

A GREAT INTERNATIONALIST MOVEMENT FOR PEACE

José Manuel Pureza

The peace movement has always been heterogeneous. But, over time, one of its main components was a radical critique of the confinement of the political space and of the public debate by a construction of reality as enclosed in a simplistic antagonism (country A against country B, as if country A and country B were not several different things at the same time, did not have many internal tensions and contradictions and in which there was no political and power dispute)

The peace movement has always incorporated this requirement to “peel apart” what is presented as the actors that count in conflicts (the states, presented as something as opaque as billiard balls), bringing to the fore policies, socioeconomic hierarchies and all the violence that geopolitics hides behind its poor ontology (only States, when not just great powers).

The left does not fight for peace because of “cuteness”, but because it does not accept war as a dispositive to erase the centrality of the political struggle and of all emancipatory struggles on all scales. This is how I see Martin Luther King's pacifism as a superior level of the anti-racist struggle and for civil rights and Gandhi's pacifism as a superior stage of the anti-colonial struggle, which rejected not only formal colonialism, but the very models of reasoning and violent action of the oppressors and disarmed their repressive strategy through non-violent resistance.

It is because of emancipation that the left fights for peace and not because of a moral imperative according to which any peace is always superior to any war. The wars of national liberation, the wars of resistance to oppression and occupation, and the wars against tyranny do not deserve the left's principled reproach, rather its solidarity – precisely because they are instruments made necessary for essential emancipation.

In February 2003, the massive demonstrations for peace against the war in Iraq were demonstrations against imperialism and against the world political economy that drove the international political process towards that war. The current challenge is to rescue this sense of emancipation and radical criticism – not only of war, but of what leads to it – in a great internationalist movement for peace.

Faced with the war in Ukraine, this general challenge must be unfolded into five concrete ones. The first is to create a massive voice for peace that opposes the current hegemony of the voice for war that has taken hold in the public space and multiply counter-hegemonic speeches against the support of the military solution, which is a complete irresponsibility because it calls for destruction that drags destruction, and embodies a fantasy that denies the nightmare it drags on. The second challenge is to articulate the primacy of the political solution with the primacy of the self-determination of peoples. The world needs a political solution to the war in Ukraine so that the self-determination of that people and of all peoples in that territory is fulfilled. The invasion and aggression of Ukraine by Russia are the opposite of that. The third challenge is to gather forces to demand an urgent political investment in the densification of the channels that remain in place despite

the war: the grain export channel and the prisoner exchange channel. Thirdly, it is necessary to remove the exclusive criticism of war from humanitarian compassion – it is precisely in the name of the direct and indirect victims that the primacy of the political solution must be clearly pointed out as an element of a lasting and ambitious security architecture guided by the values of human security and climate security. Finally, the great internationalist movement for peace will always have an intersectional vocation, articulating agendas and struggles, such as that of the feminist movement, which exposes the patriarchal nature of the international system based on warlike competition, or that of the movement for climate justice, which shows that this struggle is at the heart of all conflict prevention strategies in our time.

Radical political and ideological critique of the discourses and practices that fuel war by halting emancipation – this is why a strong movement for peace is so important.