

# THE BANALITY OF A WAR AND ITS SILENT VICTIMS

## La banalidad de una guerra y sus víctimas silenciosas

---

YOLANDA SUSANA CELI GARCÉS\*

Private Technical University of Loja / Loja-Ecuador

yscelli@itpl.edu.ec

ORCID Codige: <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5969-5730>

---

### Abstract

Generally, the war has been seen as the midwife of every misfortune, social disasters, poverty, analfabet and other epithets more. And of course it is, however, the problem of war is the question of power. The Story of Mankind has been revealed under those parameters, the struggle for power, and the conquest of this has only been possible as a country, a society, a people or a particular class moves to the other in the stopping power and generate objective and subjective conditions to exercise it. There is no historical reference evidencing this conquest by other means other than violence, it puts us in front of two interpretations we refer the Marxist classics: just wars and unjust wars. It is not outside the voragines of this, education and its educational centers, which have been affected in the same way, affecting, even more, the weakest, leaving without education or simply making them part of their arms ranks, as a combatant more than he does not know. It is not outside the voragines of this, education and its educational centers, which have been affected in the same way, affecting, even more, the weakest, leaving without education or simply making them part of their arms ranks, as a combatant more than he does not know. Arguments to convene people to attend this tragedy are varied. In recent years it has redoubled its efforts to retake strongly religious discourse as banal argument to wage war in pursuit of a new division of the world, leaving aside any type of intervention, the little that is done does not affect, but it does not help either.

---

### Keywords

War, power, human action, religion, world, education

**Suggested form of citing:** Celi G., Yolanda (2018). The banality of a war and its silent victims. *Sophia, colección de Filosofía de la Educación*, 24(1), pp. 255-278.

---

\* Master's Degree in Children's and Young People's Literature. Higher Diploma in Innovative Pedagogies. Bachelor of Science in Education, specialization in adult education. He has worked as a teacher in some institutions of secondary and higher education. Writer of several school texts in the area of Language and Literature.

### Resumen

Generalmente la guerra ha sido vista como la partera de todas las desgracias, catástrofes sociales, miseria y otros calificativos más. Y desde luego que es así, no obstante, el problema de la guerra es el problema del poder. La historia de la humanidad se ha develado bajo esos parámetros, la lucha por el poder, y la conquista de éste solo ha sido posible en la medida que un país, una sociedad, un pueblo o una clase en particular desplacen a la otra en la detención del poder y genere las condiciones objetivas y subjetivas para poder ejercerlo. No hay un referente histórico que evidencie esta conquista por otra vía que no sea la de la violencia, la misma que nos pone de frente a dos interpretaciones que nos refieren los clásicos del marxismo: las guerras justas y las guerras injustas. No queda fuera de los vorágines de esta, la educación y sus centros educativos, que han sido afectados de igual forma, afectando, aún más, a los más débiles, dejando sin educación o simplemente haciéndolos parte de sus filas de armas, como un combatiente más de lo que desconoce. Los argumentos para convocar a los pueblos a asistir a esa tragedia son variados. En los últimos años se ha redoblado el esfuerzo por retomar con fuerza el discurso religioso como el banal argumento para desatar la guerra en pos de una nueva repartición del mundo, dejando de lado cualquier tipo de intervención, lo poco que se hace no afecta, pero tampoco ayuda.

### Palabras clave

Guerra, poder, acción humana, religión, repartición del mundo, educación.

256



## Introduction

A collective social imaginary would make us think that it is a desire of humanity that wars end and be erased from the face of the earth as instruments that resolve the different contradictions generated by the social movement, and above all, that it is no longer that means by which the struggle for power is resolved. But unfortunately it does not happen. It is an imaginary, an illusion that although it is certain can be contrasted with everything that it has generated in terms of loss of life, mutations, destruction, displacements, continues to be an argument that does not have weight to deny it, to neutralize it.

The millions of Indians cruelly murdered in the colonization process of America. Many others and innumerable millions of deaths that caused the independence wars in the world against the slave and colonial vassalage. The democratic revolutions and the fight against the feudal, monarchical regimes that gave form, among others, to the “religious struggles” (crusades<sup>1</sup>) as arguments for the support of their territorial conquests. The First World War which is endorsed the death of approximately 40 million people, the Second World War that contributed to the macabre amount of 50 million victims, “double or triple the injured and another 50 million displaced forced or deported” (Shagún, 2014).

At present, no less heartbreaking and frustrating is the situation of 28 million children who cannot be educated because of war: the attempt on Malala; the 132 children killed in Pehamar; the kidnapping of

Nigerian girls by Boko Haram; children who are trained for war, among others. Alarming data from Goron Brown, special envoy of the United Nations to the International Conference held in Oslo, also denounces that educational centers, created for education and hope, serve as storage warehouses for weapons, ammunition, among others.

The summary of victims does not stop being interminable. Revolutions or armed struggles in Asia, the East, Latin America, the Cold War, the sustained conflict in the Levant, Maghreb, Arab countries and the Gulf, and what can we say about that other war that still generates more deaths and to which we put it under euphemisms such as the plagues, diseases, misery. Bloody political instruments that have marked the dynamics of societies in the world, conjecturing absurdly, that wars are inevitable and necessary. Pseudo-theories outside of logic that also think that education is not meaningful and that children are soldiers of war, but not builders of their own future. Conflict that affects each of the individuals in different aspects and contexts of their life.

Without pretending to advocate violence, without expressing agreement with armed conflicts, it can be argued that violence, conflicts, wars are understandable from the social script and the historical movement. We must understand its nature from the espite of the oppressor, subjugator as well as from the oppressed, the subjugated, much more when their interpretation escapes the idealist imaginary of peace and raises it from the concrete reality, from the two visions or points of view that precisely yields Mao Tse-tung, wars can have a fair and unjust aspect and the fairness of their nature makes them historically justifiable, but without turning schools into places of fear.

History shows that wars are divided into two classes: the just and the unjust. All progressive wars are just, and all those that impede progress are unjust. As for the unjust wars, the First World War is a case in which both sides fought for imperialist interests; therefore, the communists of the whole world resolutely opposed it. The way to fight a war of this kind is to do everything possible to prevent it before it explodes and, if it breaks out, to oppose the war to war, to oppose the just war to the unjust war, whenever possible (MaoTse -tung, 1976).

Of course there have been efforts to make changes or peaceful transitions. Pacifism has also been a current that has been permanently active; not only by definition, but as a dynamic movement that has had its emblematic representatives such as Mahatma Gandhi<sup>2</sup> or Martin Luther King, among many others. Más allá de la propuesta teórica, metodológica, de su dinámica, sus esfuerzos quedaron anclados en el reformismo,

en las reestructuraciones que devinieron en eclecticismos económicos, políticos, en verdaderos híbridos sociales que, en final de cuentas, solo lograron conciliar a unos y a otros, sentar en la mesa a opresores y a oprimidos sin que se resuelvan las contradicciones fundamentales al interior de las sociedades donde ha sido aplicado. Las soluciones no existen, el hambre por el poder, por su lado, persiste, no hay trascendencia, sigue la guerra, sigue incrementándose el analfabetismo mediático en todos sus niveles y edades. According to the 'Lessons from the War 2015' report, armed groups and military forces have attacked thousands of children, teachers and educational institutions in the last five years. In Burma, the Rohingya ethnic group, a minority that is persecuted, today, for interreligious disturbances in which children and women are its greatest victims. The predatory war of conscience, of innocence.

258



Of course, a subjective vision of pacifism leads us to brandish it as “the key to the ‘silent revolution’” (Ruiz, 2006) without understanding that revolutions demand, inevitably, a strident violence that goes beyond reform and creates the conditions for new forms of production, social organization, structure of power and with them, a new way of life.

## War and some conceptual arguments

War has not been alien to us in any passage of the historical evolution of humanity. It manifests in its first forms as violence by territorial defense, clans, tribes, peoples and others, became more strongly with the appearance of private property and with it of the classes. “It is the highest form of struggle to resolve the contradictions between classes, nations, states or political groups, when these contradictions have reached a certain stage of their development” (Tse-tung, 1968, p. 195).

There are many concepts about war, but undoubtedly the one issued by General Karl Von Clausewitz<sup>3</sup> in a timely manner is objective and sticks to a correct interpretation of how, under what conditions and with what objectives they are presented. Perhaps the most well-known meaning is that which holds that “war is the continuation of politics by other means”, that is, by defining the political character of war as a policy, it grants social foundations and in them, interests intimately adjusted to its nature as a class, nation or group in particular. The Latin American philosopher, Lora Cam, argued that “politics is the set of theoretical-practical attitudes, through which social classes express their interests -particularly economic- in front of themselves and especially in front of the state”

(1988, p. 1988) and if analyzed under this conceptual premise, this would come to constitute a bloody act that reflects the particular economic interests of individuals, easy to deduce this illogical idea of those who own the production or intend to be at the cost of making of innocent lives, of the mutilation of the conscientious freedom of human beings, of carrying out coercive acts against children, not only in violent aspects, but also in the educational field, since it is impossible for them to establish themselves and be able to grow and educate themselves. The priorities of some are not the urgencies of others.

To the criterion or concept of Calusewitz is added that of Mao Tse-tung for whom war is understood as a continuation of politics and is in itself a political action. There has never been, since ancient times, any war that did not have a political character.

It is clear that war is not a political expression, on the contrary, by itself it is political, then we can understand that if in the epoch or slave production mode, war necessarily had to orbit around the interests of the lords, masters and slavers. Here the figure was presented in relation to wars to sustain that type of oppressive regime, and, obviously, these “fair” wars for those who held power were unfair to the slaves; the wars that the slaves undertook to conquer their manumission were always going to have the degree of justice for their objectives and, logically, unfair to their adversaries, because it is by these means that they -the slavers- lost power and with it their political, social and above all economic instrumentation.

On the same tenor, not different in the age of feudalism, those who supported this system of exploitation and concentration were basically priests and other sectors linked to religion, it is clear that their wars of prey had the same argument, the maintenance of relations of production that help to hold the great property of the land, and if, for that there was the need to be pragmatic, well, religion was constituted a good “argument” to drag the masses to live the messianic illusion to cover up the interests to generate colonies, expand territories. While the plebs undertook, with slight pretension, their wars of democratic liberation, trying to liberate the productive forces and advance in the task of concretizing the figure of the nation-state.

These are the antagonisms and some aspects that come from them. Wars have not always been negative, because it is enough to take a look at history to realize that without them the emancipation of slaves would have been an illusion. That the Independence of our peoples would not have materialized, that society itself could not have evolved, and that the



imperialist rapine has not been stopped in its pretensions to generate wars to materialize its purposes.

Of course, this does not deny that war is a political act and with it a vehicle to conquer or defend interests, it has had other nuances, freedoms or the conquest of markets, territories with potential raw materials. The social cleansing for the forced evacuation of peoples and the positioning of others that are more affable to the interests of the powers. Clausewitz insists, deepens in the argument, he gives war the character of an instrument, less than a triviality endowed with a certain naturalness that is not must not be alien to human beings. While the Geneva Convention (March, 2011) emphasizes how in armed conflicts, children and youth, have been the most affected given their vulnerability, young people go from being victims to victimizers, their options are reduced to be part of this global devastation that disintegrates the family and leaves it without support to face these adversities. Deadly, silent impact that affect and impact life's projections.

From that perspective war cannot be observed only from one angle: destruction. it is important to analyze it from the dialectical nuance, without destruction there is no construction, only thus the new is erected. In all scenarios, war seeks to impose interests, wills. "War is therefore an act of force to compel the contrary to the fulfillment of our will" (Causewitz, 1991, p. 3). The problem here is which side of strength and will we are on.

## "Religious" wars

If we conform to the criterion issued by Aristotle on the *zoon politikon*, "man is a political animal" we can also claim that all human activity is political. Moreover, when the concept of politics is given its just dimension as to the expression of the interests of groups, countries, classes. If war is political, one can sign that religion is political too.

The problem arises when someone pretends or intends to "argue" a war or a conflict from the perspective of the naked religion of politics. There are many historical references about the "religious" character of wars. The re-conquest of Spain. In fact, the colonization of America by Spain had the civilizing argument, understood as Christianizing the Indians. The crusades, the Muslim conquest, the religious wars in France<sup>4</sup>, and nowadays, the conflicts of the Middle East.

A religious war is simple to define - it is a war recognized as such and whose main cause is religion. It is a violent manifestation between

parties that hold different religious positions and that seek to be solved by violent means. It is a religious discussion that takes to another plane (Girondella, 2008). Despite what Girondella cites, it is evident that it is not “simple” to define what a religious war is, since it is simplified to a religious act, of “postures”. It may be that the quotation is not the most eloquent but it was always important to state it because it conceptualizes in a clear, simple and direct manner a precept about religious wars. Of course, there are more elaborate ones, but they fall on the same basis as the mentioned quote that feeds -conceptually- misconceptions that are daily reproduced in international news. Religion as a cause of conflicts.

“With this sign you will win” assured the Emperor Constantine I, The Great (Flavius Valerius Aurelius Constantine) to his faithful fighters who were armed with banners highlighting the cross of Christ, which was also reproduced on the shields of the soldiers as a sign of immortality.

Of course the famous slogan was a “gift of the divinity”: “According to the tradition collected by Eusebio de Nicomedia, the day before the battle of the Milvian bridge, Constantine saw in the sky a sign: a cross accompanied by the legend in *hoc signo vinces* (with this sign you will win) “(biografiasyvidas, 2014). Obviously, the expansion of the Roman Empire to the West and with it Christianity was not the work of mortals, in the case of Constantine, but “work of God”, without their help, protection and above all his will <sup>5</sup>was unlikely that the successes will give.

What they do not say about the campaigns of Constantine or other military campaigns of Christians and later Catholics is that under the slogans and religious objectives was the need for territorial expansionism, with it, the merchandise trade, slave trade, fertile land and of course, the economic, productive, social, political and military strengthening of the empire. It is likely that one of the most dramatic events in the history of “religious wars” is the crusades, since here we can clearly demonstrate the behavior of two fundamental actors: the Catholic Church and the Muslims. The “unleashing” of the fury of the “catholic god” against the Moors <sup>6</sup>could only be explained under the overlapping logic of the Catholic Church of that imperative to fight evil, the infidels, the sinful Muslims who, according to the church, intended to expand his heresy throughout the world. The rescue of the “good religion” from the clutches of the “bad religion” generated three crusades between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries.

Education is not exempt from these so-called religious wars. The legitimation of the political system has always taken education as its a priori resource and through this the transmission of values, ideologies (at some point), of knowledge, were its foundation. But also as part of the



palpable, eloquent reality, it is known that the interest of dominating this space on the part of the groups of power has more weight, because the cultural element of religion is key in the educational centers trying to be the channel it so that each culture can be differentiated from the others. The conflict arises; the exclusionary became the bloody wars of religion.

The fact is that power, politics, does not measure its expansion space, takes whatever it wants in any way, religion goes down the same path, under the pretext of its cultural beliefs it has killed millions of people and left others homeless. Today, the Political-religious-cultural power is the most violent killer.

The Islamic expansionism in the East and that with much decision spread to the West, to reach the very bosom of Catholicism, generated a “natural” reaction. The arguments for war, Christianity and Catholicism no longer had only in the Bible, but also the development of the theologian episteme whose doctrine of war supported by the Catholic faith had a clear objective: the defense of territories conquered in blood and fire for the church, territories that played a decisive role in the construction of colonial power, the maintenance of trade routes in the Middle Ages and later the strengthening of the capitalist construction of Europe.

On the “other side” the Islamic world supported its conquering effort on several fronts. We must remember the Seldjuk<sup>7</sup> campaign in the Near East, and their conquest of Syria and Palestine. The Turkish invasion. The expansionist power of the Byzantine Empire. The Islamic power not only came to conquer territories in Spain, but also had the ability to reach the center of France in the eighth century. That is to say until the eleventh century, the Muslims had conquered two thirds of the territories that belonged to the Christians and the Catholic Church: Palestine, the land of Jesus Christ; Egypt, the place where monastic Christianity was born. Asia Minor, where Saint Paul generated the foundations of the first Christian communities.

With the Muslim deployment empires were built, caliphates, a commercial corridor that had the ability to take over the “western” markets. That is, neither the Christian God nor Muslim Allah (Allah) “were ever at war”, the earthly bid for territories, goods, raw materials, slaves, commerce, ports, political power were the central arguments of the castes, power groups, oligarchies, classes, nations. Of course, Christians, Catholics and Muslims have not been the only ones who have used the thesis of religion to undertake their military campaigns on an essentially economic basis, but many others have developed under the same param-

eters. But there is one in particular that has been notorious and that survives with great force and dynamism, the Jewish religion.

Without it being the purpose of this exercise to analyze the religions, their origins and others, when we focus on the “Jewish” theme, we do so thinking of the coming and going of a religiously empowered people by their fundamentalist conceptions and focused on the task they have had many other peoples or nationalities in the world: the figure of the nation-state. The non-existence of a firm territorial space that facilitates the creation of the State of Israel until the beginning of the last century determined, to a large extent, that it be the religious arguments exposed in the old testament.

... the justification for vindicating the legitimacy of the installation of the State of Israel in Palestinian territory is found in the “Bible and history”. It is fundamentally based on the consideration of Palestine as its “historical homeland” founded on the “promise” of the Messiah to the Jewish people. Of course, historically, this claim is unfounded: the Jewish kingdoms of David and Solomon lasted seventy-three years and even if one considers as independent the entire history of the ancient Jewish kingdoms, from the conquest of Canaan by David in 1000 BC. C. until the eradication of Judea in 586 a. C, we arrived at a Jewish regime of only 414 years. The Jewish kingdoms were only one of the many periods in the history of ancient Palestine (Cerio, 2014, p. 54).

263



“The promised land”, the decisions of “God”, the will of men or simply the need to have a territory, any argument is good, applicable and in fact, even valid. And if the argumentative motivations are religious, it is obvious that under that premise the ability of mobilization of the faithful to the crusades for the conquest of territories, markets, strategic valuations and others are important, incidental, and even determining.

And the history of “religious wars” was not anchored in the centuries from the seventh to the nineteenth century, in any way, today in the XXI century we are still confronting the war, and as has been maintained, not only under the argument of the fight against the Axis of Evil, or against terrorism, drugs, guerrillas, but survive the struggles with banal religious arguments such as those that are intended to be raised in Syria, Iraq, Iran, Turkey, Afghanistan and others. The struggle to impose Islam! Which also makes it impossible for the youngest to go to schools for fear of repression or death or destruction of educational centers, for example in Syria, according to Unesco data. 2.6 million children cannot attend school. Studying has also become a sin.

The Taliban attack schools -especially of girls- and threaten the teachers, while the Pakistani government looks the other way, given the impossibility of controlling the radical Islamist groups. Between 2010 and 2013, a total of 839 schools, 81 of them just last year, were destroyed in the province of Khiber Pakhtunkha (KPK). The literacy rate is 16 percent in that province and in the FATA tribal areas, compared to 47 percent on average in the rest of Pakistan (Bonet, 2013, p. 54).

Children and young people appear as the most fragile human objectives, religious arguments have no place when the conflict causes vulnerability, destruction, exposure. Having no education are forcedly recruiting to give continuity to the absurd. And those who have been able to migrate to countries that welcome them as, Turkey, Lebanon, Jordan, Egypt, face the problem that the capacity of the schools there is limited and cannot solve the problem.

The capacity of schools exceeds the flood of new students, as they see the need to increase transport and school supplies, while at other times the curricular and language differences are an obstacle for schools that are already fragile. (Izquierdo, 2015, p. 3).

There is no way out, the hopes lie between a gear that does not end, only expands, extends and the situation continues its course towards oblivion, is that religious war, political war, non-existent medication, leaves in the edge of the abyss to all those who could be the axis of change, of a transformation that seeks the freedom to be and to be able to do.

The shooting that Malala suffered in Pakistan has had a worldwide resonance, but unfortunately it is only a regrettable and habitual practice. In November 2014, 11 children were killed in the attack on the school in Qqboun, east of Damascus; In Afghanistan, rebel groups regularly and deliberately attack schools, with more than 613 incidents recorded in 2009. In 2010, some 450 schools in this country had to close due to lack of security and 74 children died as a consequence of the suicide attacks and explosives deliberately placed in the path traveled by girls who went to school; in the framework of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, the Israeli military offensives destroyed 280 schools between 2008 and 2009; in Thailand, schools and teachers have become targets of attacks in the extreme south of the country; in Pakistan, insurgent groups operating in the northwest have attacked primary and secondary schools for girls. In one of these assaults, 95 girls who left school were injured; In India, Naxalite groups have systematically attacked Chhattisgarh schools with the aim of weakening government infrastructure; in Yemen, the 725 schools in the southern district of Saada had to remain closed dur-

ing the fighting in 2009 and 2010 and more than 200 schools were destroyed; in northern Nigeria, Boko Haram has set fire to more than 300 schools since 2012; in Donetsk ten people were killed in the bombing of a school in October 2014 and the Gaza crisis in 2014 destroyed at least seven schools of the UN agency for Palestinian refugees and caused damage to a total of 134 schools. (Izquierdo, 2015, p. 6).

The poor protection, shows that the school is the last place to which humanitarian aid can reach, many agencies focus more on these can be the “propagation” of violent ideologies and therefore the radicalization of violence would be encouraged, the tendency to care for refugees, to save lives, is the priority. Dichotomy of logical human behavior. Without life there is no hope of change.

War did not come alone, it did not only bring violence, as we have mentioned, it is not only a history of power, it is a recalcitrant reality of what the peoples have had to endure and continue to do so in the struggle to survive, and the rest unimportant, there are no priorities other than standing. So, how could we hope to be able to create valid spaces, safe for those who were deprived of their freedom, their power to choose, their willingness to do something dissimilar to what they are living. They could hardly come out; they are already part of the figures not of the projects.

265  
S

## The Islamic state of Iraq and Levant. The third way

When in 1979 the effort to materialize the bourgeois democratic revolution in Iran finally does, they do it precisely by flying a “new ideological banner,” Islamism. It is a fact that religion, those who practice it or direct it can assume an ideological position in front of the phenomena and social movement, but religion itself is not an ideology.

The implementation of religion with a determined political interest throughout history has led those who exercise power to try to reproduce “that religion” to the extent that it is useful to their political, economic and ideological interests. When the Iranian revolution took place collaterally, another type of international conflicts were developing, which generated in the Persian Gulf and the Arab countries, a lot of instability whose foundations we can find in the world bipolarity evidenced in the US-USSR conflict, the military deployment of Israel in the region, the struggle for oil, strategic areas, markets, among others.

These incidental elements in the internal politics of Iran were not only shown as contradictions generated by the convergence of the politi-

cal interests of the great powers, but also generated a nationalist sentiment that little by little was consolidated as a “third way”, that is, In the Islamic world, fundamentally in the countries and peoples that go by the Shiite thesis there was a certain animosity to the Marxist theses of the USSR. The arguments?, Of course, in the first instance passed through the filter of the Koran and its religious foundation: the Marxists no, they are atheists, enemies of God. But in truth, what was involved was some resistance to the communists because those who promoted the democratic revolution in Iran were not the proletariat, since it was almost non-existent or very limited, not only numerically, but in its ability to call and organize and those who encouraged, organized and executed it were the rising bourgeoisie, the one that was constrained by the monopolistic and pro-American policies of Shah Reza Pahlavi<sup>8</sup>.

The concordance in manifesting this has to do with the political program of the communists. If they had driven the revolution, automatically Iran became an appendix of the USSR in the region, and not only that, the ideology placed the big bourgeoisie and even the middle bourgeoisie in front of a conflict of interests because it was almost a fact that with the communist leadership of the revolutionary process came the confiscation of the medium and large property and means of production. Before this reality, they had to “get vaccinated” and the national bourgeoisie took over the direction of the process. Then neutralizing communists who attacked the interests of the bourgeoisie could have a better argument: religion.

The Shah before the Iranian revolution was “took care” of the annihilation of the Communist Party of Iran. In 1962, under American consent and under the fury of the Cold War, he promoted what they called the “White Revolution”, which was nothing more than a bourgeois reform that did not require “bloodshed” in order to materialize it. Of course, what they did was to unleash an unparalleled repressive campaign that aimed basically at two objectives, communists of the Communist Party of Iran (also known as Thude) and democratic young people who called for changes, revolution.

As in other parts of the world where certain elements of the clergy identified with popular struggles (Latin America, Liberation Theology, guerrilla priests or leaders of revolutionary movements from the perspective of Catholicism), in Iran the priests, shiek’ s, ayatollahs, mullahs and others also committed themselves in 1979 to the revolutionary process, but because of their own ideological nature, although they argued revolutionary democratic and anti-imperialist positions, they were far from the communist current. With the triumph of the Iranian revolution

not only that “accounts were settled” with the former allies of the US and the government of the Shah, but also gave continuity to the persecution of communists who now lived in exile.

Then we have democratic revolutionaries linked to the clergy. Not to pretend anything with communists or the Soviet orbit was an aspect of their needs as representatives of a class, but allying or aligning with the US or the “Western” sphere was not in their minds as they always showed themselves as their enemies, their executioners. This must be analyzed not only within the context of international contradictions but also internally. The monopolies managed by the clans of the Shah constrained the development of the national bourgeoisie or the petty bourgeoisie. It could not even take off, much less consolidate, live or produce under the shadow of transnationals and monopolies. Consequences?, An anti-imperialist sentiment and national liberation by the bourgeoisie in advance.

On the other hand, the Umalas maintained a feudal regime (not even semi-feudal, but feudal), they managed large estates and not only that, but they reproduced feudality within their relations of production and generated a rebellious, revolutionary feeling of small peasants who were politically assisted (from religion) by the sheikhs or village priests who allied themselves with the poor peasants against the landowners and in them the hierarchs of Islam. These elements are not different from what happened in Latin America, the Church and its leaders linked to the old gamonal-landowning power and the low level priests in contradictions with the high clergy, because they were by the hand of the people, of the poor peasants.

If it was not with the communists and not with the imperialists, it is located in the “middle”: neither with nor with others. Then the intermediate, eclectic theses that take shape as the “third way” whose particularity is associated with religion are strengthened, hence Islam is given an ideological connotation that is supposed to be above the two ideologies shown or manifested by the classics of Marxism: bourgeois and proletarian ideology.

Although it is true that previously there was already a movement that folded to this proposal and that, it is supposed, kept a certain independence of the two imperialist powers of the USA and USSR, as in the case of Gamal Abdal Nasser (Egypt), Achmed Sukarno (Indonesia) and Josip Broz -Tito (Yugoslavia) that shaped the Organization of Non-aligned Countries, it did not have enough strength to develop under conditions that allow them to consolidate certain, objective or weighty positions before the powers. It is there that only the Iranian revolution manages to materialize this thesis in 1979 and project it in the Levant, the Maghreb and other countries of the

Arab orbit, so much so that Muhammad Gaddafi manages to capture an important political exercise of the “third way” whose theoretical synthesis is the you can find in Gaddafi’s Green Book<sup>9</sup> that he lays as the foundations of a third political and social way (“third universal theory”) against Marxism and capitalist liberalism. A correct understanding of this theory “the third way”, without a doubt, provides better inputs to understand the conflict in the Middle East and, to some extent, explain the why of Al Qaeda, ISIS and the Free Syrian Army.

It is not intended to analyze, justify or question violent methods, to the extent that the war itself is bloody, an objective of this, as I quoted Causewitz, what is intended is to impose the will of some over others, and that no one, absolutely no one in humanity has the ability to “*cats the first stone*” to criticize the violence of adversaries when humanity recently witnessed a brutal aggression by Israel to the Palestinian people generating equal or worse horrors that today happen in Syria and Iraq.

268



## The pretensions of creating the Islamic state (ISIS) in the 21st century and its foundations

There are several theses about the origins of al Qaeda and the militants of the Islamic state and apparently all the roads lead to the USA and the CIA. To realize an anatomy of these groups in truth that is a complex task, because the historical facts that we could contextualize from Afghanistan controlled by the former USSR to our days have been so varied and even, surprising, that it envelops in their conceptions and objectives. When we try to look for the origins of Al Qaeda, we necessarily return to the US-USSR antagonisms, the Cold War<sup>10</sup> and the overlapping conflict between these two powers that used other countries to carry out their non-conventional war exercises.

In the presidential regime of Gerald Ford in the USA -1974- keeping Henry Kissinger as Secretary of State strengthened the work of the CIA on the former USSR and its influence governments.

In 1973, a coup d’état took place in Afghanistan that ended the monarchical regime to give way to the republic that immediately approached the Soviets, in whom they found their best “strategic ally”. Only five years later, Afghanistan began to exercise a pro-Soviet pseudo-socialist regime and was obviously placed on the CIA list to be neutralized.

In 1978, the progressive government of Taraki in Afghanistan managed to suffer the wrath of the United States due to “its egalitarian

and collectivist economic policy”. The Afghan government was mainly seen in the West as “communist” and therefore, a threat to the national security of the United States. The government, however, carried out favorable policies and commitments with the Soviet Union, but it was not a communist government.

In 1978, when the new government came to power, almost immediately the United States secretly began financing rebel groups through the CIA. In 1979, Zbigniew Brzezinski worked closely with his CIA assistant, Robert Gates (who is currently Secretary of Defense), to change President Carter’s Islamic politics. As Brzezinski, he said in a 1998 interview with a publication in France... (Marshall, 2014).

The participation of the US through the CIA in the organization of terrorist groups that are “in charge of doing the dirty work” in the non-affable countries of their system has been historic and, on the contrary, they become a “headache” for his geopolitical vision. Antecedents?, many, the Bay of Pigs invasion or “Playa Girón” in Cuba, 1961 made by mercenaries to “collapse” Castro’s “communist” regime. The organization of the “Contra” in Sandinista Nicaragua, as the best known in Latin America. That is to say, the organization of the armed resistance in Afghanistan against the Soviets who intervened as allies of the Afghan regime to collaborate in the fight against the Muslim rebels was not something new for the world, let alone mechanisms that could be put in doubt regarding its origins.

In 1986, the CIA endorsed a Pakistani ISI plan “to recruit people from all over the world to join the Afghan jihad.” Subsequently: More than 100,000 Islamic militants were trained in Pakistan during 1986 by British special forces, they trained future Al-Qaida and the Taliban members in the manufacture of bombs and other black arts. Their leaders were trained in a CIA camp in Virginia. This was called Operation Cyclone and continued long after the Soviets withdrew in 1989... (Marshall, 2014, p. 57).

Perhaps what the CIA and the US did not clearly understand is that the sponsorship, organization and logistical support to the Taliban <sup>11</sup>could grant them a circumstantial triumph in Afghanistan, but that this, given the conceptions of the Muslims sustained in the “Third way,” sooner or later they were going to go against the West. In this regard, the rest is history, the attack on the “twin towers” and hundreds of other violent actions that endorse the clear position of “Islamists” and their purposes.

With the expulsion of the USSR from Afghanistan and the re-implementation of a theocratic regime, is from there that the strategy of the “third Muslim way” is redesigned for deploying efforts to make the Islamic world the alternative of the peoples to communism and capitalist imperialism.

Later, in 2002, a solid alliance between two of the most renowned representatives of the radicalized “third way” took place: Osama Bin Laden and Abu Musab al-Zarqawi and gave way to the formation of Tawhid wa al-Jihad. Whose basic objectives were to fight the US occupation troops in Iraq after they invaded them to overthrow the regime of Saddam Hussein and establish a puppet regime to the US pretensions.

This organization gave a new face to the independence struggle of the Arab peoples and others where Islam is the official religion, especially in those where the Sunni current is prevalent: the internationalism of the jihad<sup>12</sup> understood not as the struggle for the defense of religion, of Islam, but as the fight against imperialism be it from the western or eastern orbit.

With the disintegration of the USSR<sup>13</sup> the jihadists were left with two pitfalls to materialize their new economic, political and social current: defeat and destroy their enemies that could place them in the friendly regimes of the West and obviously, all the imperialist and capitalist powers headed by USA, France, England -among others-.

The presence of Al-Qaeda in Iraq was not defeated. Although Obama shouted to the world his military and political triumph with the assassination of Osama Bin Laden (May 1, 2011) and proposed the departure of US troops from Iraq:

On August 31, Obama had announced the end of combat operations in Iraq, and according to the Spanish newspaper *El País*, “only 50 thousand of the 144 thousand soldiers will remain until the end of 2011.” The newspaper stressed that at its peak, it reached “165 thousand American troops” stationed in Iraq (Univision, 2011).

In no way did this mean that the fight against “international terrorism” had culminated, on the contrary, there is always the feeling that the US does not want to continue repatriating the corpses of its soldiers killed by the insurgent action, let alone engaging in a conflict. Apparently destined to lose it, to the end, the experience and defeat of the former USSR in Afghanistan under these rebel forces marks that possibility.

After the alliance between Tawhid al-Jihad and Al-Qaeda in Iraq, in 2006, it would be called ISI, Islamic State of Iraq. But in a clear manifestation of strategic management and in order to “win supporters” and material and economic support, they change their name to ISIS, the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria.

Following Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi’s assumption of power, AQI’s operations expanded in Syria, prompting the renaming of AQI that “The Islamic State in Iraq and Syria” (ISIS), sometimes translated as “State Is-

lamic in Iraq and the Levant” (ISIL). The variation in translation is derived from the word al-Sham, which refers to an area that encompasses southern Turkey through Syria to Egypt, which can be translated as “Greater Syria” or “the Levant”. On June 29, 2014, the group changed its name back to simply “Islamic State”, declares a caliphate and the appointment of its leader Abu Bakr al-Baghdadi as Caliph. He exhorted all Muslims to declare allegiance to the new caliphate (Stanford, 2014).

Despite the complex contradictions that these actors have with the US, once again the CIA “uses” them with the purpose of “closing the siege” around the Syrian regime, of Bashar al-Asad who had been marking a serious and worrisome distance with the US as it gets closer and better to Iran, Russia and other countries not compatible with the policies of imperialism. Of course, the CIA and the US hurried efforts to maintain that Syria supported the “terrorist” groups that fought in Iraq and that carried out violent actions in other countries of the US orbit.

In 2010, he became the new leader of the organization (AI) and in 2013 merged the Iraq and Syrian militias to make way for the struggle to form an Islamic state, caliphate<sup>14</sup>, located in a large part of the territories that compromise Iraq and Syria and directed for the Sunni branch of Islam.

We must consider that the members of ISIS have managed to manage seven essential elements in their tactics and strategy to deploy their campaign to build the Islamic state:

1. To make the most of the historic resistance of the Iraqi and Syrian people to the western powers, mainly from the USA, in reference to the invasion or intervention in Iraq. This “anti-imperialist” sentiment provides them with enough social fabric and the human-material resources necessary for the support of their political project not only in the occupation areas that involve approximately 50 thousand square kilometers and a little more than 8 million people, but also abroad, in fact it is estimated that Saudi Arabia and Qatar informally contribute with huge economic resources to the fundamentalist purpose.
2. Erect the flags of the caliphate, as a fighting program. This has allowed them to summon a series of Muslims from Europe and even from North America who have attended the call of Islamic Jihad. In other words, they do not remain in a static or focalized vision of the state, which has managed to create an international imaginary in the struggle that not only recruits everywhere, but also violent action of their devices anywhere in the world.

The composition of ISIS in terms of origin is varied, “According to the files occupied in Sinjar, 41% of foreign terrorists members of the ‘Islamic Emirate in Iraq’ held Saudi nationality, 18.8% were Libyans and only 8,2% were Syrians “(Meysan, 2014) to these we must add French, British and even Asian fighters.” And now a new type of jihadists appears: the Chinese jihadists. Since June 2014, the United States and Turkey have introduced hundreds of Chinese jihadists brought to the northeast of Syria, including their families. Some immediately become officers. They are mainly members of the Uyghur ethnic group, that is, Chinese from the People’s Republic of China but Turkish-speaking Sunni Muslims “(Meysan, 2014).

3. To have previously carried out a campaign of “attrition” of the conventional-governmental forces in Iraq until achieving maybe not their defeat, but a serious weakening. The same situation has happened in Syria, where they stoked and in fact in much of the campaign, came to form the Free Syrian Army, openly funded by the US to fight the Assad regime. The wear and tear of war on this regime has been tremendous. Weakened the two positions or forces, its implementation has been less complex than one might expect.
4. Allying themselves to the “enemies” of their enemies. They learned that strategy from the CIA. There is no doubt that they have the collaboration of the Turkish regime that has antagonisms with Syria, especially around the possession of Aleppo, a former Turkish province, now part of Syrian territory. It is precisely on the border between Syria and Turkey that the war is currently being debated. On the one hand an important sector of the Kurds that have Marxist organization or advocacy in the defense of the town of Kobane and on the other hand ISIS trying to establish a bridge with the Turks that will facilitate the strategic rearguard and the logistics routes.
5. Handle the independence feelings of the Turkish nation, who have a settlement: Kurdistan north of Syria that although it is true is managed by the Kurds are not yet an independent state. The Kurds are one of the most numerous stateless nationalities on the planet (50 million, approximately) and they are scattered in Iraq, Iran, Syria, Turkey, among others. By offering ISIS territory, state, country, identity to the Muslim Kurds, it has managed to co-opt them with some ease, obviously, despite the existence

- of Kurds who refuse to accept them as they consider them an instrument of imperialism to disintegrate the Kurdish-muslim population and in this way have a better control of the region.
6. Adjust the propaganda campaign to the media effort. This aspect is fundamental because it causes many effects. To show videos that reflect the effective positioning in populations where the Islamic law under the caliphate's vision has generated the feeling of triumph, of the materialization of its objectives. On the other hand, there is the strength and forcefulness of its attacks that are documented and exposed in the international media. It is from this element that allows them to improve their radio and call for recruitment and support. Finally, the propagandization of the beheading of its prisoners causes the desired effect, fear in its enemies and emigration of the non-affable populations, leaving the territorial-social conditions to be raised for their benefit.
  7. They have managed to generate some uncertainty about the real support they receive from abroad. In the peripheral international community, a number of incriminations and associations of some states have been generated with ISIS, contributing to the confusion and weakening of positions to combat them.



## Why ISIS is Sunni and not Shia?

Behind the caliphate lies a long history of contradictions between Sunnis and Shiites. It is regarding the successor of the prophet Muhammad<sup>15</sup>, an important current of the Muslims considered that who should assume the absolute leadership of the Muslims was Abu Bakr. On the contrary, the followers of Ali, cousin and son-in-law of Muhammad considered that he had that right, thus giving way to discord and antagonism between the followers of Abu Bakr, Sunnis and Ali, Shiites.

The difference between one and the other went far beyond the religious. The Islamic foundation says that the caliph must take care of the administrative, legal, organizational aspects of the Islamic state and that the guide or spiritual representative, Imam, was Ali and therefore his successor.

But the religious goal difference is found in economic behaviors. The Sunni, practice sunna, custom and with it the most literal and orthodox application of the Koran. Of course, having been written, the Koran, in full apogee of feudalism, has certain values in the doctrine that

promotes the most intimate fibers of this historical stage: feudalism. On the contrary, the Shiites are more permeable to the transition to a more advanced society, development of the productive forces and others.

By raising the banners of Sunnism, ISIS is summoning the essentials of Islamic thought, its custom and in it to the reproduction of an anachronistic mode of production whose reflection in itself is evident. Of course, this reproduction also allows us to redouble our efforts to return to a productive, social regime that allows for a process of accumulation of wealth that is more agile and with little or no investment in capital and technology.

The quoted enunciates a vision, point of view and even an aspect of ISIS and its purposes. But there is another, the interests of stoking that conflict (infra religious) by the US.

Thierry Meyssan (2014) in his article “The return of the Yankee plan to redesign the expanded Middle East” suggests the subsistence of ISIS as part of a US campaign to weaken the region and generate “micro-states” that allow for better control of the region. The paper by Meyssan (2014) also includes the US strategy to promote the emigration of the Palestinian population of Gaza, the “ethnic cleansing” of Iraq with the participation of the Islamic State of Iraq, the pro-Israeli Kurds and members of the former party Bass of Iraq separated from power in 2003.

It is clear that the claim to create the Islamic State can, circumstantially-respond to the need to raise within it an economic, political, social and religious current that has a certain identity and that is predominantly stateless, the religious foundations that have tried to print their struggles to some extent have resulted in the ability to call in the purpose.

It is not intended to analyze, justify or question the violent methods of the members of the IS or ISIS to the extent that the war itself is bloody, Causewitz says, which is intended to impose the will of some over others, and that no one, absolutely nobody in humanity has the ability to “*cast the first stone*” to criticize the violence of adversaries when humanity recently witnessed a brutal aggression by Israel to the Palestinian people generating equal or worse horrors to those who live in Syria and Iraq today.

If the United States is definitely behind this process, it would not be strange either, since it would not be the first time that they promote warmongering adventures of this format, even knowing the risk involved in allying themselves with the “enemies of their enemies” in order to get their purposes of continuing to remain as the only imperialist powers.



## Conclusions

It is not intended to analyze, justify or question the violent methods of the members of the IS or ISIS to the extent that the war itself is bloody, Causewitz says, which is intended to impose the will of some over others, and that no one, absolutely nobody in humanity has the ability to “*cast the first stone*” to criticize the violence of adversaries when humanity recently witnessed a brutal aggression by Israel to the Palestinian people generating equal or worse horrors to those who live in Syria and Iraq today.

It is clear that wars, conflicts and violence by themselves are nothing, that in essence respond to ideological definitions and political decisions. It is clear that war can have several euphemisms that only aim, vainly, to hide their true purposes. Religious wars, imperialist wars, colonialist wars, national liberation wars, revolutionary wars, whatever you want to call them and how to adjust them to concrete stages, always, always, have a strong reason marked by the interest of a class, nation, state or power to carry forward the fulfillment of their ideology and political program, a true reflection of their interests.

There are just wars and there are unjust wars. Undoubtedly, when just wars prevail and with them the critical conditions of material life of humans that are the generators of social antagonisms are erased, war will be shelved in the old annals of history, meanwhile, the justice of a war will always be the expeditious exit that counteracts the imposition of the merchants of unjust wars.

One aspect that is important to consider is that precisely there, where societies have not managed to overcome or transform, leaving behind precarious modes of production and production relations, where social pauperization, inequalities and overexploitation flourish, religion can be used as arguments to drag the masses to live a religious nonsense that is understood, beyond the intoxicating character that it has, the possibility of peace, harmony and good living.

There are no violent Muslims or terrorists. When a Muslim meets his neighbor the first thing they say is *salam aleikum*, peace be with you, the quick answer is, *aleiukum salam*, with you be peace. That is the essence of Islam.

When someone murders, immolates, commits a terrorist attack, he does not do so because he is Muslim, he does it because it is precisely that, a terrorist, a violent person. When Obama decides to attack Iraq he did not do it because he is a Catholic, or Protestant, he did so because his imperialist nature dictates or commands him to do, his religious condition in that purpose is indifferent. When Netanyahu orders his troops to

demolish Gaza, to bomb civilians, he does not do so because he is Jewish or Hebrew, he does so because he is a Zionist and responds to his interests. It is what must be considered, it is the fundamental thing that must be observed in any conflict.

This is analyzed from the point of view of the interests of each country, and of each region that responds to its cultural situation. But not necessarily the right thing in front of millions of people who have been left in the most profound loneliness.

Wars not only annihilate people, they are responsible for sweeping all the generations, they take with them much of the hope that today works in relation to their interests, few, but theirs, save and keep their lives to continue looking for the longed freedom to allow them to be, and above all, to grow to promote peace, education, latent and urgent changes. Centuries have passed and there is no powerful sage that has an end, which allows a new beginning.

276



## Notes

- 1 The crusades were constituted in a desperate effort of the Catholic Church to recover the territorial, economic and political spaces that the Arabs conquered under the figure or banners of Islam. While it is true, the crusades represented Catholicism and Christianity, the imperial effort of the Arabs was simplified in the Muslim movement that increased precipitously from the eighth century. "November 28, 1095, at the Council of Clermont, Pope Urban II calls Christianity to fight against the Muslim infidel, indulgences are proclaimed for everyone who goes to the holy war against the Muslims, also warns that there is that that it is appropriated, that it takes over the territories left by the knights that are going to fight against the Arabs, because without a doubt they will be excommunicated" (Cebrian, 2010).
- 2 Mahatma Gandhi, Indian lawyer. Formed by the English. Supported by his Hindu religion, he promoted a dissenting and disobedient mass movement to the English mandates while India was a colony of Great Britain. Professed peace, however his figure has been seriously questioned because he is accused, among other things, having favored the interests of England in his country and the region despite having contributed to the independence of India. In this regard, the independence has been shown as a work of his attitude and pacifism, however little or nothing is said that similar to Gandhi calls for civil disobedience the "Indian National Army" contributed with the share of violence that precipitated the (symbolic) exit of the English. Gandhi is accused of having fomented violence against the Zulu people, of having collaborated with the Nazis in the Second World War and other accusations of easy exploration in the internet.
- 3 Carl Philipp Gottlieb von Clausewitz, (1780-1831) was a Prussian military man, one of the most influential historians and theorists of military science. His works, among them and the fundamental: *Of War*, has been studied and is still the leading book of the current armies.

- 4 The religious wars of France. They were conflicts that took place between 1562 and 1598 in France, between Catholics and Calvinist Protestants. In the end it was a war between conservative Catholics and reformers.
- 5 “God’s will”. It is in these terms that the decision of the rulers on the work of the masses, of the peoples in all religions has been handled. Determinism as a social action.
- 6 Moors. Objectively this word comes from North Africa and it alluded to the Berber people and Phoenician and Greek settlers, however the term: Moro, was used by the Spanish to refer to Muslims, regardless of their nationality. Of course, the term was racist, pejorative.
- 7 Seljuks, Turkish dynasty of the XI-XIII centuries that dominated the regions that today correspond to Iraq and Iran.
- 8 Shah Reza Pahlavi was born in Tehran in 1919 and died of cancer in Cairo in 1980. He ruled Iran with a strong hand. It was the main US ally in the region. He tried to carry out democratic reforms trying to abolish the feudal remnants in Iran under the umbrella of a project known as the “White Revolution”. If greater success deepened an arms race that generated much criticism and discontent within Iran. His regime sharpened the conditions for the Islamic revolution led by Ayatollah Khomeini.
- 9 Gaddafi’s green book. The work of Gaddafi exhibited in three volumes written between 1975 and 1981 is still an interesting democratic exercise that gives -in the text-prevalence to popular decisions, to the organization of society in popular committees, a Muslim version of socialism with nationalist traits. We must remember that Gaddafi was a Shia, hence his progressive and anti-imperialist conceptions reflected in his work.
- 10 The Cold War. Term with which the sustained contest between the US and the former USSR was called. The contradictions of ideological, political, philosophical and economic nature between these two powers generated a sustained conflict in all areas. It originated after the Second World War and on many occasions had humanity on the verge of a third world war. The particularity of this conflict is that both the one and the other world power used third and fourth countries to confront them and try to resolve their contradictions or strengthen their plans for world hegemony.
- 11 Taliban, Taliban Pashtun (Afghan) which means student or apprentice. It refers to those who start in the study of the Koran, however it is a term used to identify the fighters who expel the Soviets from Afghanistan and who are now fighting to retake power and implement an Islamist theocratic regime.
- 12 The jihad, whose translation is effort, alludes to the need to be consistent with the sunna or tradition of Islam. It refers basically to the defense of religious precepts and their application, however it has been used as the summons to the Muslim “war”, to the violent diffusion of this religion.
- 13 The disintegration of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, USSR was the result of perestroika and glasnost implemented by Mikhail Gorbachev between 1990 and 1991.
- 14 Caliphate. Of caliph, successor. It is understood that it is the organization of the State and a State system under the religious precepts of Islam. The legal body has its foundation in Islamic jurisprudence also known as sharia.
- 15 Muhammad His full name in Arabic is Abu l-Qāsim Muḥammad ibn Abd Allāh al-Hāšimī al-Qurayšī and known vulgarly or erroneously as Muhammad.



## Bibliography

### BIOGRAFÍAS Y VIDAS

2014 *Biografías y Vidas*. En [www.biografiasyvidas.com/monografia/constantino/](http://www.biografiasyvidas.com/monografia/constantino/)  
BONET, Ethel

2013 El tiempo. *Escuelas en Pakistán blanco de guerra talibán*. El tiempo  
CLAUSEWITZ, Karl von

1991 ¿Qué es la guerra? México, D.F.: SDN.

CEBRIAN, Juan

2010 *Las Cruzadas*. Recuperado de <https://goo.gl/r23PvJ>

CERIO, Débora

2014 *Sionismo y capitalismo*. Recuperado de <https://goo.gl/oyDhr4>

GIRONDELLA, Leonardo

2008 *Guerras religiosas*. Recuperado de <https://goo.gl/qy4UcM>

IZQUIERDO, Josefa

2015 Escuelas y educación en los conflictos armados. En [www.ieee.es/Galerias/fichero/docs\\_analisis/2015/DIEEEA19-201\\_Escuelas-Educacion\\_ConflictosArmados\\_MJIA.pdf](http://www.ieee.es/Galerias/fichero/docs_analisis/2015/DIEEEA19-201_Escuelas-Educacion_ConflictosArmados_MJIA.pdf)

LORA, Cam

1988 *La política*. México, DF: JANIS, S:A.

MARSHALL, Andrew

2014 *Orígenes de Al-Qaeda*. Recuperado de <https://goo.gl/EJpC3a>

MEYSSAN, Thierry

2014 ¿Quiénes son los miembros del Emirato Islámico? Recuperado de <https://goo.gl/nRW7C>

RUIZ, José Ángel

13 de agosto de 2006. El movimiento pacifista en el siglo XXI: Nuevos principios Estratégicos. *Polis* [En línea], *Revista Latinoamericana*. Recuperado de <https://goo.gl/7wpi5w>

STANFORD

04 de agosto de 2014. *Estado Islámico en Irak y Siria*. Recuperado de <https://goo.gl/murdyB>  
TSE-TUNG, Mao

1968 Cómo estudiar la guerra. En: M. Tse-Tung, *Obras escogidas de Mao Tse-Tung*. Pekín: Ediciones de lenguas extranjeras.

1976 Sobre la Guerra Prolongada. En: M. Tse-tung, *Obras Escogidas de Mao Tse-tung, Tomo II* (p. 154). Pekín: Editorial del Pueblo.

UNIVISIÓN

21 de octubre de 2011 *Obama anunció el retiro de tropas de Irak*. Recuperado de <https://goo.gl/X7YNTL>

Date of receipt of the document: May 29, 2017

Date of document review: July 20, 2017

Date of acceptance of the document: September 15, 2017

Date of publication of the document: January 15, 2018