

## Chapter 14

# The Transformation of Leadership and Political Systems in the Six-Day War

---

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25062/9786287602502.14>

**William Alfredo Sierra Gutiérrez**

Escuela Superior de Guerra "General Rafael Reyes Prieto"

**Abstract:** Conflicts on an international scale have had a significant impact on the transformation of political systems around the world. These conflicts have triggered a series of political, social and economic changes in the affected countries and have led to the emergence of new political actors and ideologies. This paper analyzes how once the conflict called the Six-Day War ended, the Middle East has been the scene of strong shocks, going through a very difficult time, such as the popular uprisings of 2011, better known as the Arab Spring, which alludes to the clashes between two spheres of regional actors with international links and the repercussions on existing conflicts. Likewise, the appearance of new non-state actors that energize conflicts in the Middle East is analyzed, which allows us to observe how the situation is becoming more warlike every day.

**Keywords:** autocracy, democracy, democratization, air war, Arab Spring, authoritarian regimes.

### William Alfredo Sierra Gutiérrez

Lieutenant Colonel (R), Ejército Nacional de Colombia. Ph.D. student in Strategic Studies, Security and Defense, Escuela Superior de Guerra "General Rafael Reyes Prieto". Master's Degree in National Security and Defense, Escuela Superior de Guerra. Master's degree in International Relations and Business and Business Administrator, UMNG. Professional, Military Sciences, Escuela Militar de Cadetes "General José María Córdova". Professor and research fellow, Center for Strategic Studies on National Security and Defense, Escuela Superior de Guerra.

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0640-7907> - Contact: [william.sierra@esdeg.edu.co](mailto:william.sierra@esdeg.edu.co)

**APA citation:** Sierra Gutiérrez, W. A. (2023). The Transformation of Leadership and Political Systems in the Six-Day War. In S. Uribe-Caceres & D. López Niño (Eds.), *Theoretical Approach to Notions of War and Strategic Leadership* (pp.281-300). Sello Editorial ESDEG. <https://doi.org/10.25062/9786287602502.14>

### **THEORETICAL APPROACH TO THE NOTIONS OF WAR AND STRATEGIC LEADERSHIP**

ISBN (print): 978-628-7602-49-6

ISBN (online): 978-628-7602-50-2

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25062/9786287602502>

#### **Security and Defense Collection**

Sello Editorial ESDEG

Escuela Superior de Guerra "General Rafael Reyes prieto"

Bogotá D.C., Colombia

2023



## Introduction

Once the socio-political situation that existed in the Middle East for the 1960s has been decanted and recognized, and that is lived even now, in the second decade of the 21st century, we will mention two historical events that left a reference throughout history: the Six-Day War and the Arab Spring.

The Six-Day War was the confrontation between, on the one hand, the Israelis (Jews), the new State of Israel, and different Arab countries. And where the capacity of air power was demonstrated as a determining factor for the achievement of early victory by the State of Israel.

This conflict lasted between June 5 and 10, 1967; that is why it is known as the Six-Day War. In fact, it was a stunning defeat for the Arabs. That is, Israel annihilated the Armed Forces of the different Arab countries, with which the geopolitical chessboard of the region was radically transformed, since Israel conquered the Sinai Peninsula, the Gaza Strip, the Golan Heights and the West Bank (Bermúdez, 2017).

The Arab Spring is the name by which the media has identified the series of popular and political demonstrations that took place in the Arab region, mainly since the beginning of 2011, and which led to the fall of the dictatorships of Ben Ali in Tunisia and Hosni Mubarak in Egypt, along with the reinforcement of violence in Yemen, under the political leadership of Ali Abdullah Saleh, who resigned after the opposition protests that began in January 2011, and the civil war in Libya, energized under the mandate of Muammar Gaddafi, also referred to as the period of Gaddafi Libya, which covers a period of about 42 years, from September 1, 1969 to August 25, 2011 (Figueroa, 2011). All these were situations of internal conflict that led to transformations in the political systems of the aforementioned countries, as a response to the problem of the struggle for democratization and justice.

In the Six-Day War, the problem lay in the security and integrity of the State of Israel, which was surrounded by hostile Arab countries. However, the continuation of armed conflicts and the lack of a diplomatic solution intensified political and ideological polarization, further reinforcing the political systems of control and restriction in the region.

In the case of the Arab Spring, the problem lay in the oppression of authoritarian regimes that denied Human Rights and the demands of the population. In many cases, repression and corruption were severe, and the population had been living in unsustainable political and economic conditions for decades. As a result, people began to demand a radical change and transformation of political systems.

In both cases, the result was growing social and political pressure for a transformative change in political systems, in search of more democratic and just systems that guaranteed the rights of the population and decreased repression and violence. In this sense, the struggle for democratization became the key factor and trigger for political transformation in these countries.

## Wars, leadership and political transformation

The changes referred to here require leadership such as that proposed by Kouzes and Posner (2018). The authors base their research on more than 20 years of surveys of thousands of leaders around the world, allowing them to identify the patterns that distinguish the most successful leaders from the least successful.

In the book *The Leadership Challenge. How to make extraordinary things happen in an organization*, Kouzes and Posner argue that leadership is not an innate trait, but a skill that can be learned and developed. To do this, they present five key practices that leaders must follow:

1. **Shaping the Path:** Effective leaders must set an example for their team to follow, and they must act in a manner consistent with the values and principles they espouse.
2. **Inspire a shared vision:** Leaders must be able to communicate a clear and compelling vision of the future, and inspire their team to pursue it.
3. **Challenging the status quo:** Leaders must be willing to take risks and make changes to improve the organization.
4. **Empower others to act:** Leaders should foster collaboration and autonomy in their team, and should help their members develop their skills and knowledge.

5. **Show the way.** Leaders must be able to lead and coordinate their team to achieve organizational goals.

Likewise, it is mentioned that leaders must prospectively imagine what the desired final state should be, where the future is seen as a perfect and conducive environment, said ideal state refers to preferences in terms of economic relations, values, social policies and technological advances, among others. The objective sought is a *long-term extension*, which refers to the recognition of the ideal objectives pursued by political decision-makers through practical actions in favor of the implementation of adequate public policies that meet the social needs of the population.

Likewise, the effectiveness of leadership has been a concept highly vulnerable to socio-historical and cultural changes. The criterion of effectiveness is linked to the effect to be achieved through the exercise of leadership. Although the effectiveness of leadership depends on the quality of the processes and the results achieved - including political, social, economic and even cultural processes - perhaps the most important thing, and which underlies the above, is the ethical and responsible way of leading, as it generates trust and interest in others. The latter depends, to a large extent, on the characteristics of the organization, its climate and the other variables that encourage the development of certain types of leaders, with principles and values that lead to leadership styles that generate particular dynamics that favor certain aspects of the organization to the detriment of others. Or on the contrary, leaders who manage to favorably embrace all the axes of the organization, within a flexible structure that encourages it.

Leadership played a very important role in both the Six-Day War and the Arab Spring, and in both cases contributed to the change of political systems in the region.

In the Six-Day War, Israel's leadership was central to the country's success during the conflict. Levi Eshkol, Israeli prime minister at the time, demonstrated a great ability to lead and make difficult decisions. He was able to cope with international pressures and made the decision to launch a preemptive strike against his Arab enemies, resulting in a decisive victory for Israel (Regev, 2017).

In the Arab Spring, the role of leadership was more ambiguous. In some countries, leaders were the main obstacle to political and social changes, while in others leaders were at the forefront of protests and fought against dictatorial regimes.

For example, in Tunisia, Rached Ghannouchi, leader of the opposition party, used his leadership skills to mobilize the population and lead a peaceful revolution that overthrew the authoritarian government of Zine El Abidine Ben Ali (Driss, 2011).

In Egypt, opposition leader Mohamed El-Baradei was one of the main drivers of the Arab Spring demonstrations. His leadership in the struggle against the dictatorship of Hosni Mubarak was a key factor in the fall of the regime (Ajansi, 2021).

In conclusion, leadership played a crucial role in the Six-Day War and the Arab Spring. In both cases, leaders were instrumental in achieving desired outcomes and promoting political change in the region. Moreover, these historic events demonstrated that leadership can play an important and decisive role in conflict resolution and in the transformation of political systems.

For the aforementioned and in relation to the socio-political situation for the time of the Six-Day War - during the sixties, at a time and an area of the world where tension was growing noticeably - it is worth mentioning the political decisions made by the rulers of the time, since each of the parties doubted the other more and more. In the decision-making by the leaders of the moment, in that part of the world, the control of water had a lot to do, since it is a very desert territory. In fact, in 1963 Israel decided to divert water from the Jordan River, to which the Arabs responded by doing the same (Seivane et al., 2005).

•Burns (1978) "Leadership over human beings is exercised when people with certain motives and purposes mobilize, in competition or conflict with others, institutional, political, psychological, and other resources in order to awaken, encourage, and satisfy the motives of followers."

In the Six-Day War and the Arab Spring, leaders mobilized their followers based on the theory of leadership over human beings for political, ideological and psychological reasons, using some resources or tools such as, for example, the political discourse used by leaders through persuasive language and a political discourse that appealed to the emotions and motivations of followers. In the Six-Day War, Israel used a *discourse* that emphasized its right to defend itself and protect its people. In the Arab Spring, opposition leaders used a discourse that appealed to freedom, social justice, and democracy. As a second resource we have the *propaganda* used by leaders to spread their message and mobilize followers. In the Six-Day War, both Israel and the Arab countries used propaganda to present their version of events and justify their intervention in the conflict. In the Arab Spring, opposition leaders used social media and other means to spread their message and mobilize the population.

The *mobilization of institutional resources* was another resource that leaders used: mobilizing the institutional resources at their disposal - such as political parties, social organizations, and religious institutions - to rally followers. In the Six-Day War, the Government of Israel mobilized all state institutions to support the war effort. In the Arab Spring, opposition leaders used civil society organizations and religious institutions to mobilize the population, which led to the creation of symbols and myths to mobilize followers and generate a sense of collective identity. In the Six-Day War, Israel used the myth of David versus Goliath to mobilize the population. In the Arab Spring, the symbols of the revolution were the raised fist and the national flag.

It can be said, then, that leaders in the Six-Day War and the Arab Spring used various mobilization purposes to encourage and satisfy the motives of followers, including political discourse, propaganda, the mobilization of institutional resources, and the creation of symbols and myths.

Giving scope to the previous statement, Bass (1999) developed an investigation on the type of *transformational leadership*. Thanks to Bass's research in 1999, this type of theory on leadership was put into practice, and it was scientifically demonstrated that the application of this leadership model allows obtaining results of greater importance.

Previously, Bass had designed in 1985 the method to evaluate or measure transformational leadership, which is measured by taking into account the influence of the leader on his followers and their ability to seek new solutions. Thanks to the development of Bass, the concept has been applied in different contexts. Thus, its conclusions are used in the business world, as well as in educational, military and religious fields (Bass, 1985).

Followers identify with the leader's mission and goals, and they articulate with each other and reach higher levels of motivation.

According to Bass, transformational leadership is made up of four major factors or components:

- **Charisma, or idealized influence:** The leader is clear about his set of values that he respects at all times by showing exemplary behavior. In this way, he appears as a model to imitate before his followers.
- **Inspiration, or inspirational motivation:** The leader articulates a forward-looking and optimistic vision, so that he manages to inspire and motivate his followers.

- **Intellectual stimulation:** The leader also knows how to stimulate creativity and encourages his followers to look for new solutions, or new ways of doing things.
- **Individual Consideration:** The leader knows how to appreciate the individual contribution of each of the team members to the overall objective, and therefore manages to motivate his followers with recognition.

In the Six-Day War, the charismatic leaders were Israeli Prime Minister Levi Eshkol and General Moshe Dayan, who articulated a vision of defending Israel's very existence, inspiring soldiers and convincing the population of the threat posed by a possible invasion. In addition, these leaders were models to continue demonstrating exemplary behavior and respecting the values that the country represented. There was also intellectual stimulation for innovation and development of new and innovative military tactics that aided success in warfare.

In the Arab Spring, there were charismatic leaders like Mohamed Bouazizi, who became a symbol of the struggle against oppression and unemployment in Tunisia after his self-immolation. There were also leaders who articulated an optimistic vision and motivated people to fight for democracy and the Human Rights like the Egyptian Mohamed El Baradei. In addition, these leaders valued the individual contribution of activists and devoted time and resources to recognizing the importance of the role each of them played in the collective struggle. There was a stimulation of critical thinking and creativity in the search for new forms of peaceful action and political demonstrations.

In both the Six-Day War and the Arab Spring, charismatic and motivational leaders were able to articulate an inspiring vision and recognize the importance of creativity and the individual contribution of followers. These leadership traits helped mobilize and motivate people to fight for what they believed in.

According to the previous theories and with the events that occurred during the Arab Spring, where the rivers of blood and the clouds of gunpowder and dust that rose over Syria, Iraq, Libya, Yemen and other territories of the Middle East since 2011 (Conde, 2018). Social mobilizations against oppressive governments turned into large social outbursts that began to seek the necessary social and political transformation in a region so devastated by war.

Since December 2010, several Arab peoples have risen up against their dictatorial regimes. These uprisings gave different results for and against the shift regimes. The different rebellions that took place on a regional and global scale produced changes in the political systems of government.



This has generated, around the conflict between peoples and rulers, the clash of alignments of States that try to promote their regional interests and roll back those of their adversaries; conflicts that have led to the loss of leadership by the rulers. According to Zaleznik (1997), leadership inevitably requires the use of power to influence the thoughts and actions of others, because there is a close relationship between power and leadership. Power is a means to obedience. On the other hand, leadership is a process of influencing the behavior of others. Both power and leadership result in the effect an individual exerts on the behavior of other people.

The close relationship between power and leadership can be clearly seen in the Six-Day War and the Arab Spring. In both cases, the leaders exerted great influence over their followers and managed to mobilize the masses to achieve their goals. In the case of the Six-Day War, Israeli leaders used the military and political power they had to mobilize the population and create a sense of urgency in defending the very existence of the State of Israel.

In the Arab Spring, social movement leaders used their convening and mobilizing power to challenge established authoritarian regimes and fight for democracy and the Human Rights. Through their inspiring leadership, these activists managed to mobilize the population and create a sense of empowerment to fight for their rights and freedom.

In both the Six-Day War and the Arab Spring, leaders used their power and leadership to influence the behavior of others and achieve their goals. The combination of both elements was essential to the success of these social and political change movements.

## The Six-Day War within the framework of Douhet's theory of air warfare

According to Yukl and Van Fleet (1990), leadership is seen as a process that includes influencing the objectives of the tasks and strategies of a group or organization, as well as the people of the organization, to implement the strategies and achieve the objectives, including air power as the decisive element in contemporary warfare conflicts. A review of the conflagrations of the 21st century will show that the strongest side makes extensive use of air power, which sometimes becomes the only element used for extended periods. This modality is based on the belief

that air power has the capacity to induce the surrender of those who suffer such attacks, due to the devastating nature of bombing from the air (Díaz, 1987).

In the case of the Six-Day War, Israel's air superiority was central to its victory in the conflict. Israel's initial airstrike destroyed much of the Egyptian, Jordanian, and Syrian military capability, and allowed ground forces to rapidly advance into enemy territory. In addition, airspace control allowed Israel to spy on its enemies and gain valuable information about their movements and defenses.

In terms of the impact on changing political systems, the Six-Day War intensified political polarization in the region and further reinforced political systems of control and restraint. After the war, Israel occupied the Palestinian territories and began a policy of settlements in them, which increased Palestinian tension and resistance. In addition, the war reinforced the Arab nationalist stance, leading to an increase in militancy and extremism in the region.

Douhet's *theory of air warfare* provides an interesting perspective for analyzing the Six-Day War by highlighting the importance of air superiority in military victory. However, in terms of the impact on changing political systems, the war further polarized the region and reinforced political systems of control and restraint, rather than driving a political transformation towards greater freedom and greater democracy.

The aerial struggle can only develop through quick and violent blows. A state of inferiority can only be transformed into a state of superiority through swift and more violent action than that of the enemy. Therefore, a nation whose air forces are defeated by those of the adversary will expose its own unarmed body to enemy air offensives and will have the Army and Navy with their backs unprotected, just as happened in the Yom Kippur War, in 1973 (Baez, 2018).

In the case of the Six-Day War, which confronted Israel and the Arab countries of Egypt, Jordan, Syria and Iraq in a confrontation that would last Six Days, and which would leave for history a great strategic example of the use of air capabilities to define a conflict from the beginning of it, Israel's military capabilities are shown in order to anticipate the attack of the Arab countries and even more so the great air strategy that resulted in the dismantling of the air strengths of the adversary countries.

As a result of these attacks, the military capabilities of the allied Arab countries were totally decimated by having lost all their air capacity after a large well-planned and better executed air attack, which destroyed the vast majority of enemy aircraft still stationed on the ground, and which gave the Israelis an explainable advantage

during the air battle against the few Arab aircraft that managed to take flight. This was a determining factor in defining an early victory by the Israeli state over the Arab countries.

## Behavioral Theory in the Six-Day War and the Arab Spring

Behavioral theory classifies leaders based on their behaviors. This qualification can be understood and analyzed through the training that the different leaders who participated as rulers during the Arab Spring have had and that give rise to leadership styles: autocratic, democratic, and *laissez-faire*. Behavioral theory can be related to the Six-Day War and the Arab Spring in terms of the different leadership styles that were adopted in each case.

In the Six-Day War, Israeli leaders adopted an autocratic leadership style exercising a high level of control and authority in decision-making and handling the situation. They focused on accomplishing the tasks assigned to them and on achieving strategic military objectives effectively. However, they also demonstrated relationship leadership skills; particularly, in inspiring and motivating their people during a time of great tension.

In the Arab Spring, leaders adopted a more democratic leadership style, involving the population in decision-making and empowering the masses to fight for freedom and social justice. In addition, they valued the importance of interpersonal relationships and solidarity between protesters and social movements.

In both the Six-Day War and the Arab Spring you can see different leadership styles adopted by leaders based on the tasks they had to accomplish and the need to handle complex political and social situations. In addition, the importance of the relationship between leaders and their followers to achieve the desired objectives was assessed.

According to Tannenbaum and Schmidt (1958), contingency leadership theories hold that the type of leadership varies depending on conditions and situational variables, such as the relationship between the leader and his followers. In connection with this theory, one must consider the links between rulers and ruled in Arab countries that came into controversy and opposition with political leaders on the grounds that the Arab Spring phenomenon took place in mid-2011 with a series of social movements and protests in North Africa and the Middle East. This

phenomenon was mainly aimed at making a political, economic, and social change. In most of the countries where the Arab Spring took place, an authoritarian government prevailed, the State was excessively corrupt and, above all, what the insurgent crowds asked for were better living conditions.

The country where the popular uprising arose was Tunisia, when Mohamed Bouazizi, a 26-year-old, blew himself up in a public square in protest against the Tunisian government. This event motivated different social groups to unite to seek change in all areas: political, economic, and social, since they were subject to an authoritarian regime, led at that time by former President Ben Ali, who was the first leader of the Arab Spring to leave power. But this was only the beginning of the movement: the next country was Egypt, when it overthrew the regime imposed by Hosni Mubarak, and whose fall was followed by that of Muammar Gaddafi, in Libya, and those of the dictators of other countries, such as Yemen and Morocco.

One of the most important factors in the Arab Spring, and that we must understand, is the *conservation of the leaders*; that is, the seniority they had in power, which they had hoarded for years, and the fact that they themselves chose their successors; they even enthroned their relatives in positions of importance within the government, and in this way guaranteed absolute control over the institutions (Amnesty, 2016).

Economic factors also triggered discontent in society. The situation was very difficult, due to the increase in the prices of food and raw materials: in some of these countries increases of up to 80% were reached. In the case of Egypt, for example, one of the many mobilizations took place in Tahrir Square; the protesters had as their slogan: "Bread, freedom and social justice" to demand an improvement in living conditions from the Egyptian Government.

We cannot forget the role of the State apparatus, since it did not respect the Human Rights of the citizens. In fact, the leaders of the mobilizations were persecuted, and not infrequently their physical integrity was violated. Another common denominator in all the protests was the demand, on the part of the governed, for freedom: they were subjected to a regime where there was no democracy. And without a democracy, therefore, there was no citizen participation nor, much less, political rights, nor freedom of expression, etc.

As we know, the Arab Spring was a phenomenon that imposed a before and after in the countries that were involved; the factors that constituted this movement are different, and they are not enough to explain the complexity of this phenomenon. The economic, political and social change that was made was historic, because the

opportunity for a democracy to exist in some Arab or Islamic-influenced country had never been thought of, and it is now possible to think that way. The leadership described here was fundamental in the achievement of the objectives, as well as the area in which air power is exercised, as evidenced in different conflicts in which humanity has fallen.

## Air supremacy as a relevant aspect to win wars

*Air supremacy* is the most favorable air control status that exists within the three that define NATO and the US Department of Defense. The concrete definition that both entities offer is that degree of superiority in which the enemy air force is unable to make any effective interference (Nievas, 2016).

Air supremacy is often invoked as the highest degree of air control. Defined as “degree of superiority to which the enemy air force is incapable of making any effective interference.” At present, air supremacy is the key to North American aggressions. From the first moment, bombing is carried out using high technology to suppress the batteries of air defense, destroy the runways of airports and hostile aircraft on the ground, which usually if they could reach to fly would have to operate in such a lower environment, monitored from all angles and where the aggressors also have supremacy in electronic warfare, which would practically be shot down in the first actions (Carreras, 1995).

After the First World War, the first in which aviation played an important role, many specialists considered the importance of air supremacy. In his book *The Mastery of the Air*, General Giulio Douhet referred to it. Thus, at the beginning of World War II, the main combatants took into account the capital importance of air control.

Air power remains a fundamental part of military strategies today, as detailed in the book *The Future of Air Power: In the Aftermath of the Gulf War*, by Richard H. Shultz and Robert L. Pfaltzgraff, where the importance of air power in modern military operations is presented. The book indicates that airpower is vital for a wide range of military missions, including surveillance and reconnaissance, as well as transportation and logistics, strategic attack, and close air support (Shultz & Pfaltzgarff, 1992).

At present, countries such as the United States, Russia, China and the United Kingdom continue to invest in improving air power by developing advanced

technologies and modernizing their air forces. This reflects the continuing importance of air power in warfare and national defense today.

The importance of air power in the present is reflected in the wide range of military missions that such power can perform and the considerable investments in its development and modernization by the major world powers.

Current air power remains a fundamental part of military strategies, and its importance has been accentuated in the context of globalization and growing international interconnection. Therefore, some reasons are presented that highlight the importance of air power in current and future conflicts:

- **Surveillance and reconnaissance:** Air superiority allows detailed observation of the battlefield as well as enemy activities and movements. Through technologies such as satellites, drones, and reconnaissance aircraft, air power provides an important advantage in monitoring enemy activities.
- **Transportation and logistics:** Military aircraft are vital for the transportation of personnel, weaponry, and supplies, especially in conflict or hard-to-reach areas. In addition, resupply planes allow expanding the range of action and prolonging missions.
- **Strategic attack:** Airstrikes can be used to neutralize strategic targets, such as military bases, command centers, and air defense systems. Today, cruise missile systems enable precise air strikes from long distances.
- **Close air support:** Cooperation between ground and air forces is critical to successful military operations. Combat aircraft can provide close air support for ground troops by attacking nearby enemy targets and providing air protection.

Air power remains central to today's military strategies providing advantages in surveillance, transportation, strategic attack, and close air support. Its ability to act quickly and dynamically makes it an invaluable resource for meeting current and future military challenges; this power has played a crucial role in numerous military campaigns throughout history. Three events in particular illustrate the importance of air power in warfare: the 1991 Gulf campaign (Calvo, 2014), the German bombing of London during World War II (Arango & Pedraza, 2020), and the 1999 NATO bombing of Yugoslavia (Galletti, 2023).

In the 1991 Gulf Campaign, the West, with a US-led coalition, used air superiority to conduct a strategic bombing campaign in Iraq. The coalition launched a total of more than 100,000 air missions over Iraqi territory, including the use of advanced technology and the coordination of multiple weapons systems to achieve its

objectives. Air power was instrumental in the coalition's victory, inflicting damage on enemy forces, disrupting Iraqi logistics, and destroying much of the country's infrastructure.

In 1940, the German Luftwaffe used air power against Britain, in the framework of the Battle of Britain and the *Blitz* of London (Navarro, 2016). The aerial bombardment was carried out by the Luftwaffe and was aimed at attacking infrastructure and the civilian population. While the attack did not achieve the goal of demoralizing the British, air power did play a crucial role in the British victory, providing the British with the means to repel air attacks.

In 1999, NATO carried out an aerial bombing campaign in Yugoslavia, in response to the conflict in Kosovo (Gómez, 2009). The bombing campaign was designed to degrade Yugoslavia's military capability, but it also resulted in the destruction of civilian infrastructure and the deaths of hundreds of civilians. Air power was used to attack a number of military targets in Yugoslavia, which weakened the Yugoslav army's ability to continue the campaign against Kosovar troops.

Air power has proven to be a key tool for conducting successful military operations in various conflicts. Both the Gulf campaign and the German bombing of London and NATO bombing of Yugoslavia illustrate the importance of air power in warfare and how its use can have both military and civilian consequences.

## Conclusions

Air power has had a significant impact on the transformation of political systems into military and social conflicts. Two cases that exemplify such changes are the Six-Day War, in 1967, and the Arab Spring, which began in 2010.

In the Six-Day War, Israel achieved a stunning victory by using its air force effectively to destroy most Egyptian, Syrian, and Jordanian air and ground forces. Israeli air superiority allowed ground forces to advance with ease and capture important territories, including the Sinai Peninsula, the Gaza Strip, the West Bank, East Jerusalem, and the Golan Heights. This victory transformed not only the military situation in the Middle East, but also the region's political systems. As a result, Israel strengthened ties with the United States and became a regional power in the Middle East. In addition, the Six-Day War led to a rise in Palestinian nationalism and the creation of terrorist groups such as Al Qaeda and Hezbollah.

In the Arab Spring, air power also played an important role in political transformation. In 2011, the Arab Spring began with peaceful protests in Tunisia, which

quickly spread throughout the region. In Libya, NATO military intervention, with bombing and close air support, helped the rebels overthrow the Gaddafi regime. In addition, the use of drones by the United States and its allies enabled the Armed Forces Identify, locate and attack specific targets in remote locations. In Syria, the Assad regime's air force used airstrikes and shelling against civilians, prompting an international response and growing opposition to the regime.

As a result of these military and social conflicts, significant political transformations were carried out led by people who were characterized by combining cognitive capabilities about air power, knowledge of the enemy, understanding of their own culture and that of the counterpart, and exploring technological and strategic innovation. That leadership gave the necessary strength to people who managed to influence the minds of broad sectors of the population, motivating them to fight to solve some personal problems, but which are ultimately identified as common problems, and achieving levels of democracy capable of promoting justice and freedom simultaneously.

It is evident that air power continues to have a significant impact on the transformation of the political systems of countries in military and social conflict. The Six-Day War and the Arab Spring show how air superiority has allowed armies to occupy territory and defeat their enemies. They have also led to increased international attention on countries' political systems, their functioning, corruption, and lack of civil liberties. Air warfare has changed both the political and social spheres; in some cases, it has done so positively, but it has also generated political and social instability, and protracted military conflicts.



## References

- Ajansi, A. (2021, 25 de enero). *Los egipcios celebran una década de la Primavera Árabe*. Anadolu Ajansi. <https://www.aa.com.tr/es/mundo/los-egipcios-celebran-una-d%C3%A9cada-de-la-primavera-%C3%A1rabe/2122353#>
- Amnesty. (2016). *La Primavera Árabe cinco años después*. Amnistía Internacional. <https://www.es.amnesty.org/en-que-estamos/reportajes/primavera-arabe-5-anos-despues/>
- Arango, C., & Pedraza, M. (2020). Poder aéreo y el concepto de centro de gravedad: la Batalla de Inglaterra como estudio de caso. *Revista científica general José María Córdova*, 18(31), 483-494. <https://doi.org/10.21830/19006586.637>
- Baez, F. (2018). *La acción militar conjunta para el logro de la superioridad aérea*. <http://www.cefadigital.edu.ar/bitstream/1847939/1183/1/TFI%2002-2018%20BAEZ.pdf>
- Bass, B. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/hrm.3930250310>
- Bass, B. (1999). Two decades of research and development in transformational leadership. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, 8, 9-32. <https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/135943299398410>
- Bermúdez, A. (2017, 5 de junio). *Guerra de los Seis Días: el conflicto relámpago ocurrido hace medio siglo entre Israel, Egipto, Jordania y Siria que cambió para siempre Medio Oriente*. BBC. <https://www.bbc.com/mundo/noticias-internacional-40139818>
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership*. Harper & Row.
- Calvo, J. (2014, 12 de noviembre). *El poder aéreo y la campaña contra el Estado Islámico*. Defensa.com <https://www.defensa.com/analisis-gesi/poder-aereo-campana-contra-estado-islamico>
- Carreras, E. (1995). *Por el dominio del aire*. Editora Política de las FAR.
- Conde, G. (2018). *El Medio Oriente: entre rebeliones populares y geopolítica*. <https://revistas.uexnado.edu.co/index.php/oasis/article/view/5325/8980>
- Díaz, J. (1987). *El dominio del aire*. <http://www.ecema.edu.uy/Anexo/LibrosLibros/69.pdf>
- Driss, A. (2011). *Reflexiones sobre la revolución tunecina (ARI)*. <https://www.realinstitutoelcano.org/analisis/reflexiones-sobre-la-revolucion-tunecina-ari/>
- Gómez, J. (2009). *Análisis de la intervención de la OTAN en la crisis de Kosovo, como reflejo de las transformaciones del concepto estratégico de la alianza de 1999* [Tesis de pregrado]. Universidad Colegio Mayor Nuestra Señora del Rosario. <https://repository.urosario.edu.co/server/api/core/bitstreams/d0ee5870-feef-4b01-a4e0-3d82a-c3ae67f/content>
- Galletti, D. (2023, 24 de marzo). *¿Cómo la OTAN demostró su poderío militar sobre Yugoslavia?* Prensa Latina <https://www.prensa-latina.cu/2023/03/24/como-la-otan-demonstro-su-poderio-militar-sobre-yugoslavia>

- Kouzes, M., & Posner, B. (2018). *El desafío del liderazgo. Cómo hacer realidad cosas extraordinarias en una organización*. <https://www.reverte.com/media/reverte/files/book-attachment-3197.pdf>
- Navarro, C. (2016). La Estela del Blitz: el constructo cultural británico tras la Segunda Guerra Mundial. *Revista de Filología Románica*, 33. <https://go.gale.com/ps/i.do?id=GALE%7CA501079113&sid=googleScholar&v=2.1&it=r&linkaccess=abs&issn=19882815&p=IF-ME&sw=w&userGroupName=anon%7Eb1963c20&aty=open+web+entry>
- Nievas, F. (2016). *El mito de la supremacía aérea como aspecto fundamental en la guerra*. [http://sedici.unlp.edu.ar/bitstream/handle/10915/74821/Documento\\_Completo.pdf-PDFA.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y](http://sedici.unlp.edu.ar/bitstream/handle/10915/74821/Documento_Completo.pdf-PDFA.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y)
- Regev, D. (2017, 5 de julio). *Opinión: 1967, la guerra que nunca terminó*. DW. <https://www.dw.com/es/opini%C3%B3n-1967-la-guerra-que-nunca-termin%C3%B3/a-39115048>
- Figueroa, M. (2011). *La problemática político-social en Libia en 2011, estudiada desde la perspectiva Constructivista de las Relaciones Internacionales* [Tesis de maestría]. Instituto Tecnológico y de Estudios Superiores de Monterrey. <https://repositorio.tec.mx/bitstream/handle/11285/629006/33068001103481.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Seivane, R., Trigo, L., & Velaz, F. (2005). *Conflictos por el agua en la cuenca del Jordán*. <https://dialnet.unirioja.es/descarga/articulo/4578908.pdf>
- Shultz, R., & Pfaltzgarff, R. (1992). *The Future of Air Power in the Aftermath of the Gulf War*. [https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/AUPress/Books/B\\_0048\\_SHULTZ\\_FUTURE\\_OF\\_AIRPOWER.pdf](https://www.airuniversity.af.edu/Portals/10/AUPress/Books/B_0048_SHULTZ_FUTURE_OF_AIRPOWER.pdf)
- Tannenbaum, L., & Schmidt, J. (1958). *Teoría de Tannenbaum y Schmidt*. <https://es.scribd.com/doc/292872273/Teoria-de-Tannenbaum-y-Schmidt-docx>
- Yukl, G., & Van Fleet, D. (1990). Theory and Research on Leadership in Organizations. M. Dunnette, & L. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (pp. 147-197). Consulting Psychologists Press. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286930761\\_Theory\\_and\\_Research\\_on\\_Leadership\\_in\\_Organizations](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/286930761_Theory_and_Research_on_Leadership_in_Organizations)
- Zaleznik, A. (1997). *Managers and Leaders: Are They Different*. <https://hbr.org/2004/01/managers-and-leaders-are-they-different>