

Agreement on Trade and Tariffs (GATT), the main vehicle for imposition of British "free trade." The idea is to flood the continent with industrial goods produced in the advanced sector and force them to return to an emphasis on raw-materials production.

- **Halt transfers of advanced technologies to the continent.** Under the excuse of controlling the proliferation of nuclear weapons, Aspen's policy-makers propose a series of complicated mechanisms and "safeguards" which would make nuclear-energy development in these nations virtually impossible. Under this guise, Cuba, Argentina, and Chile are ordered to join the Tlateloclo Treaty on non-proliferation while Brazil, a signer, is told to comply with it.

- **Stall industrial development through so-called international anti-pollution rules.** On the model of Aspen's deployment of the environmentalist movement to stop nuclear energy development in the United States, the workshop now proposes that inter-American agencies in the OAS undertake legal battles against industrial "pollution" in Latin America. Environmental problems on the U.S.-Mexico border are presented as an example of where this apparatus would intervene.

The anglophilic Aspen strategists welcome the collapse of U.S. influence in the continent after the Malvinas war. They recognize that Ibero-American governments and economic leaders are looking for new workable institutions to defend the continent from outside aggression and to further industrial development. Now Aspen hopes to direct this reorganization process.

Aspen's plots against Latin America had the unrestricted logistical support of the head of the OAS, Alejandro Orfila, as Viron Vaky notes in his introduction to the study. It is through ideological control of Orfila that Aspen hopes to take control of the OAS, the most important representative body for the continent.

With the United States discredited, Aspen proposes to have the British protectorate of Canada playing a greater role in inter-American affairs. Contrary to U.S. obsessions with Soviet expansion in the continent, the report notes, Canada has wisely won sympathies in the continent by befriending both "left" countries like Cuba and "rightist" ones like Haiti.

Using Canada as a channel of British influence in the continent, however, would require some structural changes in the OAS. Since it is not a sovereign nation but a dependency of the British crown, Canada has never been admitted to the OAS, where it only holds the status of "observer." Aspen calls on the OAS to admit all countries in the hemisphere as members. The institute also hopes to deploy the English-speaking countries of the Caribbean, some of which are not currently members of the OAS, against the Ibero-American nations which have traditionally dominated the OAS.

Interview: Spain's Defense Minister

'We must command our territory'



Spain's precipitous decision last year to enter the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)—a decision entered into after intense international pressure mainly from Britain and the United States, on the one hand, and internal pressure to appease the coup plotters that still threaten the future of the country, on the other—has now led to predictable complications. Some of the most important of these are discussed in the interview below with Spanish Defense Minister Alberto Oliart.

One of the most acute and potentially disastrous complications revolves around the issue of the NATO command under which Spain would be integrated. Will Spain have a unified command or, as currently looks more likely, will the NATO powers continue to insist on a humiliating division of the country between the English command for the nation's Atlantic side, and a Neapolitan command for the Mediterranean half? This issue has led to a temporary halt in the country's negotiations with the NATO allies.

The question of Gibraltar is thus placed on center stage. As NATO chief Joseph Luns explained in an interview to the Spanish daily *Ya* on June 20, it is the current control of Gibraltar by the British which makes appropriate the integration of Atlantic Spain into the British NATO command at Norfolk. Particularly after the Malvinas affair, the mere proposal that Spanish generals be forced to operate on Spanish territory (Gibraltar) under British command is a provocation of such a high order that it guarantees disorder and possibly worse among the Spanish officer corps.

There is no doubt, therefore, of the correctness of Defense Minister Oliart's statement that Spain must have sole and undivided control over the command of her territory, in which he emphatically includes Gibraltar. What is involved is a fundamental question of national sovereignty, and one of high emotional content at that, which no Spanish government would dare disregard with impunity. The internal pressure, from the military point of view, is compounded by the expected landslide victory of the Spanish Socialists in the early legislative elections

scheduled for this fall. The most reactionary, not to say Falangist, elements in the military are already speaking of the necessity of going so far as to promote another coup d'état to stop what (correctly, as it happens), they view as a disaster for the country.

The most pro-development forces in Spain, however, correctly view such a Falangist military coup as an equivalent catastrophe. In this situation, the NATO-sovereignty issue further fans the flames.

Defense Minister Oliart is also quite explicit on his lack of support for the Luns thesis promoting NATO out-of-area deployments. Here too the Spanish government is on a decidedly different track from the currently prevailing NATO posture, which Luns reiterated in his cited interview and which was made official during the June NATO summit in Brussels at British insistence.

This interview was conducted on June 24 in Madrid by *EIR*'s European Editor, Vivian Zoakos, and *EIR* Paris Bureau Chief Katherine Kanter.

EIR: After the Malvinas crisis, does Spain plan to integrate itself militarily into NATO, or to play a more limited role like that of France?

Oliart: We plan integration into the military organization of NATO in a way which of course must be worked out with the actual components of the alliance; but we do not intend to remain in a position like that of France.

EIR: [NATO Secretary-General] Joseph Luns in an interview with the Madrid daily newspaper *Ya* on June 20 speaks of the possibility of interventions into the Third World by NATO members as something perfectly natural in the future. What do you think?

Oliart: I have not read this interview with Luns. I imagine that, given the special nature of the NATO alliance, and the independence maintained by the countries within the alliance, to determine their own foreign and military policy, that Secretary-General Luns has probably simply justified the fact that some countries within the alliance have intervened, obviously, in the past and at certain points, in various Third World areas like Africa.

I insist that this corresponds to the sovereign decision of each of the member countries of NATO to act in matters of foreign policy or military policy as they think opportune, without prejudice to the ultimate aim of the alliance, which is the defense of territory vital in interest to all the alliance members, which includes Spain today. As members of the Atlantic alliance, we have committed ourselves to the sphere geographically within the terms of the treaty, not to any other. This does not affect our decision to continue our foreign policy just as we consider it should be carried forward, as a sovereign and independent nation.

EIR: What do you think of the proposal that Gibraltar could be a NATO base jointly governed by Spain and Great Britain?

Oliart: We have clearly put forward the fact that it is a priority, a vital strategic interest for our nation. I mean that zone defined by the points of the Balearic Islands, the Straits of Gibraltar, the Canaries. We have clearly expressed the concept that in this zone, the Spanish command is not subject to debate.

EIR: A debate is presently raging in NATO about the future of armaments: Whether one should opt for conventional forces, or else develop, as the Soviets are now doing, new strategic arms based on space-age warfare—laser beam weapons and so on. What do you think, taking into account the very distinct implications of the two alternatives in terms of world economic growth, about this debate?

Oliart: In my country's situation, at our industrial, economic, and technological level, I believe we can develop an army by land, by sea, by air, which in conventional terms will be on a par with the others in the Atlantic alliance. The other arms systems you refer to do not enter the immediate horizon. I do not mean to say that we are not paying careful attention to this advance, nor that we are not gaining the means to handle these technologies in the event we should possess them. However, the present modernization project we have for the armed forces materiel still does not include these levels of high technology, for budget, economic, and technical reasons.

EIR: But on what side do you stand in the debate?

Oliart: It is hard to answer this, but I would say that each country must do the utmost to attain the highest possible defense level. The Atlantic alliance is a defensive alliance, faced with what appeared to be a decisive Soviet menace against Europe in 1945. This potential threat still exists in spite of all the diplomatic, political, and cultural relations between us. I do think therefore that anything those countries in the alliance which can develop the absolutely highest technologies can do to defend the free world, should be done, because this helps to maintain the character of a true shield, which the Atlantic alliance is supposed to be. These countries should develop the type of technology you referred to.

EIR: What do you think about the European Rapid Deployment Force?

Oliart: This already exists. Each country in the alliance has contributed to it. This force is necessary, and Spain is disposed to contribute units, and to discuss the size of the units. This Rapid Deployment Force of the Atlantic alliance of course is not the same as the North American Rapid Deployment Force.

EIR: Could you elaborate a little more on the question of out-of-area deployments?

Oliart: I cannot imagine under what conditions my country could have an interest in intervening militarily in countries which you have called Third World countries, and which are not included in the geographically delimited area of the North Atlantic treaty. For a great many years now, my country has not had an expansionist policy outside its own territory. Spain is concerned and involved in defending and developing its own national territory and population. I do not see reasons why at this point we should find motivations to intervene in other countries.

EIR: In your opinion must the NATO mandate for Spain be under Spanish control or could you accept integration of other commands?

Oliart: More detailed discussion will be required on this topic. But, as you know, Spain is a country between southern Europe and northern Africa. The Straits of Gibraltar are not an abyss separating us from Africa, but rather a means of communication.

Furthermore, we are a nation between the Mediterranean and the Atlantic. This poses so many problems that if you take the NATO commands as they presently stand, you could come up with Naples, just as you could come up with Norfolk. Perhaps the first priority from which we move is a Spanish command, as now already exists. This is justified precisely by the fact of our complex situation, and by the enormous importance, in my eyes, which my country has strategically for NATO as a nation, and as a reserve territory, a last bastion. It is not inconceivable that there must be a single command for this territory which is so special.

EIR: You mean a single Spanish mandate?

Oliart: Yes, naturally. Dependent or integrated of course, as is the English, as is any other mandate, on the alliance as a whole. This is what we plan to discuss with our allies. We wish to see whether this is possible or not. We think that they too must work through the question in depth, i.e., whether, given our complex situation, we must fit into the pre-conceived schemes of NATO, which has been around for 35 years. This alliance was constituted by agreement between the countries which composed it at the time of its creation. But a new piece is entering the alliance, which has its own peculiarities, unlike those of any other European country.

EIR: But will this be a *sine qua non* condition?

Oliart: I would not go so far as to say that it is a *sine qua non* condition, but it is a priority which we want examined very thoroughly indeed.

INDIA

Behind the Khalistan separatist movement

by Thierry Lalevée and Uma Zykovsky

In September 1981, a small band of terrorists hijacked an Indian Airlines aircraft from India to Pakistan, making international headlines as representatives of the obscure "Khalistan" separatist movement. Although no one in India knew much about this group, the Khalistanis, as they call themselves, had taken care to inform the *New York Times* of their goals a few weeks prior to the hijacking.

The *Times* reported that the group demanded Indian recognition of the "nationhood" of the Sikh community and acceptance of their plan to carve a new Khalistani nation out of a big part of north India. There are approximately 16 million Indian Sikhs, a separate religious community which comprises about 2 to 3 percent of the nation's population. The Sikhs share many customs and beliefs with Hinduism and have never expressed a desire to separate from the country. Nevertheless, the Khalistanis, a fundamentalist extreme sect within Sikhism, told the *New York Times* that they will use terrorism, sabotage, and communal rioting to force India to surrender to their demands for a "Sikh homeland." In April this year, the National Council for Khalistan and the Dal Khalsa party, both groupings of Khalistani separatists, systematically provoked Hindu-Sikh riots in the holy city of Amritsar. The riots were triggered with an old British colonial trick: the Khalistanis placed severed cow-heads in a Hindu temple, where the cow is considered a sacred animal.

The Indian government reacted swiftly, banning the Khalistanis and clearly expressing what everyone in India thought and saw: First, the Khalistanis have no support for their movement, even in the areas they claim for a homeland; and second, by choosing Pakistani dictator Gen. Ziaul Haq as a "friend" and sparking conflict between Hindus and Sikhs—two communities that have coexisted peacefully for a long time—the Khalistan movement was doing a third party's dirty work.

Made in Britain

There are three levels to any investigation of the Khalistan movement: who is behind it? why? and how is