arms imports are concentrated, mainly the USA. This generates strong dependencies, both in terms of defending the country's interests autonomously, for example, against Morocco, and in terms of encouraging us to participate in operations of aggression against other countries.

This technological dependence not only conditions arms imports; it also facilitates the growth of a military industry subsidiary to foreign investments far removed from the country's interests and generating arms export policies to countries such as Israel, Saudi Arabia, Colombia..., involved in genocidal interventions against their neighbouring countries or in massacring their own peoples. **It also drags along a rogue national industry, mainly focused on ammunition, heavily involved in international arms trafficking.**

Another consequence of belonging to NATO's military structure is the presence of NATO facilities and command centres on Spanish territory, associated with the facilities and command centres of the national<sup>5</sup> armed forces themselves. This generates subsidiarity in decision-making and in many of its own military actions.

**The Command Centres for expeditionary operations of ground forces (in Bétera) <sup>6</sup>and naval forces (on board the Rota-based "Castilla"), as well as the Combined Air Operations Control Centre in Torrejón, are an example of military dependence in the conduct of operations at the service of NATO.** There are many other examples of units at NATO's service that lend themselves to the participation of foreign military forces for their training<sup>7</sup> or tutelage in NATO missions, such as the Colombian contingent in Afghanistan, the armed forces of a country that is not a NATO member, but which acts in a NATO mission under the aegis of the Spanish state.

**NATO membership, far from facilitating the purging of the fascist structure of the military hierarchy, has enhanced the pre-existing patronage networks of nepotism and arbitrariness:** involvement in armed operations facilitates the acquisition of merit by individuals who have normalized participation in indiscriminate killing and massacres, as observed in their peers in the "more advanced" supremacist countries and whom they seek to emulate for their "effectiveness"; this, in turn, favours the selection and promotion through the ranks of elements predisposed to such ignominies.

The historical precedent for such dysfunction within the Spanish army is the result of the development of Africanist officialdom in the last century, which did not hesitate to apply the

5 [Bétera leads the NATO military exercise in Spain](#). Juan Antonio Marrahí. Las Provincias, 27 October 2021.

6 [High Readiness Ground Headquarters \(CGTAD\)](#). Official website of the Ministry of Defence

7 [US Marines and Green Berets train for war at the Rabasa military base](#). Juan Antonio Marrahí. Las Provincias, 21 October 2021.

barbaric methods of mocking the civilian population used in the Spanish colonial war in Africa, the repression carried out in Asturias in 1934 and above all, the brutal political cleansing, the "mockery" carried out after the 1936 coup d'état and after the war, which left more than a hundred thousand civilians murdered and still missing in the gutters.

To the implications of NATO membership must be added the dependencies generated by the wrongly labelled Agreement on Defence Cooperation with the USA: in exchange for the free use of the Rota and Morón bases for all US expeditionary operations, we have to endure a military occupation without any scrutiny and compromise with their criminal actions as if they were not with us, without any guarantee that they would come to our defense and while exposing us to the real risk of possible reprisals on our territory.

In the political sphere, NATO membership generates a whole network of influence and pressure embedded in the Spanish state apparatus. Decision-making is fed by information reworked and filtered by these networks, which strongly conditions it, turning the state itself into an instrument subordinated to the interests of the countries leading the military alliance. The intelligence services, the CNI, are heavily penetrated, through the so-called "collaboration", by foreign services, fundamentally the CIA and the Israeli<sup>8</sup> Mossad, which severely limits and conditions their work.

#### **8.- The importance of the NATO Summit in 2022: Reordering the Alliance to adapt itself to the new times.**

Once again, this summit will serve to strengthen and develop the alliance's warmongering alternative. Not all summits have had the same significance. **This one will probably be one of the most significant, and it will not be so because of the announcement of a reduction in its military potential, its political interference or its expansionist trajectory, but quite the opposite.**

In the case of the Spanish state, this summit is particularly relevant for several reasons: its position in the military industrial complex, its geostrategic situation, and its role as a vector of US foreign policy on Europe, especially in the case of Latin America. But this summit will also coincide with the renewal of the Agreement On Defense Cooperation between the Kingdom of Spain and the United States of America on the transfer of our soil and our sovereignty to US bases in our territory.

**Security is sold and terror is spread. This logic is necessary to maintain the way capitalism works and to secure the interests of the elites. It is not an option, it is a necessity.** Their real objectives are unmentionable and therefore systematic propaganda campaigns are needed to cover up and sweeten their actions with the sole aim of their being acceptable.

As we have already seen, throughout its history NATO has acted without respecting the UN mandate, has not respected the UN charter and has systematically violated the human rights of the inhabitants of the countries where it has intervened, especially in Yugoslavia, Central Asia and the Middle East. However, these allegations do not seem to be an obstacle to altering the logic in which it operates.

8 [The CIA in Spain: Espionage, intrigue and politics in the service of Washington](#). Alfredo Grimaldos. Random House Mondadori, 2006

NATO follows a procedure of action based on inversion, making it appear that everything it does is in defense of the highest values of humanity: peace, human rights, freedom, security... in short, everything that makes up an ideal and desirable image. Of course, its military actions are always justified and are carried out in response to an aggression or an imminent threat and always to protect and help the population. However, the alleged threats and aggressions are never confirmed by independent bodies, but the numbers of casualties and destruction are confirmed.

For decades, NATO was sustained by the need to confront the Warsaw Pact. When the Warsaw Pact was dissolved, **NATO had two alternatives: to consider that the threat had ceased and the possibility of disarmament and dissolution was open, or on the contrary to consider that the main impediment to grow and dominate the world had disappeared. It was this second alternative that it adopted.** In the same decade that the Warsaw Pact was dissolved, it attacked Yugoslavia (1999) without a UN mandate, causing thousands of civilian casualties, destroying most of the country's infrastructure and laying the groundwork for its dismemberment.

Shortly thereafter, its most prominent member, the USA, its main partner the UK and a figurehead, the Kingdom of Spain, all three NATO members, declared war on Iraq, which UN Secretary General Kofi Annan denounced as "illegal from our point of view and the point of view of the UN": "Lies about the existence of weapons of mass destruction provided the excuse, but when it was verified that there were no such weapons, there were no consequences: those responsible for hundreds of thousands of lives lost, a country devastated and terrorism reaching unthinkable heights have gone unpunished. NATO would later intervene in Libya and devastate the country, destroying its public institutions and infrastructure and subjecting the population to death and immense suffering, to the point where it is no longer possible to speak of the existence of such a country in the strict sense of the word.

Nor can we ignore its presence and interventions in Africa. Apart from the direct intervention in Libya in 2011, NATO's military control of the Sahel and Central Africa has traditionally been left to France. However, the US is greatly increasing its presence on the continent since the creation of Africa Command in 2008 and has been establishing a large number of small bases, fixed or mobile, to ensure its permanent presence.

**The profound crisis that preceded the COVID-19 pandemic, tested in the autumn of 2018, determined the need for a reordering of the capitalist system that affects all essential spheres of life. This, coupled with the existence of powerful emerging forces seen as antagonistic, requires a parallel reordering of NATO.**

NATO is seeking its place in a context of a global crisis that has already lasted 14 years. A crisis that began between 2007 and 2009 and whose effects have lasted until today. At the beginning, none of the structural reforms that were announced were carried out; on the contrary, what was done must be seen as a forward flight that encouraged the same mechanisms that had provoked it. The result of the perpetuation of this crisis has been the collapse that was announced in October 2018 and is projected into the next decade.

Meanwhile, concern about climate change as a consequence of the production and consumption model is now spreading to all levels and successive meetings are being held to try to find palliative measures without compromising the very essence of the system. In this context, it is revealing to note that **the US military alone emits more greenhouse gases than any of the**

## **140 UN countries that pollute the least, yet they have been expressly excluded from global accounting in climate<sup>9</sup> agreements.**

The most relevant economic, political and intellectual institutions of this system have been spreading warnings throughout the world of a new crisis which they describe as "deep, structural and long-term" and which will require in response changes that will affect essential aspects of life, changes in the capital-labour relationship, technological changes, changes in international relations, in the relationship between the public and the private, what the great think tanks have called "the great reset".

**In these conditions, the hegemonic powers need to accumulate forces and act with determination, proposing new saving paradigms:** sustainable development, technical-productive changes, economic and commercial alliances, new foreign policies..... In addition to **a plan to convince the population that it is necessary to make "an effort", that is, to accept living worse in order to overcome this drama.**

This is not only the challenge. The appearance of emerging powers with great technical-productive vigour and which have been able to overcome the previous crisis with much less damage, calls into question whether this is the only viable alternative and whether what they offer us is the only way forward. This poses a great "threat" to this system: not only does it materially threaten the hegemony of the US and its allies, but it does so from within capitalism itself, the premises of the minimal state and non-intervention in the economy, the need to plunder the periphery, the ineffectiveness of the state (see neoliberal premises), development through competition, all these collapses and with them their world. They literally need to eliminate those who do not submit and challenge them on their own ground.

Such has been China's vigour and expansion that today no one can renounce trade with it or evade Russia's technological and military capacity, as well as its hydrocarbon supply potential. **This situation is cracking Western alliances: not everyone wants China as an enemy, neither to do without what it produces, nor to renounce Russian energy supplies, nor to stop fearing its military potential.** The crisis with Turkey and its acquisition of Russian missiles give an idea of the extent to which these countries are attractive to many NATO members. But they also happen to be allies and form a bloc - the Eurasian bloc - so it is difficult to see how they can be confronted one by one.

## **9.- Distribution of roles in the World's War: The Anglo-Saxon axis will face China and Europe will take care of "Russia".**

The current geostrategic map and the one projected into the future maintains the hegemonic criteria of the US: the European allies will take care of "Russia", while the Anglo-Saxon axis will take care of China in the Asia-Pacific. **NATO will be the glue that binds this power strategy together.** As agreed, one major issue has been excluded from the summit: EU-NATO relations and the sharing of roles and scenarios. This issue is expected to be made public in a statement prior to the summit. It is not intended that this issue should in any way contaminate a summit at which everything should appear unified and of excellence.

<sup>9</sup> [The US military pollutes more than 140 countries: this war machine must be scaled back.](#) The Conversation, 3 July 2019.

Already during Barack Obama's presidency, the need for a distribution of roles between Europe and the US was raised, with NATO acting as a link. The US, with the collaboration of the Anglo-Saxon axis, would focus its action on the Asia-Pacific, as an area for developing harassment and possible attacks on China. Europe will be in charge of harassment and possible confrontations with the Russian Federation (Russia for the West). **NATO is the assembly of this strategy.**

**In 2018 during Trump's presidency**, initially highly critical of NATO, the EU foreign affairs committee issued a report on 25 May in which, in 19 background remarks, 15 recitals and 43 statements, it sets out the broad outlines on EU-NATO relations, while not neglecting to mention the US.

The main axes were: **European cohesion, affirming relations with NATO and the US, and above all defining "Russia" as the enemy.**

It was acknowledged that there were internal disagreements: "the risk of weakening the transatlantic link and the solidarity of EU member states persists"; and it was proposed "that the Union and NATO are indispensable to ensure Europe's security", a concern that explains the insistence on the bonds of unity for the next summit, with an express reference to "Russia": "both the Union and NATO are concerned about more assertive military behaviour by Russia".

The Union welcomed "NATO's instruction to allies to spend 2% of their GDP on defence, and added: **"welcomes the continuing trend of increasing defence spending among NATO members"**; it broadened the framework of alliances and responsibilities: "cooperation with non-NATO member states of the Union and with NATO member states which do not belong to the Union, is an integral part of EU-NATO cooperation".

It called for the area of the Union to be one of free military movement by "removing bureaucratic and infrastructural barriers to the rapid movement of forces and the pre-distribution of military equipment and supplies", i.e. accepting Europe as a battlefield. It also referred to rearmament: "Recalls... the Joint EU-NATO Warsaw Declaration to its members to facilitate a stronger defence industry and increased defence research".

A very important point is that this summit paid particular attention to public opinion: "according to the latest Pew Research Center polls, public support for NATO is strong and growing". Finally, it is worth mentioning the use of any issue that has media hook. President Pedro Sánchez recently announced as a novelty that he would include the issue of women in the next Madrid 2022 summit; well, in the document we quoted from May 2018 it says: "Reiterates (the Union) the important role of women in CSDP and NATO missions".

Europe is experiencing one of the most difficult moments in the history of the European Union, with differences that weaken the European project and for which no answers seem to be found. Political unity failed when the European Constitution project failed, Brexit occurred, there are states in open rebellion (Poland and Hungary) and there are others in which the credibility of the European Union is very much undermined, as in Italy. **In reality, what holds Europe together most at the moment is the discipline of NATO.**

It should be added that in 2017, just weeks before taking office, Donald Trump described NATO as an 'obsolete' organization and even as he withdrew that term, he continued to criticize its allies for a lack of commitment that was essentially economic, considering that the US was contributing far more than its fair share to the 'defense of Europe'.

This is despite the **EU's recent commitment to finance an entire programme to strengthen transport infrastructure to enable the movement of heavy equipment from the Western rearguard to the very Russia's borders**, and despite the commitment made at the NATO defense ministers' meeting to create an "Innovation Fund", initially endowed with 1 billion euros, provided <sup>10</sup>exclusively by European countries, for the development of the most advanced warfare technologies.

It should be noted that nuclear weapons expansion programmes envisage the development of self-propelled nuclear missiles that could be quickly displaced by such infrastructure. **Iraq's phantom weapons of mass destruction will become a reality on European soil.**

Under these conditions, strengthening unity and cohesion is a priority issue; even more so if it becomes necessary to distribute roles and responsibilities according to the scenarios. Despite its declarations, the EU does not act on its own criteria, nor does it defend its own interests. This is evident when it assumes Russia to be an enemy, when there is no reason to consider it a threat and it also depends on its hydrocarbons. It unnecessarily spends enormous resources on armaments and puts its own territory available for war, something that its great ally, but also its boss, the USA, would obviously never do.

#### **10.- NATO's Strategic Concept for 2030: United in permanent war and for the recovery of Western hegemony.**

**The Madrid 2022 summit will not be a mere formality because NATO needs to restructure itself in order to continue Western hegemony.** Hence the Strategic Concept for 2030 raises the need for all countries to be 'united for a new era', in which NATO will be a 'global and multi-purpose alliance far removed from the NATO of 1949'. It will be argued that "the 2010 strategic concept is outdated" and that a new strategy is needed. None of this is mere rhetoric.

**Unity and cohesion are indispensable, the transition to a new economic form is inevitable, the broadening of a social base (young people, women) is a necessity.** All this in order to face a new phase and to confront "enemies" who are said to be trying to "weaken the transatlantic institutions".

The issues discussed **at the 14 June 2021 Summit** were <sup>11</sup>intended to respond to this juncture and the agenda for the 29-30 June 2022 Summit includes **the new "Strategic Concept"**<sup>12</sup> as a key element, **along with partner recruitment and alliances, technological change and increased population penetration.**

A 67-page document, "NATO-2030, united for a new era", was adopted at the Summit of NATO Heads of State and Government on 14 June 2021; "To integrate civil society, it brought together two working groups": "one of 10 experts, composed of allied parliamentarians and members of civil society" "and another of 14 young people with leadership skills".

Throughout the whole document underlies the central idea of preserving and strengthening the cohesion of the transatlantic link as a vital task in opposition to a threat-ridden outside world

10 [Billions of euros to "innovate" in nuclear NATO](#). Manlio Dinucci. Voltaire Network, 27 October 2021

11 [The "postobsolete" NATO summit](#). FAES Analysis Group. FAES Foundation, 14 June 2021.

12 [NATO's new strategy will be approved at the Madrid 2022 summit](#). Miguel González. El País, 13 June 2021

that must be confronted. It should also be noted the alliance concern to build a social base of support, considering that younger people should be on its side, not against it.

This document addresses four essential concepts for NATO at this time: **unity**, the **transition to a new** economic, political and social **phase**, the need to **incorporate new generations**, and the definition of **Russia and China** as **enemies**.

According to Alliance proceedings, conceptual and doctrinal aspects were discussed at this meeting, as well as the timeframe for which they were planned. The focus was on the 'Strategic Concept', first established at the 2010 Summit but now considered outdated, so the need to establish a new strategic concept until 2030 was arisen.

The 2021 Summit also noted what NATO identifies as risks and threats. These included, as an essential element, the lack of internal coherence and also the risks which occurred in security matters, cyberattacks, disinformation, hybrid warfare and underfunding were added; and of course, the Russian and Chinese challenges, as well as terrorism, which have been on the Alliance's agenda for nearly 30 years.

Internal division was described as the main threat to NATO's survival and that this fragmentation could be used by external actors (Russia and China), whose aim, according to the report, is to "weaken the transatlantic institutions".

The propaganda aspects focused on making NATO more valuable and necessary than ever and that it must become a global, multi-purpose Alliance far removed from the NATO of 1949. For its part, the US emphasized its desire for a common policy on China.

Until the inauguration of US President Joe Biden, there were many doubts about the scope and importance of this summit, but the US president's determined stance prompted a strengthened 2021 summit, in which there were no differences of opinion except on the budget issue. On this issue, the United States wanted to approve a 100 percent budget increase over the next 10 years, but there was no agreement on this, and what was achieved was to increase budgets without setting the amount or a timetable. In short, strengthening the alliance, increasing the scope for action, increasing budgets, a more solid unity and facing the challenges posed by Russia and China. **It was also approved that at the next summit in 2022 a new Strategic Concept for this decade would be established, a piece that structures NATO's development during this period.**

Biden believed that these two summits would mark a new era in the relations between the US and its European allies. Together, they agreed to deepen political consultation, strengthen deterrence and defense, enhance resilience, sharpen the technological edge, advance the rules-based international order, promote partner countries' training and capacity building, combat climate change, and increase investments in both civilian and military aspects.

#### **11. - Strategic objectives set at the 2021 Summit: Everything will be a military resource.**

The warmongering development set out at the 2021 Summit implies, de facto, the militarization of the whole of society. Armed forces will be omnipresent in all areas of life, both in times of peace and in the face of crises and conflicts. **The key concept will be that of "extended security" which encompasses everything that exists on the planet, military security over economic, environmental, communications, etc.**



The Spanish Defense Review thus reports on the summit of heads of state and government on 14 June 2021<sup>13</sup>: "climate change is one of the great defining challenges of our time"; and the other is the commitment to Strengthened Resilience, "a new, expanded approach to security that includes basic infrastructure, supply chains and communications". As stated, it is to "ensure that our armed forces can operate effectively in peace, crisis and conflict". Nor did they forget to cite COVID-19's "vital role that the armed forces play in supporting our societies".

In short, a broad spectrum of new policy areas ("extended security") that virtually cover everything that exists on the planet. This is NATO's new global dimension. It also cites unity and forcefulness of actions (exercised by a club of democracies that uphold individual freedom, human rights, the rule of law and adherence to the UN Charter).

The review insists on the threats that the alliance has to face at this time: "we are facing a new era that implies new threats and a revision of the very concept of security that no longer only involves military aspects", and quotes the summit statement: "we face multifaceted threats, a systemic competition of assertive and authoritarian powers as well as growing security challenges for our countries and our citizens coming from all strategic directions". **Again we find the same topics: global threats, authoritarian enemies, endangered security.**

The review continues: "state and non-state actors challenge the international order and seek to undermine democracy around the world; instability beyond our borders", it also refers to more concrete aspects: "proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and the erosion of the architecture of the arms control system and climate change as a threat multiplier". A statement reminiscent of Truman's Cold War doctrine with the novelty of climate change and cybernetics; thus the statement adds: "malicious cyber-activities could be considered equivalent to an armed attack".

In the sphere of the militarization of society, two NATO developments in recent years which are particularly relevant for the future must be mentioned: on the one hand, the involvement of the EU, which will bear its costs, in adapting transport infrastructures to facilitate the deployment of combat assets across Europe towards the eastern border; on the other hand, the emergence of "centers of excellence" and, in particular, those dedicated to cybersecurity and "strategic communication"<sup>14</sup>, a euphemism to designate the NATO propaganda broadcasting center, along the same lines of those already existing in the US or the UK.

**The construction of a threat, whether real or not, is necessary to fabricate an enemy, the enemy is necessary to justify our violence, its destruction, the war. The art of deception is a key to victory. The systematic and permanent criminalization of all those who resist Western domination, and at this moment especially the Russian Federation and China, responds to this strategy.**

Russia once again emerges as the Alliance's main challenge; "Russia's aggressive actions constitute a threat to Euro-Atlantic security". The other key country referred to in the above statement is China: "its declared ambitions and assertive behavior present systemic challenges to the international order and in areas relevant to Alliance security"; and it adds: "China is

13 [A consolidated and strengthened Alliance](#). Rosa Ruiz. Spanish Defence Review, July/August 2021

14 [The "battle for your brain" waged by the Western military](#). Ben Norton. The Intercept, 11 October 2021

rapidly expanding its nuclear arsenal" and "maintains opacity about the development of its military modernization".

Depicting these countries as threats and enemies responds to the added difficulty of reaching the developments of these new emerging powers. Moreover, these powers keep outside of the dominant Western logic, they practice non-interference, do not engage in armed aggressions, establish economic agreements rather than sanctions, and trade without subjugation. Another point to note is that they are less affected by systemic crises and maintain a higher level of productive technical development than the West.

Such vigour and strength in expansion and equivalent treatment makes it very difficult to renounce relations with these countries today. This divides the Western alliance, since not everyone wants to have neither China nor Russia as an enemy, nor can they do without their resources or products. In the military field, Russia currently surpasses Western technology in several respects, and China, with its technical and productive capacity, is ready to rearm itself militarily if harassed.

## **12. - The 2022 Summit's keys to subdue the planet: Collective Defence, Crisis Management and Cooperative Security.**

A new Strategic Concept with a horizon of 2030 will emerge from this 2022 summit. Major changes are foreseen and the strategic concept will contain the elements and strategic lines to order them in time and form. **The essential axes are: Collective Defence, Crisis Management and Cooperative Security. To these should be added: Resilience, technological edge, cyber and space warfare, climate change, as well as the common identification of "Russia" and China as a threat.**

The next summit agreed for 29-30 June 2022 will be marked by the adoption of the 2030 strategic concept aimed at global dominance and halting the advance of the Eurasian bloc, if necessary globally, and this has to be done in a world of profound transformations and with the threat of internal fragmentation.

The so-called Strategic Concept 2030 contains three essential elements: Collective Security (also Collective Defense), Crisis Management and Cooperative Security. These three terms require a translation.

**Collective Security** or **Collective Defense** is the cornerstone of NATO. It is the essential principle that binds NATO members together and is enshrined in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty, which stipulates that an attack on any member of NATO shall be considered an attack on all NATO allies. This was the principle invoked by the US in the aftermath of the Twin Towers attack that initiated NATO operations in the Middle East and eventually spread out across the whole Mediterranean.

**Crisis<sup>15</sup> Management** involves "taking action", i.e. action of any kind, including armed action, whether before, during, or after conflict, including preventive war (Yugoslavia, Iraq) or indefinite continued action (Afghanistan).<sup>16</sup>

15 [Crisis Management and Conflict Resolution: Is NATO the Solution?](#) Institute for Conflict Studies and Humanitarian Action, 14 November 2010.

16 [Exclusive: Inside the Military's Secret Undercover Army.](#) William M. Arkin. Newsweek, 17 May 2021

**Cooperative Security** refers to the broad network that NATO has developed virtually worldwide with groups of countries or individual countries for "practical cooperation" on "a wide range of political and security issues". In NATO's terms, more inclusive, flexible, meaningful and above all strategically oriented cooperation. We are talking about involving or engaging with the aforementioned 70 countries with which this politico-military organization has some form of agreement.

To these three basic fundamentals must be added: improving resilience, already mentioned; training and capacity building; technological advantage; climate change and the strength of deterrence; cyber warfare; and warfare in space. It is worth insisting upon the continuous and harsh references to Russia and China, especially in the latter case, calling on everyone to intervene and collaborate against the challenges they represent, although as we have already pointed out this last issue encounters difficulties in reconciling interests within the Alliance, an issue that is attempted to be resolved with numerous appeals for unity.

It is also worth noting the orientation it proposes in relation to nuclear weapons: it supports the modernization and vigorous deployment of the nuclear arsenal of the three allied powers, insisting on the key role of their existence as a deterrence tool; but not a word about its own violations of international arms control agreements, claiming that it was Russia that broke them. It also instructs allies not to sign the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons because, according to NATO, thanks to them the populations are provided with protection and security, for which it calls for an extra effort of persuasion.

The call for the upcoming summit considers that NATO's relaunch and proposed expansion plan would already be justified by the **Chinese threat**, pointing to its technological capabilities, its ongoing cyber-attacks, its interest in the Arctic region, artificial intelligence technology and its presence in Africa and Latin America, adding generally to the sustained risk it poses to the institutional system.

All this despite the fact that **Russia and China** have assured in every possible way and through proven facts that they **do not aspire to world hegemony and that what they seek is a multipolar world with equivalent relations**. The US prefers not to believe this and to make its allies share the same idea, opting instead for a scenario of confrontation at the service of its interests, especially those of the military industrial complex.

### **13.- The Kingdom of Spain, the seat of the summit and a key player in the World War if we do not prevent it.**

The Kingdom of Spain is hosting the summit and plays a prominent role in the dual field of US and NATO bases, it has a background that cast doubt on the legitimacy of both subordinations, and has been the scene where of major social mobilizations took place against both. The institutional political effort from inside and outside the territory to achieve full integration at this juncture is already underway and will be much more important from now on. **Only popular awareness and mobilisation will be able to stop the barbarity that will be agreed at this summit.**

NATO<sup>17</sup> Secretary General Jean Stoltember referred to Spain, host of the upcoming summit, as follows: "**Spain has not only increased defense spending, but also includes a significant**

17 [Madrid will host the NATO summit on 29 and 30 June 2022](#). Public, 8 October 2021

**contribution to NATO missions and operations": battle group in Latvia, Baltic air surveillance, anti-missile defense in Turkey, Aegis programme in Rota and training in Iraq and Afghanistan. He also stressed "Spain's geostrategic importance".**

Spain, as host of the summit, has also had something to say, repeating what has already been announced, with two additions: topics related to women and a greater involvement of civil society. On this aspect, President Pedro Sánchez declared his intention to "open a conversation with civil society", "to establish an in-depth dialogue", for which "events with the presence of civil society" will be developed. All of this is aimed at making society "aware of the important role that NATO plays in the security of the country". **A perhaps more ambitious indoctrination programme, but with the same characteristics as the one developed by his party (PSOE) in the 1986 referendum.**

The difference is that at that time there was a strong anti-NATO movement and a majority consciousness of rejection that confronted the entire state apparatus, the vast majority of the political class and parties and a large part of the institutions, which had at their disposal all the official media and practically all the private media. Even so, it was necessary to resort to repression, sanctions, dismissals, resignations, censored radio and television programmes, coercion and threats to the most vulnerable population, and doubts about the veracity of the result still remain.

**Given the current weakness of popular consciousness, the indoctrination plan is now a different one, based primarily on persuasion in order to gain strength and visibility as the event approaches.**

NATO and our authorities have long been working on a **pro-militarist indoctrination process**: in December 1984, NATO initiated a scholarship scheme for students, researchers and academics; now the approach is broader, from various communicational and institutional angles. Two examples: **The University of Salamanca** has been organising all kinds of meetings since 2011, in 2013, 2015, 2019 and 2020. In the latter year, the objective of the fellowships was defined as "providing participants with the opportunity to learn about the NATO community and gain a better understanding and a more balanced view of the organization". In the same year, the US embassy developed meetings with the titles "defence and security culture" and "my role as a citizen in the face of new threats". The other example is that of **the Military Academy of Zaragoza**, which invites participation in a course whose content is the same as that proposed by NATO: Hybrid Threat, the unpredictable war and where the organisation's central themes are addressed: cyberterrorism, hybrid threat, nuclear risks, energy threats, opening up other areas such as migrants, opinion and the press, deliberate production of ignorance, without forgetting the recurring objective; grey areas of cyberspace: Russia and China; Russia as a hybrid threat; or geostrategic opinion-forming.

**14.- It is essential to recover social awareness and mobilisation against NATO and US military bases.**

But the tragedy does not end here; the struggles against NATO and the Bases involved the mobilisation of a broad social base where pacifists, ecologists, feminists, Christians and numerous different left-wing groups coexisted, a movement sustained over time that attracted

sectors that led countless mass mobilisations and succeeded in rooting an anti-war sentiment in the population, materialized in the rejection of NATO and the US bases.

For most of these militants and the people who accompanied them, the loss of the referendum meant the loss of hope of breaking with the old regime and that the will of the people would be respected. Seventeen years later, to some extent, the spirit of the anti-war struggle was revived in the mobilizations against the Iraq war, but since then this awareness has been waning, at the same time, ignorance of what the bases and membership of the North Atlantic Treaty Organisation mean and how they affect us has been growing.

At the moment, there is no special sensitivity in the Spanish state about the US bases on our territory or NATO, in addition , a broad "hybrid" campaign has been announced in which all necessary means will be used in support of this summit. **In these conditions, those of us who fight for peace, against the arms race, for full sovereignty in our territory and anywhere in the world, are obliged to equip ourselves with the necessary knowledge on this subject, to spread it, to create awareness and mobilize ourselves, transmitting the feeling that those who promote warmongering and surrender sovereignty are will not go unpunished, that they have not succeeded in destroying our conscience and political and social struggle.** All this will only be possible if we raise awareness, if we are determined and if we organize ourselves as broadly as possible.

**January 2022**

**Internationalist Anti-imperialist Front**

---

## References

**General references:** Leaflet series "For Peace. Not to NATO not to bases". INTERNATIONALIST ANTI-IMPERIALIST FRONT, NOVEMBER 2019:

1. [History of NATO I \(until the end of the Cold War\)](#)
2. [NATO history II: NATO's expansion](#)
3. [Recent NATO operations and activities](#)
4. [NATO structure and capabilities](#)
5. [Spain's military relations with the US, NATO and the EU](#)
6. [Implications and Spanish participation in military operations today](#)
7. [NATO in figures](#)
8. [NATO expeditionary operations](#)
9. [NATO's latest threats](#)
10. [NATO, a criminal organization](#)