NEW SOCIAL MOVEMENTS, INTERNATIONAL SECURITY AND THE NEW SOCIAL PROTESTS: THE RISE AND FALL OF PACIFISM

José Antonio Pena[1]
Universidad Pablo de Olavide
Iván Medina[2]
Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona

Abstract:
This article examines the pacifist movement from a twofold approach: on the one hand, it discusses the various achievements of the pacifist movement regarding security issues, and, on the other hand, it assesses whether the new protests in Europe, the United States, and the Arab-Muslim world have revitalised pacifism's claims. We are therefore interested in the role citizens' protests play in shaping international relations, especially when it comes to exert democratic control on national governments and raise public awareness of international risks. We conclude that pacifism is not becoming a core demand for the new social protests as they challenge economic-related reforms (Europe and the United States) or attempt to topple dictatorships even by violence (Arab-Muslim world).

Keywords: Pacifism, International, Security, Protests.

Resumen:
Este artículo examina el movimiento pacifista desde una doble vertiente: por un lado, se discuten los logros alcanzados por el movimiento pacifista en relación con los temas de seguridad y, por otro lado, se analiza si las nuevas protestas sociales en Europa, Estados Unidos y el mundo arabo-musulmán han revitalizado las demandas del pacifismo. De tal forma, estamos interesados en el papel que las protestas ciudadanas desempeñan en dar forma a las relaciones internacionales, especialmente cuando se trata de ejercer control democrático sobre los gobiernos nacionales y concienciar a la población sobre los riesgos internacionales. Llegamos a la conclusión de que las actuales protestas no han asumido las reivindicaciones pacifistas en tanto que sus principales demandas son de corte económico (en Europa y Estados Unidos) o pretenden erradicar dictaduras incluso con medios violentos (mundo arabo-musulmán).

Palabras clave: *Pacifismo, internacional, seguridad, protestas.*

[1] José Antonio Peña Ramos es Doctor en Ciencia Política y de la Administración. Universidad Pablo de Olavide, de Sevilla. Líneas de investigación: políticas públicas de defensa y estrategias de seguridad nacional, comunidades islámicas, movimientos sociales y seguridad internacional, grupos de interés religioso islámico. Universidad Pablo de Olavide, de Sevilla, Edificio 14, Crta de Utrera, km. 1, 41013-Sevilla. *E-mail:*japer@upo.es.
[2] Iván Medina Iborra es Doctor en Ciencia Política y de la Administración. Universidad Autónoma de Barcelona (UAB). Líneas de investigación: grupos de interés, organizaciones empresariales, nuevo regionalismo, élites económicas. Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona, Facultad Ciencia Política y Sociología, Dpto. Ciencia Política y Derecho Público, Unidad Ciencia Política y de la Administración, Edifici B, 08193 Bellaterra (Cerdanyola del Vallès).*E-mail:* ivan.medina@uab.cat.

1. Introduction

As is widely known, Social Movements (SMs) are non-state actors constituting one of the main forms linking civil society to the institutionalised political power. Social protests constantly arise new claims in favour of democracy, welfare, equality, and citizens' rights. As a consequence of long-term citizens' pressures, many of these broad demands have been included in public policy such as, for instance, social security, women's promotion, environmental programmes, and so forth. However, since SMs have been achieving their goals, their ability to set up new objectives with which to recruit new supports diminishes. In general terms, the more a social movement's demands are institutionalised, the less it is likely to attract new supporters, be on vogue, and then survive. This is the case, for instance, of the labour movement once trade unions and socialist parties have both undergone a series of organisational crises and electoral turndowns.

We primarily discuss the current stage of the Pacifist Social Movement (PSM hereafter) now that social protests seem to have been revitalised globally as, for instance, in the Arab-Muslim world (the Arab Spring), Europe (Occupy the London Stock Exchange, the Spanish Outraged), as well as the United States (Occupy Wall Street). Despite the completely transversal nature of the PSM, our main concern relates to PSM' demands regarding international security. In fact, the PSM is not alien to such a topic in that it was soon integrated within the AntiGlobalisation protests. Since the majority of the new Social Movements have had an anti-war approach, and since they show a clear anti-imperialist bias, it is worth focusing on the PSM's impact on international security, as well as on the new concept of security involving international instability, environmental degradation, pandemics, massive unemployment, and so forth.

This article unfolds as follows: first, we discuss the relationship between the PSM and international security; second, we analyse the various aspects shaping the PSM; and third, we examine whether the new social protests in Europe and in the Arab-Muslim world have altered and/or renewed the basis of global pacifism.

2. The Pacifist Social Movement Challenging Security Issues

Social Movements emerged as means of improving certain aspects of the traditional capitalist nation-state,[3] whereas the various new social movements (NSMs) confronted the Cold War and the hyper-bureaucratic Social Welfare state, in a context charted by the transition from materialist towards post-materialist values that Inglehart noted in the 1970s. May 1968 paved the way for the old SMs to build bridges with the NSMs, namely, pacifism, ecologism, and feminism. From a political elites' standpoint, the action taken by both SMs and NSMs arose a whole set of risks and opportunities, in which the nation-state appears to be in permanent crisis. Doubtlessly NSMs have played a major role in eroding the state's power in a context in

[3] Many different definitions of SMs have been put forward (Scott, A. (1990): *Ideology and the New Social Movements*, London, Unwin Hyman, p. 6; Giddens, A. (2000): *Sociología*, Madrid, Alianza, p. 645). In our contention, one of the most satisfactory definitions is that given by Snow, Soule and Kriesi (Snow, D. A.; Soule, S. A. and Kriesi, H.: "Mapping the Terrain", in Snow, D. A.; Soule, S. A. and Kriesi, H. (eds.) (2004): *The Blackwell Companion to Social Movements*, Oxford, UK, Blackwell Publishing, p. 11): 'collectivities acting with some degree of organization and continuity outside of institutional or organizational channels for the purpose of challenging or defending extant authority, whether it is institutionally or culturally based, in the group, organization, society, culture, or world order of which they are a part'.

which Western civil societies are increasingly interested and involved in national and international politics, thus citizens try in several manners to increase their participation in the decision-making. A first goal was to stop the Vietnam War and slow down the nuclear proliferation. In this respect, it is difficult to find successful events carried out by citizens as a whole against the state's interests and the economically powerful elite such as those experienced in the 1960s.[4] NSMs have benefited from the global expansion of technology with respect to the internationalisation of traditional media (newspapers, television).[5]

There are evidences of NSMs throughout Europe. To name a few cases, NSMs criticized the growing consumerism in the Netherlands through pacifist student protests; West Germany witnessed an escalating student unrest triggered by the assassination attempt of the student's leader Rudi Dutschke; whereas the *Hot Autumn*'s strikes of 1969 were notorious in Italy. As regards America, the Vietnam War stirred student and racial unrests in the United States; Mexico experienced student movements, the massacre in the "Plaza de las Tres Culturas", and bloody disturbances; in Bolivia, the Revolution followed the death of Che Guevara in 1967; and in Uruguay, the *Tupamaros* guerrilla emerged. Meanwhile in Asia, the All-Japan Federation of Student Self-Government Associations supported anti-US demonstrations; China initiated a cultural revolution; and Nepal became a point of reference and transnational attraction for the hippie movement.

Therefore, it was during 1970s when the various NSMs began to highlight specific concerns about international security. Since international security is a worldwide concern, NSMs depict a transnational scope. We refer to a transnational movement when it is essentially composed of closely interrelated groups and organisations, which belong to more than one country.[6] In this vein, 'the emergence of a more coherent global civil society, even while extremely heterogeneous, with significant unifying bodies such as the World Social Forums, has profoundly altered the correlation of forces between states and international institutions on the one hand, and popular sectors from different countries and regions on the other'.[7] But without being dramatic, one must admit that global citizens' claims are likely to enlarge governments' window of political opportunities so as to improve certain aspects of public administrations and better understand social demands.[8]

---

[4] Ruiz Jiménez, J. A.: "El movimiento pacifista en el siglo XXI: nuevos principios y estrategias", *Polis, Revista de la Universidad Bolivariana*, vol. 5, nº 14 (2006).

[5] Della Porta, D. and Mosca, L.: "Global-net for Global Movements? A network of Networks for a Movement of Movements", *Journal of Public Policy*, nº 25 (2005), pp. 165-190; Jiménez, M. and Calle, Á.: "The Global Justice Movements in Spain", in Della Porta, D. (ed.) (2007): *The Global Justice Movement: A Cross-National and Transnational Perspectiva*, Boulder, Paradigm Publishers, pp. 79-102; Gallego, A.; San Martín, J. and Cristancho, C.: "La movilización política: medición y relevancia", *Revista Española de Ciencia Política*, nº 23 (2010), p. 114.

[6] Rucht, D.: "The Transnationalization of Social Movements: Trends, Causes, Problems", in Della Porta, D; Kriesi, H. and Rucht, D. (eds.) (1999): *Social Movements in a Globalizing World*, Houndmills, Macmillan, p. 207.

[7] Edelman, M.: "Los movimientos campesinos transnacionales: éxitos y retos, paradojas y perspectivas", presentation at the seminar *¿Quiénes son los campesinos hoy?: Diálogos en torno a la antropología y los estudios rurales en Colombia*, organised by Nadia Rodríguez and Juana Camacho, XII Anthropology Congress in Colombia, National University of Colombia, Bogotá (2007), pp. 1-2. (own translation).

[8] Within classic SMs, the labour movement is a historical example in this respect: it highlighted and demanded improvement in the working class's living conditions and democratic consolidation, and was gradually channelled into the institutions and incorporated into the logic of the state. Because of their action, NSMs have also created a favourable atmosphere for states to pass new or amend existing laws that favour conscientious objection, arms trade control, environmental protection, gender equality, etc.

The people supporting the PSM consider peace as a major political force. This leads to reject Von Clausewitz's oft-cited statement: 'War is the continuation of politics by other means.' The PSM, in stressing the salience of pacifism as a global need, has produced forms of mobilisation and thought in support of peace and against war, both of which are notions that are understood generically, on the grounds of various convictions emerging from religion, humanities, philosophy, and politics.[9] In practical terms, the PSM invites a number of different actors pursuing specific goals such as, for instance, conscientious objection; antimilitarism; antinuclearism; ecopacifism; humanitarianism; solidarity (in recent times carried out mainly by NGOs in conflict zones); reconciliation; as well as human rights and non-violence.[10]

Bergantiños and Ibarra have indicated that PSM's main strength comes from its internal heterogeneity, because it allows PSM to bring together all types of people ranging from activists in pacifist-based religious movements to extra-parliamentary left-wing formations. However, the extreme fear propagated by governments during the 1960s, leading to left-wing intellectuals to believe in the possibility of a nuclear conflict that would cause a fatal extermination, largely contributed to spread pacifism's discourse. Thus, 'the culture of fear [which is one of the main social drivers] increases pacifism's ability to mobilise'.[11] Nevertheless, PSM covers other topics beyond antinuclear campaigns.[12] It also advocates, for instance, objection to military service; rejection of armed forces; opposition to the outbreak of new wars and the end of existing wars; the prohibition of arms sales to states embroiled in conflicts; the exhaustion of political, diplomatic, and negotiating initiatives before resorting to military intervention; as well as the ineffectiveness and also the counterproductive effects of war in the resolution of conflicts, including the recently fashionable concept "preventive war".[13]

[9] López Martínez, M. (dir.) (2004): *Enciclopedia de Paz y Conflictos*, Granada, Universidad de Granada, p. 829.
[10] López Martínez, M.: "La sociedad civil por la paz", in Muñoz Muñoz, F. A. and López Martínez, M. (eds.) (2000): *Historia de la paz: tiempos, espacios y actores*, Granada, Universidad de Granada, p. 293.
[11] Bergantiños, N. and Ibarra, P.: "Eco-Pacifismo y Antimilitarismo. Nuevos Movimientos Sociales y Jóvenes en el Movimiento Alterglobalizador", *Revista de estudios de juventud*, nº 76 (2007), p. 116 (our translation).
[12] Ruiz Jiménez, *op. cit.*
[13] Bergantiños and Ibarra, *op. cit.*, p. 116.

3. What impact has the PSM had on international security? [14]

Martí i Puig[15] suggested to analyse NSMs' impact on international security in relation with the four areas in which political activity can be divided, namely, symbolic, interactive, institutional, and substantive. First of all, we consider important to stress two broad evidences, on the one hand, that the state is far from being a marginal actor in international security, and, on the other hand, that the situation in which the concept of "security of human beings" replaces the concept of "security of the states" has not come true.[16]

3.1. Symbolic area

Following a period of relative decline (or adaptation according to some scholars), experienced by pacifism during the 1990s after the rise of the antimissile pacifism of the 1980s and the antinuclear pacifism of the 1970s and 1980s, the PSM achieved its major success as the Iraqi war came to an imminent outbreak in 2003. The Gulf War in 1991 was deleterious to the pacifist aspirations. The public perception of the war being fair, acted as a thorough disincentive for the PSM to recruit new members at least until 2003. The largest global mobilisation in support of a pacifist demand took place under the unitary slogan "No War On Iraq". On the 16th February 2003, demonstrations brought together ten millions of people from all over the world. In fact, these were the first truly global demonstrations in history. The extraordinary visibility -essential in the symbolic area- achieved by the PSM in 2003 led to its revitalisation and reformulation as a reaction to the "War on Terror" beginning after the attacks of 9/11.

The PSM has fostered changes in both individual and collective values, opinions, attitudes, and behaviour regarding international security. It has also contributed to shaping

[14] We will focus on the 'external impact', since the 'internal impact' relates to reproducing the participative structures and mobilisation cycles (our translation) (Calle, Á.: "El estudio del impacto de los movimientos sociales. Una perspectiva global", *Revista Española de Investigaciones Sociales*, nº 120 (2007), pp. 139;144). It is not our intention to take sides in the debate on the measurement of the impact, because it is generally difficult to ascertain the actual quantitative or qualitative impact produced by NSMs through their actions in direct and clear terms of cause and effect; and because the process of measurement itself is not easy. We also believe that Calle is right when he notes it is more appropriate to refer more to 'social mark' rather than success or failure when we deal with the impact of NSMs. This should not only be construed as an issue of final causes, of achieving quantifiable demands; it should also be conceived as the ability to introduce themes in prominent positions on national and international political agendas, to force changes in the strategies of the other actors -especially states- on the international scene and to raise awareness in the global civil society and promote changes in its values and attitudes. Hence, for instance the need to refer to the symbolic and interactive areas of political activity (Calle, *op. cit.*, pp. 146,150). Consequently although it has been difficult to gauge the impact and there have been no theories on the success of SMs since political science began to take an interest in the SM phenomenon in the 1950s, there has been a firm belief that they are a motor for political development and social change (Heberle, R. (1951): *Social Movements: An Introduction to Political Sociology*, New York, Appleton-Century-Crofts; Stammer, O.: "Politische Soziologie", in Gehlen, A. y Schelsky, H. (eds.) (1955): *Soziologie. Ein Lehrund Handbuch zur modernen Gesellechaftskunde*, Düsseldorf & Köln, Diederichs, p. 305; Sztompka, P. (1995): *Sociología del cambio social*, Madrid, Alianza; Pont, J.: "La investigación de los Movimientos Sociales desde la sociología y la ciencia política. Una propuesta de aproximación teórica", *Papers. Revista de Sociologia*, nº 56 (1998), p. 260; Funes, M. J. and Monferrer, J.: "Perspectivas teóricas y aproximaciones metodológicas al estudio de la participación", in Funes, M. J. and Adell, R. (eds.) (2003): *Movimientos sociales: cambio social y participación*, Madrid, UNED, pp. 21-58).

[15] Martí i Puig, S.: "Los movimientos sociales en un mundo globalizado: ¿alguna novedad?", *America Latina Hoy*, nº 36 (2004), pp. 94-96.

[16] We need to clarify the fact that the boundaries between the symbolic, interactive, institutional and substantive areas may be diffuse, that certain actions by the PSM may be limited, but not exclusively, to a single area, and that success in a certain area does not necessarily imply success in another one.

new collective identities that goes beyond the nation-states. The pacifist mobilisations against the Iraq war were a qualitative step forward compared with the antinuclear mobilisations of the 1970s and 1980s, and those demanding the end of the Vietnam War. While these were motivated by the existence of a real and immediate threat to many of the activists themselves (who could have ended up being sent as soldiers to Vietnam), the mobilisations of February 2003 not only opposed the war in Iraq and supported the potential Iraqi victims, but also rejected the use of war as a valid mechanism to resolve international conflicts.

Nevertheless, such a delegitimisation of the preventive war did not boost radical changes in the symbolic area. As the PSM strives in achieving a real pacifist society by advocating the pacifist global ideology, the movement becomes excessively limited to its 'instrumental network', which mobilises only ad hoc actors to pursue temporary goals. This occurred in 2003 when the PSM intended to avoid the beginning of military intervention.[17] Therefore, the PSM has failed in raising international security as an issue of paramount concern for a vast number of people who really feel they are no longer threatened by an imminent international conflict. Above all, societies continue to focus their immediate demands on domestic issues —where national security is not a major concern. People are sporadically concerned about international security issues, especially if they believe they are directly affected.

3.2. Interactive area

In the interactive area, the PSM has contributed to the emergence of new political actors and fostered changes in the structures of political representation and the various alliances among actors. For instance, a strong alliance has been forged between ecopacifist political parties and several left-wing associations such as the European Green Party. Along with other NSMs and various groups and popular initiatives, the PSM contributed to the founding in 1980 of the Greens political party in Germany ("Die Grünen", that in 1993 merged with "Bündnis 90" party to form "Bündnis 90/Die Grünen"). In its founding manifesto, the Greens not only criticised military confrontations, rejected violence, and supported dialogue to avoid wars and destruction, they also present themselves as a new form of political party in which extra-parliamentary actors were more than welcome to join.

From 1998 to 2005, "Bündnis 90/Die Grünen" were also part of the German Federal Government alongside the Social Democratic Party (SPD), when it opposed military intervention in Iraq (2003). However, it supported military intervention in Kosovo (1999), arguing that this could avoid the genocide of the Kosovo Albanian population. This generated harsh criticism from the pacifist sector within the party, and shed light on another structural weakness of pacifism, which frequently undermines its ability to have an impact on international security: the hopeless infeasibility of many of its proposals. These are framed in a romantic concept of international security and, although legitimate, it turns out impossible to be implemented. This excludes the PSM from decision-making processes -of which the "rules of the game" they do not accept are based on Realism-.

Besides this, the fact that the PSM encouraged the creation of both political parties and interest groups is another example of its major inability to achieve its objectives alone, as is the implicit recognition of the greater ability of other actors to have an impact on international security and public security and defence policies.

[17] Ibarra, P. (2005): *Manual de sociedad civil y movimientos sociales*, Madrid, Síntesis, p. 252, (own translation).

3.3. Institutional area

As regards the institutional area, the PSM has contributed to the formulation of new administrative procedures, new spaces, and stable mechanisms for negotiating with authorities. Perhaps the best example is the World Social Forum (WSF). The WSF rejects violence as a means of exerting social control by the governments. On the contrary, WSF encourages pacific relations between people, ethnic groups, genres, and races, and refuses to be considered an entity or organisation. It defines itself as:

> "an open meeting place where social movements, networks, NGOs and other civil society organizations opposed to neo-liberalism and a world dominated by capital or by any form of imperialism come together to pursue their thinking, to debate ideas democratically, for formulate proposals, share their experiences freely and network for effective action. (…) [I]t has taken the form of a permanent world process seeking and building alternatives to neo-liberal policies. (…) [It] is also characterized by plurality and diversity, is non-confessional, non-governmental and non-party. It proposes to facilitate decentralized coordination and networking among organizations engaged in concrete action towards building another world, at any level from the local to the international, but it does not intend to be a body representing world civil society. The World Social Forum is neither a group nor an organization"[18]

The European Social Forum (ESF) is another example. It is against Europe becoming a global military power, thus it supports the creation of an international justice system that could penalise states and anyone responsible of war crimes. Additionally, it advocates the abolition of NATO and other military alliances and foreign military bases throughout the world. It rejects the concept of preventive war and humanitarian war as it opposes to the production and use of nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. Overall, the ESF is committed to disarmament and demilitarisation, and aims to the replacement of the notion of "security of states" by that of "security of human beings".

However, the need to resort to the creation of these types of alternative spaces that are somewhat removed from society indicates a weakness of the PSM when it comes to exerting effective influence on security issues. These forums reinforce the self-esteem of the people involved, but they rarely have a clear impact on the entire international system. Firstly, because the lack of plurality of their internal make-up diminishes the validity of the decisions adopted; and, secondly, because the nature of the mechanisms used in decision-making lessens their efficiency. For example, the WSF prohibits the participation of actors who play a key role in international security, such as military organisations, party representations, and political representatives—unless they are personally and expressly invited by the WSF and accept its Charter of Principles. On the other hand, it has internal mechanisms for decision-making whose nature (excessive complexity, flexibility, horizontality, lack of hierarchy, independence of the participants) makes it difficult to agree on unitary stances and often leads to ineffectiveness.

[18] On the World Social Forum see: http://forumsocialmundial.org.br/main.php?id_menu=19&cd_language=2

3.4. Substantive area

As for the substantive area, the PSM has forced to modify various security policies. It has also created new opportunities for mobilisation on security-related issues. The PSM has managed to freeze plans to develop nuclear energy in states such as Norway, the Netherlands, Italy and Austria, but not in the UK and France, despite the potential incentive represented by the accident at the Chernobyl nuclear plant in 1986.[19] In 1992, the PSM started the 'International Campaign to Ban Landmines' and won the Nobel Peace Prize in 1997 for its significant contribution to the Ottawa Treaty (1997) against anti-personnel mines, despite the initial opposition of most of the states that later ratified it. Since 1999, the 'International Action Network on Small Arms' (IANSA) managed to limit the manufacture and trade of small arms and make them more transparent. The PSM also made a significant contribution to the establishment of the International Criminal Court.[20] Likewise, the PSM played a salient role in the *Euromissile crisis* (1979-1983) when it opposed the deployment by NATO of the United States' "Pershing II" and "Cruise" missiles in Western Europe in response to the stationing of medium-range Soviet "SS-20" nuclear missiles in central and Eastern Europe states. However, the PSM was only successful in delaying the deployment of missiles. Hence, it is difficult to determine to what extent the PSM contributed to the later removal of nuclear warheads in the Netherlands, Belgium and Germany, as well as with the sharp cut in nuclear warheads by the UK.[21]

Nevertheless, PSM's current influence is conditioned by the power struggle within the international arena. The PSM is weaker than national governments, public security agencies, and other non-state actors such as, for instance, the powerful European nuclear lobby. Governments can debase PSM's demands by excluding them from decisions such as, for instance, when the widespread abolition of compulsory military service was enacted. If governments capture the whole legitimacy of pacifist initiatives, citizens are prone to forget about PSM as a key political force. It seems that the PSM's recent integration into the Antiglobalisation movement (AM) has arisen new opportunities, as well as new threats. The PSM may benefit from Antiglobalists' mobilisation in many ways. It is expected that pacifism gains influence within the AM and, consequently, PSM's voice sounds louder. However, the worst scenario must not be rejected. It is probable that the mixed nature of the AM's demands would dilute pacifist proposals, thereby making the PSM's claims be irrelevant in a joint programme, especially in the case of hypothetical progress by AM's radical anti-system sectors.

4. The Pacifist Social Movement and the New Social Protests

The current stream of social protests, which highlights S. Hessel's book "*Time for Outrage!*" as one of its key intellectual mainstay, includes four key episodes with similar features and claims, but also with their own specific demands. These four episodes are: a) the emergence of social protests in France and the United Kingdom; b) the so-called Arab Spring; c) the 15M

[19] Flam, H.: "Conclusion: Structural Impacts of the Anti-nuclear Movements", in H. Flam (ed.) (1994a): *States and Anti-Nuclear Movements*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press, pp. 416-422; Flam, H. (ed.) (1994b): *States and Anti-Nuclear Movements*, Edinburgh, Edinburgh University Press; Ajángiz, R.: "Las consecuencias de los movimientos sociales: democracia participativa" (2001), in http://partehartuz.org/prin9.htm.
[20] Ruiz Jiménez, *op. cit.*
[21] Ajángiz, *op. cit.*

movement or the movement of the "Spanish Outraged"; and d) the appearance of social protests in the United States against Wall Street and other financial institutions.

It was in France and the United Kingdom where a new series of social protests emerged in autumn 2010. French and British people joined a number of protests claiming against budget cuts in social policy; the delay in the retirement age; increased tuition fees; as well as a financial system based on speculation. In December 2010, the Arab Spring commenced with the Jasmine revolution in Tunisia that, as in many other nations of the Arab-Muslim world, demanded democratic advances and improvements in living conditions. In May 2011, a week before the celebration of local and regional elections in Spain, the "Outraged movement" strongly emerged as an informal coalition of various social platforms previously formed. The Spanish movement used social networks as relevant communication channels and achieved a salient mobilisation by occupying squares and camping in the streets. One can find among its demands: the improvement of democratic institutions; the reform of the electoral system to diminish bipartidism; and the removal of public subsides to banks. Finally, in September 2011, the protests arrived to the United States led by the "Occupy Wall Street" movement. This movement calls on the federal government to effectively tackle the economic crisis.

As for the relationship between the PSM and the new wave of social protests in Europe and the United States, we still lack the necessary perspective to make a conclusive assessment. So far, the *Spanish Outraged* movement considers violence as a social control mechanism, and has a non-violent culture that is widely reflected in its strategy and actions. However, in light of what happened so far, it seems that the PSM is unlikely to play an important role in the current cycle of social mobilisation. We pose two basic reasons to explain why the PSM is not facing such a revitalisation.

First, although the current social protests are perhaps the most intense demonstrations since May 1968, they do not refer to international security as being one of their main concerns. In Europe, protests criticise the several cuts on public budgets as well as the alleged elitist dirigisme against people's will. Some groupings have requested to suppress the military budget to put that money in social services, but their voice is not as mighty as those claiming against bankers. Moreover, the media coverage of current demonstrations do not focus on their antinuclear profile, even when the tsunami in Japan proved to be a real challenge for security as various nuclear power stations faced serious risks. Protests have neither had a clear message to the various operations carried out by UN and NATO interventions such as those in the Arab-Muslim world, or by the United States including the military operation against Bin Laden and other Al-Qaeda leaders. These sorts of protests have primarily regarded economic-related concerns ("Occupy Wall Street", "Occupy the London Stock Exchange"). The current stage of the protests does not highlight pacifism as one of its main demands, thus people involved seem to have been renewed old social movements demands (labour, unions) rather than NSMs' claims. It puts on the table the question whether the PSM supporters can include their beliefs in a movement that operates in a very anarchic manner by using social networks to forge ideas, organise activities, and share responsibilities.

Secondly, protests in the Arab-Muslim world have not been inspired in all cases by a non-violent culture. In fact, in countries such as Syria and Yemen, protests have led to armed conflicts, and Libya has faced a cruel civil war. In these countries, certain actors claiming for democratic progress and welfare began to use violent means, in part as a response to government violence, leading to an open armed conflict generating scenarios needed of international intervention. In the case of Libya, the civil war situation led to a NATO intervention ("Unified Protector"), which implemented a no-fly zone, led to an arms embargo

by sea, and tried to protect civilians by reducing the military capacity of the Gaddafi regime (mainly air strikes against military installations and weapons), making it easier, although not part of its mission, the advance of the rebel National Transitional Council (NTC). New Arab leaders will surely ask the people to reduce conflicts and trust the government efforts to speed up democratic reforms. However, it seems difficult that a real pacifist movement can be established in the Arab-Muslim world beyond a formal (constitutional) agreement to avoid military tensions within each country. The region is far from being stable, as old conflicts remain active, like Palestine, Israel, Iran, terrorism, and so forth. Moreover, there is not a clear resurgence of pacifist political parties in countries facing electoral competition. They are rather considering the religious cleavage as Islamic parties are becoming stronger than other forces. Therefore, the PSM is not able to grow in new territories that have recently undergone dictatorships. Hence, it seems that the PSM has not been able to react to contexts in which the line between peaceful actors and violent actors was diffuse, in which violent means have been used as a defence to achieve further legitimate objectives.

Overall, the afore-mentioned difficulties for the peace movement to achieve its objectives in the current climate of protests are caused by problems regarding its strategies and its members. According to Bennett,[22] two key factors differentiate the NMS from the current stream of protests: on the one hand, the use of new technologies to share information and organise mobilisations, and, on the other hand, the network structure of the new protests, which gives NGOs less relevance than that of the pacifist movement so far. In short:

> The current era of social justice activism still includes NGO policy networks, of course, but they now operate in a more emergent movement environment of large-scale direct activism, multi-issue networks, and untidy "permanent" campaigns with less clear goals and political relationships with targets. Those targets range over combinations of trade organizations, G7 summits, European Union meetings, WEF gatherings, and major corporations and industrial sectors (apparel, forest products, food, and media, among others).[23]

This leads the PSM to face a serious dilemma: whether to keep on developing a strategy focused on well-organised campaigns conducted by a limited number of actors aiming at promoting policy change or, otherwise, to join an emerging movement charted by mass protest aimed at permanent campaigns on a multitude of topics. In other words, what the PSM must decide is whether to remain a single-issue movement despite losing political strength or, otherwise, to accept that pacifism is no longer a core theme of a transnational movement that seems to be much stronger.

[22] Bennett, W. L.: "Communicating Global Activism. Strengths and Vulnerabilities of Networked Politics", in van de Donk, W.; Loader, B. D.; Nixon, P. G. and Rucht, D. (eds.) (2004): *Cyberprotest: New Media, Citizens and Social Movements*, New York, Routledge, pp. 123-146; Bennett, W. L.: "Social Movements beyond Borders: Organization, Communication, and Political Capacity in Two Eras of Transnational Activism", in Della Porta, D. and Tarrow, S. (eds.) (2005a): *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*, Boulder CO, Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 203-226; Bennett, W. L.: "Social Movements Beyond Borders: Understanding Two Eras of Transnational Activism", in Della Porta, D. and Tarrow, S. (eds.) (2005b): *Transnational Protest and Global Activism*, Lanham, MD, Rowman & Littlefield, pp. 203-226.

[23] Bennett, "Social Movements beyond Borders: Organization…", *op. cit.*, p. 212.

5. Concluding Remarks

NMSs are non-state transnational actors of collective action and of major importance in the current context of accelerated globalisation. They emerged in the 1970s, largely through their linkage with international security-related issues, as heirs of the old SMs. However, they gained transnational importance at the end of the Cold War. NSMs' development has been significantly bolstered by the use of new information and communication technologies and by the spread of traditional technologies. Like other non-state actors, NSMs try to influence international security, public security, and defence policies; and experience shows that NSMs can also represent a window of political opportunity for governments.

During the course of its existence, the PSM has not been able to stop military actions such as that of Iraq, but has enjoyed occasional successes (freezing of several nuclear programmes). At the same time, the PSM has attempted to forge a 'social mark'[24], which is frequently not quantifiable nor appreciable in the short term, but when it has been sufficiently far-reaching, it has produced exceptional results such as, for instance, the delegitimisation of the concept of "preventive war" by the lion's share of the international public opinion. However, it seems feasible that the current social protests may eclipse pacifist visions, and hinder the formulation of a unitary discourse, thereby diluting and skewing these plans. On the one hand, the new wave of social protests removes security issues as the most relevant international issue since the Cold War. As security issues are being substituted by economic-related demands, the democratic control over international security may be reduced. On the other hand, the loss of centrality of security issues in current protests suggests a troubling question about the side effects of the economic crisis on public unrest, the emergence of xenophobic parties, the reduction of active military operations budgets, a gradual downsizing in Army and police, etc. The PSM may be going through the desert now, but its collective action problems should not be detrimental to a world that increasingly requires more attention to international conflicts by the general public.

[24] Calle, *op. cit.*, pp. 146,150, (own translation).