Total War and Social Changes:
With a Focus on Arthur Marwick's Perspective on War*

Tomoyuki Ishizu

Introduction

Carl von Clausewitz, a Prussian soldier and military thinker, wrote his great work *Vom Kriege* (*On War*) based on his understanding of war being one of the large-scale social phenomena conducted by human beings. On the other hand, German historian Hans Delbrück revealed the fact that the particular political and social situation of the age strongly influences the faces of war, in his major work *Geschichte der Kriegskunst im Rahmen der politischen Geschichte* (*History of the Art of War within the Framework of Political History*). Such viewpoints on history whose focuses are on the causal relationship between war and social changes are reflected in contemporary understandings of war history: for example, those of Britain's Sir Michael Howard and the Swiss historian Stig Förster.[1]

If there really is a strong causal relationship between war and social changes, it will inevitably be possible to observe the relationship in the First World War and the Second World War, which represent the age of "Total War." This can be attributed to the fact that total war is one in which both military personnel and civilians are involved. Under such conditions, the states involved mobilize not only their military power, but also the total economic, technological, and even moral resources that are potentially available.

Following the understanding of total war mentioned above, Arthur Marwick, a distinguished British historian, examines from a functionalist viewpoint total wars in his series of works. In his works, he provocatively argues that war, an irrational phenomenon at first glance, could be a driving force for rationalization and modernization, as a result of the fact that a state organizes human and other resources

---

* The quotation below does not reflect the original.

[1] Michael Howard, *War in European History* (*Yoroppa-shi ni okeru Senso*) (Translated by Fusao Okumura and Daisuke Okumura, Chu'okoron-Shinsha, 2010); Manfred F. Boemeke, Roger Chickering and Stig Förster, eds., *Anticipating Total War: The German and American Experiences, 1871-1914* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for The German Historical Institute, 1999); Stig Förster and Jörg Nagler, eds, *On the Road to Total War: The American Civil War and the German Wars of Unification, 1861–1871* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997); Roger Chickering and Stig Förster, eds, *Great War, Total War: Combat and Mobilization on the Western Front, 1914–1918* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000); Roger Chickering, Stig Förster and Bernd Greiner, eds, *A World at Total War: Global Conflict and the Politics of Destruction, 1937–1945* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Roger Chickering and Stig Förster, eds, *The Shadows of Total War: Europe, East Asia, and the United States, 1919–1939* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2003).

and institutions for the effective and efficient conduct of the war.[2]

In this paper, let us examine total war mainly based on Marwick's viewpoint. He points out that total war causes social changes in four different dimensions in his argument concerning the causal relationship between total war and social changes.[3] The first dimension is "the destructive and disruptive dimension of war." Destruction and disruption urge people toward the reconstruction of society and sometimes to the building of a society better than the previous one. This leads to social changes. The second dimension is "the test dimension." In war, the military institutions directly related thereto, as well as other systems of society, economy, and politics, would be tested as to their suitability and survivability for the conduct of war. The third is "the participation dimension." War creates conditions which allow people, who up to that time have been deprived of the right and power to participate in various social activities, to participate in them. Marwick argues that the fourth dimension is "the psychological dimension." People start to get the sense that war ought to lead to something new, as a result of their suffering of a strong psychological shock by way of war.

---

[2] Why is a war triggered? War is a social phenomenon with what type of functions? Unfortunately, studies on war from the functional perspective have not been carried out in Japan regardless of whether we are for or against war. However, as Friedrich Engels has shrewdly pointed out, we cannot exclude a possibility that wars are a catalyst for progress, that is, one stage of progress. Nowadays the negative sides of war tend to be emphasized excessively as a result of the emergence of nuclear weapons in the late 20th century and the change of mankind's *Weltanschauung* on wars, but we cannot deny the fact that wars have contributed to the progress of mankind and social development when we look back the history in a calm manner, even if things turned out that way by chance. In fact, although it may sound strange, recent studies have recognized a close causal relationship between the occurrence of war and colonial liberation and the process of expanding autonomy of local citizens in the 20th century. In addition, the fact that the relationship between wars and the dissemination of the Universal Suffrage Act as well as the relationship between wars and the expansion of welfare and human rights were deep has been demonstrated little by little. If one thinks deeply, wars have brought destruction to mankind, but at the same time they are the Mother of Creation. In the past, Hegel said that an age without wars is a blank page in the book of history. It is true that excellent arts and literature have been buried as a result of war, but they have been a great source of creating new arts and literature. In addition, apart from an extreme argument of Marinetti that wars are the only "hygiene" in the world, a function of controlling population was recognized in wars in the history even though it is an afterthought. Have not people expected a function of breaking a sense of stagnation and social deadlock in wars? Furthermore, no one can deny the fact that wars have brought about the rapid progress of science technology, thought this is also an afterthought (Tomoyuki Ishizu, ed., *Senso no Honshitsu to Gunjiryoku no Shoso* (*Essence of War and Myriad Faces of Military Power)* Sairyusha, 2003, Chapter 1). On the contrary, mankind hates wars but has continued to utilize them until now as convenient and useful means for settling a conflict between groups. In fact, very few deny the Clausewitz's view of war that war is nothing but a continuation of political intercourse with the mixture of different means. At least, war was one means for triggering political changes for Hegel and Clausewitz. Furthermore, it is a widely known fact that war had been strongly recognized as a catalyst of changes in the European society before 1914. Such recognition is deeply reflected in political philosophy of Bergson that attracted much attention in those days.

[3] Concerning the argument of Marwick, see Arthur Marwick, *The Deluge: British Society and the First World War* (Reissued Second Edition)(London: Palgrave, 1991); Arthur Marwick, *War and Social Change in the Twentieth Century: A Comparative Study of Britain, France, Germany, Russia and the United States* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 1974); Arthur Marwick, ed., *Total War and Social Change* (London: Macmillan, 1988); Arthur Marwick, Clive Emsley, Wendy Simpson, eds., *Total War and Historical Change: Europe 1914-1955* (London: Open University Press, 2001); Arthur Marwick, Bernard Waites, Clive Emsley, John Golby, eds., *War and Change in the Twentieth- Century Europe* (Buckingham: Open University Press, 1990).

Involved in the arguments of the causal relationship between total war and social changes, many advocates emphasize two elements: the "expansion of the state" and the "leveling or even dissolution of the class system." Yasushi Yamanouchi, a distinguished Japanese sociologist, names those elements "forcible coordination" (*Gleichschaltung*), a concept borrowed from Talcott Parsons. Yamanouchi astutely pointed out the fact that all spheres of society were centralized into one huge system; in other words, that drastic social structural change was caused by the total mobilization of all nationals as a necessary demand of total war. This happened to major states involved toward or through World War II. It was not a matter of what regime-type the societies were; whether Fascist-type regimes considered irrational and tyrannical, or New Deal-type regimes considered rational and democratic.

In this paper, the author would also like to let us discuss the so-called "1940 system" of Japan.

1. On Total War

Erich Ludendorff, a German general, published his major work *Der totale Krieg* (*The Total War*) in 1935. In this book, Ludendorff focused on the fact that wars have started to be waged incorporating not only governments and military personnel but also citizens after World War I and called such a new mode of war as total war.[4] Such a situational recognition of Ludendorff is similar to that of Clausewitz who

---

[4] Erich Ludendorff, *Der totale Krieg* (*The Total War*) (München: Ludendorffs Verlag, 1935) (*Kokka Soryokusen*, translated by Toshio Mano, Mikasa Shobo, 1938). The author translated the following citation from the original of this book.

It is said that the term total war was used in France for the first time at the end of World War I and the word "*guerre total*" appeared. In Britain that participated in World War I, the first appearance of the same expression, total war, was delayed. According to the *Oxford English Dictionary*, it was in 1937. For more detail, see Yoichi Kibata, "Soryokusen to Shiteno Futatsuno Sekaitaisen (Two World Wars as Total War)", in Yoichi Kibata, ed., *Nijusseiki no Sento towa Nandeattaka* (*What Do Wars in the 20th Century Mean?*), (*War and Today*, Vol. 2, Otsukishoten, 2004), pp.70-71. In addition, see Robert T. Foley, "From Volkskrieg to Vernichtungskrieg: German Concepts of Warfare, 1871-1935," in Anja V. Hartmann, Beatrice Heuser, eds., *War, Peace and World Orders in European History* (London: Routledge, 2001).

There are a number of studies on Ludendorff's conduct of war in World War I. For example, see R. T. Foley, *German Strategy and the Path to Verdun: Erich von Falkenhayn and the Development of Attrition, 1870-1916* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005); Norman Stone, "General Erich Ludendorff," in Michael Carver, ed., *The War Lords: Military Commanders of the Twentieth Century* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword, 2005); Martin Kitchen, *The Silent Dictatorship: The Politics of the German High Command under Hindenburg and Ludendorff, 1916-1918* (New York: Holmes & Meier, 1976); John Lee, *The War Lords: Hindenburg and Ludendorff* [Great Commanders S.] (London: George Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 2005); Robert B Asprey, *The German High Command at War: Hindenburg and Ludendorff and the First World War* (New York: Time Warner, 1994); John Wheeler- Bennett, *The Nemesis of Power: The German Army in Politics, 1918-1945* (London: Macmillan, 1964); Kiyoshi Muro, "Saiko Tosuibu no Dokusai (Dictatorship of Supreme Army Command (OHL))," in Kiyoshi Muro, *Doitsu Gunbu no Seiji-shi* (*Political History of German Army: 1914-1933*) (Waseda University Press, 1964). For overall critical biography of Ludendorff, see D. J. Goodspeed, *Ludendorff: Soldier, Dictator, Revolutionary* (London: Rupert Hart-Davis, 1966); R. Parkinson, *Tormented Warrior: Ludendorff and the Supreme Command* (London: Holder and Stoughton, 1978); Karl Tschuppik, W. H. Johnston, *Ludendorff: The Tragedy of a Military Mind* (Boston: Houghton

pointed out "the Remarkable Trinity" of war focusing on the French Revolution, the subsequent Revolutionary War and the Napoleonic War in spite of a gap of about one century between those two generals. Ludendorff came up with military dictatorship that completely ignores political elements for the purpose of efficiently conducting total war and proposed to control the German people by this military dictatorship.[5]

The word total war has certainly taken root together with the Ludendorff's work *Der totale Krieg*.[6]

Mifflin Company, 1932).

For details of the Ludendorff's view of war and strategic thought, see Hans Speier, "Ludendorff: The German Concept of Total War," in Edward Mead Earle ed., *Makers of Modern Strategy: Military Thought from Machiavelli to Hitler* [Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1943] pp.306-321 (Shinsenryaku no Soshisha translated by Moriaki Yamada, Sakae Ishizuka, Hiroaki Ito, Hara Shobo, 1979), Vol.2, pp.23-39 The translation of the following citation from said article was corrected where necessary. Lastly, for the works of Ludendorff himself, see Erich Ludendorff, *Meine Kriegserinnerungen* (Berlin: Mittler, 1919); Erich Ludendorff, *Urkunden der obersten heeresleitung über ihre Tätigkeit 1916/18* (Berlin: Mittler, 1920). The works of Ludendorff including the above-mentioned ones emphasize a point in question that his own conduct of war in World War I was not thoroughly implemented due to the lack of the German people's will and the "conspiracy of his rivals." After World War I, Ludendorff defended the conduct of war of Helmuth von Moltke, partly because he intended to save his own neck.

[5] The most famous book that examines the issue over continuity and discontinuity of the views of war and strategic thoughts from Ludendorff to Clausewitz is *The Sword and the Scepter: The Problem of Militarism in Germany* (*Staatskunst und Kriegshandwerk*) by Gerhard Ritter and there are also Masaki Miyake, "Doitsu Daini Teisei no Seigun Kankei: Kurauzebittsu to Rudendorufu tono Aida (Civil-Military Relations in the Second Reich : Clausewitz and Ludendorff)," in Masaki Miyake, *Nichidoku Seiji Gaiko-shi Kenkyu* (*Study of Japanese and German History of Politics and Diplomacy*) (Kawade Shobo Shinsha, 1996); Hans Lurich Wehler, Munemasa Shinjo (provisional translation, 1988), "*Zettaiteki Senso to Zentaiteki Senso- Kurauzebittsu kara Rudendorufu made* (Absolute War and Total War: From Clausewitz to Ludendorff)(Der Verfall der deutschen Kriegstheorie: Vom "Absoluten" zum "Totalen" Krieg oder von Clausewitz zu Ludendorff)," in Hans-Ulrich Wehler, *Krisenherde des Kaiserreichs 1871-1918: Studien zur deutschen Sozial-und Verfassungsgeschichte* [Gottingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1971]). In addition, for the Clausewitz's view of war, see Takichi Shimizu, Tomoyuki Ishizu, eds., *Kurozebittsu to Sensoron* (*Clausewitz and "On of War"*) (Sairyusha, 2008), Tomoyuki Ishizu, *Rideruhato to Riberaruna Sensokan* (*Liddell-Hart and Liberal Vision of War*) (Chuokoron-Shinsha, 2008).

[6] It was in 1935 when *Der totale Krieg* of Ludendorff was published. Since then, this word has become a fashion, but the term total war was not so common in the beginning. In World War I, the word "National General Mobilization" had been used. According to Speier, the Ludendorff's theory of total war consists of five basic elements (Speier, "The German Concept of Total War," in Earle, ed., *Makers of Modern Strategy*, Vol. 2, p.32). The first element is a recognition that war has become comprehensive or thorough, because all territories of warring countries have started to be included in the theater of war. The second element is a recognition that total war is waged not only by troops but also by whole the nation, because it actively drives whole the nation to engage in efforts for the war. As a result, to efficiently conduct total war, it becomes necessary to establish an economic organization in line with the war objectives. The third element is a recognition that special efforts are required to raise morale of the general public by propaganda so that they participate in the war and to weaken a political solidarity of the enemy's nation. The fourth element is a recognition that it is necessary to make preparations for total war before clear acts of combat initiate. That is because military, economic and psychological wars have a great impact on peacetime policies in the modern society. Lastly, Ludendorff had a belief that total war must be led by one supreme leader, military personnel, to integrate efforts for the war and conduct it efficiently. Interestingly enough, Ludendorff exemplified total war as citizens in a surrounded walled city (Speier, "The German Concept of Total War," in Earle, ed., *Makers of Modern Strategy*, Vol.2, p.33). The army that surrounds the walled city tries to starve its citizens using all means including military means to lead them to surrender. In a similar way, non-military means are used coupled with military means against the enemy noncombatants in total war. According to him, World War I was waged not only by the armies of the warring countries. While the armies intended to destroy and annihilate their enemies each other, the countries and their people

Total war means war waged by virtually ignoring the distinction between combatants and noncombatants based on international laws. In such a type of war, not only military capabilities but also economic, technological and moral potentials of warring countries are mobilized to the fullest extent. Also, all areas of people's life are organized for conducting war and all the nations are involved in war in some form. Thus, an attack against the enemy includes the destruction of not only its military capabilities but also the military production in the home front (this word exactly expresses the characteristics of total war), food and entire industrial production and paralysis of people's daily life. Furthermore, psychological dimensions of war, for example, propaganda for raising morale of one's people and discouraging the enemy's people from being involved in the war on the contrary, come to have a vitally important significance.[7] It is a widely-known fact that Ludendorff had noticed the importance of the psychological dimensions of war, and particularly the effectiveness of propaganda.[8] To put it briefly, victory or defeat

---

were mobilized to serve for the war so that they fought against their hostile countries.

[7] For the general definition of the word, total war, see Hew Strachan, "Total War in the Twentieth Century," in Marwick, Emsley, Simpson, eds., *Total War and Historical Change*, pp.255-283; Ian F. W. Beckett, "Total War," in Marwick, Emsley, Simpson, eds., *Total War and Historical Change*, pp.25-41; Richard Holmes, ed., *The Oxford Companion to Military History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001), pp.915-16; William J. Philpott, "Total War," in Matthew Hughes, William J. Philpott, eds., *Palgrave Advances in Modern Military History* (London: Palgrave, 2006); Jeremy Black, *The Age of Total War 1860-1945* (Plymouth: Rowman & Littlefield, 2006), pp.1-11; Tomoyasu Kato, ed., *Rekishigaku Jiten 7: Senso to Gaiko* (*Encyclopedia of Historiograghy 7: War and Diplomacy, Kobundou, 1999*), pp.326-327, pp.420-423 and pp.441-442.

[8] Ludendorff came to believe that war was not political continuation by other means any more thorough his experience in World War I. War had been in the course toward absolute war pointed out by Clausewitz. Also, war has become more thorough, because the people's fanaticism was added as seen in World War I. Thus, war has come to be directly involved in the life and mentality of all people in warring countries. As the means for war have become thorough due to the introduction of the conscription and new technologies, its objective has also changed to be more thorough. That is, the national and people's survival has become the war objective. Immediately after World War I, Ludendorff already had a recognition that the next war would be large-scale economic war for survival and "national war based on the consensus of all the people." He also predicted that the next war would be a "war that dominates the survival of whole the nation and requires enormous efforts and tension" (Erich Ludendorff, *Kriegführung und Politik* [Berlin: Mittler und Sohn, 1922], S. 11). Such phase of war is a "war in a true sense and its objective is to overwhelm the enemy" and he expresses his recognition that "the nation that participates in such type of war will involve in it with the power beyond everything in the past and the objective" (Ludendorff, *Kriegführung und Politik*, S. 11f).

Based on such situational recognition, Ludendorff came to believe that politics is a means for war in the age of total war. He defined war as "what expresses the will to survive as a nation to the maximum extent" (Ludendorff, *Der totale Krieg,* S. 10) and argued that war is no doubt *raison d'etre* of a nation. "We can define the nation by war. A nation is a group of humans to wage war together" (Ludendorff, *Der totale Krieg,* S. 7). If a war expresses the will to survive as a nation to the maximum extent, no doubt they become the morally-highest obligation for a nation. Furthermore, war should not serve for the establishment of peace, but peace should serve as the preparations for war. The Ludendorff's recognition is that peace is actually a temporary suspension of fire or buying of time until the next war. That is how the logic that all valuable efforts should be turned to wars and approved by wars and other efforts should be despised has been developed, because other efforts are useless for wars. "Whether or not the whole fate of humans and societies is justified depends on whether or not it is preparation for a war" (Ludendorff, *Der totale Krieg,* S. 7). This Ludendorff's description is cited also in *Ningen to Seinaru Mono* (*Man and the Sacred*: new translation) written by Roger Caillois and jointly translated by Fumi Tsukahara, Motoko Yoshimoto, Kazuo Obata, Noriko Nakamura and Naoki Morinaga, Serica Shobo, 1994, p.261. Howard mentioned earlier evaluates such Ludendorff's recognition on total war as an endless battle for which whole the nation is mobilized forever under military leaders and peace is a short break between

a war and the next war. The most unique point in the Ludendorff's discussion on total war is considered as a psychological dimension of war. The reason that Ludendorff particularly emphasized the force of will and solidarity of the German nation was probably related to a bitter experience of the "German Revolution" in 1918. In fact, he entirely dedicates Chapter 2 of *Der totale Krieg* to this issue (the title of Chapter 2 of *Der totale Krieg* is "Die seelische Geschlossenheit des Volkes: die Grundlage des totalen Krieges").

As the author has mentioned earlier, one of the main characteristics of the Ludendorff's "theory of total war" is the argument that total war should be led by military personnel who have the absolute power, because military-level conduct as well as conduct at a level of national strategies such as diplomacy, economy and propaganda need to be carried out to deal with total war. According to him, however, there is no room for civilian political leaders in total war. Clausewitz focused on the relation with social changes in the discussion of the transformation of war to absolute war and pointed out a political dimension of war, but total war is nothing but a result of the development of demography and scientific technology for Ludendorff. That is, he believed that the increase in population and enhancement of destruction means made total war inevitable and that total war does not have any political element and absorbed politics (Speier, "The German Concept of Total War (Doitsu no Soryokusen)," in Earle, ed., *Makers of Modern Strategy* (*Shin-Senryaku no Soshisha*) Vol.2, p.35; Roger Caillois, *Bellone ou La pente de la guerre* (Sensoron: Wareware no Uchini Hisomu Megami Berona) (Translated by Shigeo Akieda, Hosei University Press, 1974) pp.164-167. Ludendorff argues in his work in 1922 entitled *Kriegführung und Politik* (*The Conduct of War and Politics*) that the scope of politics itself has to change, as the role of politics expands. That is, politics should take on an all-out characteristic like total war. War causes the maximum tension on which the nation's survival depends so that all-out politics must contribute to preparations for a national survival battle from peacetime and establish a base for that purpose (Ludendorff, *Kriegführung und Politik*, S. 10). Then, he has reached a conclusion that war and politics are carried out for the national survival and war, in particular, expresses the will to survive as a nation to the maximum extent. Therefore, politics must serve for the conduct of war (He made an assertion in *Kriegführung und Politik* that politics is certainly war. For him, politics of the Third Supreme Command during World War I had already been positioned as a servant of the conduct of war). In that sense, Ludendorff clearly inverted the Clausewitz's view of war. In this point, for example, see Jehuda Wallach, "Misperceptions of Clausewitz' On War by the German Military,"; Klaus Jürgen Müller, "Clausewitz, Ludendorff and Beck,"; Williamson Murray, "Clausewitz: Some Thoughts on What the Germans Got Right," in Michael Handel, ed., *Clausewitz and Modern Strategy* (London: Routledge, 1999); Jehuda L. Wallach, *Kriegstheorien* (Frankfurt am Main: Bernard und Graefe, 1972); Miyake, "Doitsu Daini Teisei no Seigun Kankei (Relationship of Politics and Military in German Second Empire)," and Wehler, "*Absolute War* and *Total War*." However, Wehler interpreted that the Ludendorff's view of war is not necessarily peculiar and it is on the extension of *"Zeitgeist"* in Germany at the time regardless of the difference of civilians and military personnel. For example, he examined the view of war of German intellectuals represented by Hans Freyer (sociologist), Ernst Jünger (writer), Rudolf Smend (legal scholar), Carl Schmitt (legal philosopher) and Ernst Forsthoff (legal scholar) and drew a conclusion that their thoughts are among the source of the Ludendorff's "theory of total war." It is true that there are arguments similar to the Ludendorff's theory in the Freyer's work. For example, war is the father of everything and war is the air of life for states and elevation of its substantive existence. Wehler positions Ludendorff in the genealogy of German strategic thought of military personnel represented by Helmuth von Moltke, Alfred von Schlieffen and Friedrich von Bernhardi. To be sure, there exists continuity between the content of the work of Bernhardi titled *Vom heutigen Kriege* (*On War of Today*) and the Ludendorff's "theory of total war." His argument is that military demands should strongly restrain politics. In addition, Hans von Seeckt, representative military personnel in the interwar period, mentioned once that war is the best work of mankind. The tone of both Seeckt and Ludendorf reflects a strong influence of social Darwinism. What the discussion of Ludendorff reveals is that he agrees to the Clausewitz's view of war by citing the content of *On War* many times, although he denied that in *Der Totale Krieg*, and that, as a result of that, he caused a confusion of the concept of the words, "Absolute War (Clausewitz)" and "Total War (Ludendorff)" in later years. The achievements of Ludendorff should be justly evaluated, for example, his situational recognition that he noticed the fact that a war is expanding its objectives, means and scale in response to social changes and shifting to a doctrinal (ideological) battle beyond the framework of a state and he conceptualized this by the word "total war." In particular, one can highly evaluate that he recognized the importance of psychological dimensions of war symbolized by propaganda. On the other hand, various solutions to those issues suggested by Ludendorff are not appropriate even in his time. Ludendorff is largely responsible for completely reversing the relationship between politics and war and suggesting a future course of the conduct of war convenient to military personnel.

of war is not decided in battlefields but by technological and production capabilities of the states involved. As Thomas Edison accurately said in the past, "A state that is able to produce far more than its enemy will win in the 20th century, not a state that beats its enemy in battlefields."[9] Thus, it was necessary for states to continue to raise morale of the people regardless of whether it was in wartime or peacetime.

When World War I started in 1914, "nation in arms" only meant the number of soldiers for many civilian and military leaders. In fact, in World War I, the national birthrate was an indicator of each country's military capacity. As war had turned to be more thorough, however, economic potential and entire national capabilities of mobilization have been recognized as important indicators of military capacity and the importance of the home front has been raised drastically. As an inevitable result of that, measures such as economic (naval) blockage and strategic bombing have started to be used frequently on a large scale in World War I even if one focuses only on military-level phenomena and their effectiveness was demonstrated to a certain degree. As Clausewitz had noticed from an early stage, when one focuses on the connection between war and society at that time, it had been returning to its original fierce form, because the factor of the "nation" has entered deep into war.[10] Additionally, the battle front and the home

---

[9] Quoted in Christopher Coker, "War and the 20th Century," in Christopher Coker, *War and the 20th Century: The Impact of War on the Modern Consciousness* (London: Brassey's Press, 1994), p.8.

[10] In Japan, there were some who had a keen recognition on the reality of total war. One of them was Kanji Ishiwara, an officer of the Imperial Japanese Army. The age of Ishiwara was truly the age of modernism, see Coker, *War and the 20th Century*, pp.1-55 as a literature that keenly considers the relationship of war and modernism. In addition, an excellent work that argues modernism in Japan is Masao Yamaguchi, *"Zasetsu" no Showa-shi* (*A History of "Failure" in the Showa Period*), Iwanami Shoten, 1995. In this book, Yamaguchi expresses Ishiwara as Dadaist or "meta-soldier." Modernism, generally used in the field of art, is not only used in a limited sense as the tendency to express with modern feeling in conflict with traditionalism but also as the concept referring to the entire climate of society. As Azar Gat keenly points out, the interesting fact here is that there was an odd accordance in thoughts of soldiers called reformist officers of major countries in this age of modernism. British J. F. C. Fuller who is known for his "theory of armored warfare" and Italian Giulio Douhet who is known for his concept of "command of the air" are representative figures (Azar Gat, *Fascist and Liberal Visions of War: Fuller, Liddell Hart, Douhet, and other Modernists* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1998], pp.3-124). The first characteristic of the common *Zeitgeist* of modernism is the absolute belief in machines. As for the military field, it is expressed as a high interest in aircraft and tanks. It is a widely-known fact that Ishiwara used to pay attention to potential of aircraft. In fact, one of the premises of the "Japan-US Final War" advocated by him owed to such astonishing development of aircraft. It is also known that a series of policies Ishiwara intended to enforce had aimed at mass production of aircraft and its efficient operation (See *"Juyo Sangyo Gonen Keikaku Yoko (Five-Year Plan Outline of Important Industries)"* in May 1937 [Jun Tsunota ed., *Ishiwara Kanji Shiryo; Kokuboron Saku Hen* (*Material of Kanji Ishiwara: National Defense Review* (enlarged edition), 1971, Hara Shobo] P.148). The second is an inclination to totalitarianism. To put it more simply, it can be said as the belief in fascism and this was notable in the case of Fuller and Douhet. Any state faced a common issue of how to establish an efficient general mobilization system of human resources, goods and information in the age of total war after World War I. A variety of political experiments was carried out to address such issue, and a representative case was fascism. In fact, fascism can be said as a movement to deal with the request of the age of modernism in a modern way. In that sense, modernism, fascism and machines were closely related. "Control system" in the spirit advocated by Ishiwara was a kind of totalitarianism (to be more accurate, "control system" Ishiwara meant to say was "not a setback from freedom to tyranny but a high instructive spirit that skillfully integrated and developed freedom and tyranny." However, it is not untrue to say that a direction of his thought was totalitarianism). Ishiwara's confidence in planned economy had secured in the wake of the successful examples of Nazi Germany and the Soviet Union during the

front during wartime can be understood as one type of division of mobilization of soldiers and mobilization of labor.[11] Using the expression of Clausewitz, as a result of the progress of total war, the "center of gravity" has shifted from the enemy's army to the production capacity and morale of enemy's noncombatants.

Not to mention, the concept of total war is equivocal.[12] For example, it is closely related to the

interwar period. A number of excellent studies reveals the construction plan of national defense state he intended to promote in Japan and Manchuria in detail (See Hideo Kobayashi, *Showa Fashisuto no Gunzo* (*Image of Fascists in the Showa Period*) (Azekura Shobo, 1984), particularly Chapter 2 "Ishiwara Kanji." In addition, *Nenpo:Nihon Gendaishi − Souryokusen Fashizumu to Gendai-shi* (*Annual Report: Japan Contemporary History - Total War, Fascism and Contemporary History*, No.3) (Gendai Shiryo Shuppan, 1997) Chapter 1, "Soryokusen wo Do Toraeruka : Soryokusen to Gendaika wo Yomu (How Can One Interpret Total War System : How Can One read *Total War and Modernization*)" and Chapter 3, "Soryokusen wo Megutte : Rikugun Chusu to 2.26 Jiken no Seinen Shoko no Aida (An understanding of Total War: the Imperial Japanese Army and Young Officers of the 2.26 Incident)" (Shinichi Suzaki) are highly suggestive to understand total war). In addition, the excessive emperor worship by Ishiwara and his theory of *Kokutai* (national polity) based on it are obviously positioned in the genealogy of totalitarianism at least in a superficial way. The third common prominent characteristic of reformist officers in the age of modernism is the existence of visionary in their view of war and national strategy. That is, a number of intelligent soldiers who work out a clear direction in statecraft which may be called as grand design have appeared (However, as a general tendency of visionary at the time, a grand vision was vividly drawn but there was little interest in the concept of individual and specific tactical operations necessary for achieving it at a lower military strategy level except only Fuller. Ishiwara also lacked a specific concept of actual operations of aircraft and tanks. For more detail, see Tomoyuki Ishizu, "The Japanese General Fuller?: Ishiwara Kanji and his Concept of War, of Strategy, and of Armored Warfare," paper presented at the Military History Seminar, Institute of Historical Research, London University [12 November, 2002]). Many of them did not just focus on a possibility of the development of aircraft and tanks. Rather, they had a strong vision on politics, economy and entire society. It is clearly related to their keen recognition on total war.

[11] Hirofumi Hatakeyama, *Doin Shikan Josetsu : Kindai, Senso, Kokka* (*Introduction to Historical Perspective of Mobilization : Modernity, war, State*)(Bunsekido,2 006), p.192.

[12] The embryo of total war was already seen in the "German Wars of Unification," the American Civil War, the Boer War (South African War) and the Russo-Japanese War. For example, a guerrilla-war fighting of the French nation experienced by Germany especially in the late stage of the Franco-Prussian War, gave a feeling that guerrilla war would have occurred in the 20th century embroiling the whole nation in the same way as the war in Spain during the Napoleonic Wars (for more detail, see Foley, "From *Volkskrieg* to *Vernichtungskrieg*," in Hartmann, Heuser, eds., *War, Peace and World Orders in European History*). In addition, in the American Civil War, victory or defeat was not decided only in extensive battlefields any more. The way of waging war has changed to the way in which they destroyed the enemy's railroads, disconnected telegraph lines, and attacked supply bases of weapons and food. As a result, to force the enemy to surrender, it has become necessary to destroy factories and facilities that support the enemy. Needless to say, noncombatants (citizens) are involved in this type of war. Generals of the Union Army Grant and Sherman were the soldiers who recognized such change in the style of war at once. Consequently, the state of Georgia was definitively destroyed by General Sherman. He intended to lower the morale of the enemy by destroying not only military facilities of the Confederate Army but also its railroads, factories, shops and plantations (for more details of the American Civil War, see Brian Holden Reid, *The American Civil War* [London: Cassell, 1999]; James M McPherson, *Battle Cry of Freedom: The Civil War Era* (Oxford History of the United States) [Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003]). In the American Civil War, telegrams played a revolutionary role. Lincoln was one of the persons who had noticed the effectiveness of telegrams. In the battle of Richmond, soldiers of the Union Army were frustrated by deep trenches constructed by the Confederate Army. Trenches that are thought to be a symbol in the Russo-Japanese War and World War I, which occurred 40 and 50 years after the American Civil War, respectively, had already been used in the American Civil War on a large scale. Lastly, the treatment of POWs in the American Civil War is said to be extremely severe. In fact, there is a record that explains that as high as approx. 9% of the total war dead (about 620,000) were due to fierce treatment in POW camps of the both sides. Then, looking back the Boer War from the present, this

dimensions of means and objectives of war. Howard expresses about this point that the concept of total

---

war no doubt had some characteristics that symbolize war in the 20th-cenutry including the concept of total war (concerning the following points in question related to the Boer War, see Hiroyuki Agawa, Naoki Inose, Terumasa Nakanishi, Ikuhiko Hata and Kazuya Fukuda, *Nijusseiki no Nihon no Senso* (*Japanese Wars in the 20th Century*), Bungeishunju, 2000, pp.10-12). Firstly, in the Boer War, the Boers who are immigrants from the Netherlands had a certain degree of success by guerrilla-war fighting against the modern British Army that consists mainly of regular soldiers. In that sense, this war can be regarded as a precedent of the Vietnam War that occurred later. The second point is the influence of domestic public opinion. As it is known, apart from military debacle, a factor that pushed the British government into the corner was domestic public opinion against the war. Of course, international public opinion displayed a sympathetic attitude to the Boer. Thirdly, concentration camps were used on a large scale in the Boer War. Nazi Germany used those concentration camps for the Boers as a reference to the construction of concentration camps for the Jews and "strategic villages" envisaged by the U.S. in the Vietnam War are said to be similar ones. In that sense, the Boer War was a precedent of the policy of ethnic cleansing notably seen in the war in former Yugoslavia in recent years. The impact of the Russo-Japanese War was decisive when one considers the face of the next war predicted by the soldiers of major European countries on the evening before World War I and corresponding military strategies (There are excellent studies of Jay Luvaas and Tim Travers for the reason why the soldiers of major European countries failed to learn decisive lessons from a number of wars that occurred from 1860's to 1914. For more detail, see Jay Luvaas, *The Military Legacy of the Civil War: The European Inheritance* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959]; T. H. E. Travers, "Technology, Tactics, and Morale: Jean de Bloch, *the Boer War*, and *British Military Theory*, 1900-1914," *Journal of Modern History*, Vol. 51[June 1979], pp.264-286). In the Russo-Japanese War, a number of products of modern science technology appeared such as magazine guns, quick firing guns, mobile heavy firearms, machine guns, land mines, barbed wires, search lights, communications via telephones and in particular trenches. Furthermore, there is no doubt that the Russo-Japanese War was the first battle which witnessed that the most important equipage of foot soldiers is shovels apart from rifles. There had been a strong tendency to disregard "colonial wars" represented by the Boer War as a whole, because people thought that lessons for the next war in the European continent cannot be learnt from them. But the Russo-Japanese War was totally different (Michael Howard, "Men against Fire: The Doctrine of the Offensive in 1914," in Michael Howard, *The Lessons of History* [Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991], p.107). In fact, officers of the US and European armies and navies sent a number of reports on the appearance of this war to their home countries after they observed the war. These reports were studied with an extreme enthusiasm by each country's General Staff. To put it briefly, when major European countries mobilized their armies in 1914, the image of war soldiers of those countries had in mind was the Russo-Japanese War waged on mainland China from 1904 to 1905, not the Boer War, the American Civil War or the German Wars of Unification (Howard, "Men against Fire," p.108). If we look back the Russo-Japanese War from the present, there already found a number of events which are general characteristics of total war. However, it was in World War I when the appearance of total war has become apparent to everyone. World War I was not prepared with a form of total war in mind from the beginning. Rather, the war started when no one was still aware that it was total war. That is, leaders of major warring countries made a decision to participate in the war in the beginning on the assumption that it would be a short limited war, but they came to realize the appearance of a form of war they had never experienced before in the process of waging war. Immediately after World War I broke out, the governments and people of the warring countries did not predict that the war would have been a long battle that lasted for more than four years. Thus, the national mobilization system at the beginning of the war did not assume a prolonged war. On the contrary, World War II was total war prepared subjectively. Based on the experience in World War I, the next war had been assumed to be total war. According to Yukio Mochida, World War I "resulted in" total war, while World War II was total war from its "beginning" (Yukio Mochida, "Daiichiji Sekaitaisen-ji kara Dainiji Sekaitaisen-ji : Futatsu no Soryokusen to Doitsu (From World War I to World War II: Two Total Wars and Germany)" in Masaki Miyake, Tomoyuki Ishizu, Suguru Araya and Hiroki Nakajima, eds., *Doitsu-shi to Senso :「Gunji-shi」to「Senso-shi」*(*War in German History : "Military History" and "War History"*)[Sairyusha, 2011]). In fact, an integrated war conduct system had already been constructed before the Pacific War in Japan including the enactment of the "National General Mobilization Act" in 1938, although it was not a comprehensive system. The concept "Nation in Arms" in the age of the Napoleonic Wars was replaced with the new concept of war, "Nation at War." This signifies that the production of weapons and food and their supply to soldiers by a state have become more important than the supply of soldiers.

war includes at least capabilities and intention. To be sure, the means and objectives of war have expanded after the French Revolution in 1789. In addition, total war has become possible to be measured by its scale as well as by its objectives and means. A symbolic example of that is brutality against noncombatants, which is now called as genocide. If war is waged by the entire state, its cities and citizens become a justifiable target of attack. For example, a thought of strategic bombing is developed together with the development of air power significantly backed up by the technological development.

Furthermore, as both Clausewitz and Ludendorff pointed out, the relationship of war and society has become close, because people's fanaticism has actively been input in war spheres from this time. Thus, new doctrine, philosophy or ideological dimensions have come to be strongly recognized. The fact that Carl Marx and Friedrich Engels advocated the communism revolution from the perspective of class and the fact that Ludendorff went deeply into fascism at one time are widely known. As a result, war is a battle between states and at the same time it leads to domestic battles. Then, an element that may be called as "crash of culture" becomes strong by integrating all those factors.[13]

The word called total war indicates more extensive worldwide war and implies a situation where there is nothing to stop it. However, the concept of two total wars (the two world wars) ends up being relative when taking into account the appearance of nuclear weapons and subsequent expansion of its scale. Thus, the word total war has started to be used in more cultural and political context and does not refer to the conduct of war.[14]

Ian F. W. Beckett once argued that war is a "determinant of major changes" and it is wrong to consider wars only from a perspective of calamity even if they are lamentable.[15] In addition, Beckett also mentioned that war has probably brought about changes to the world rather than armies have changed the world.[16] Furthermore, Anthony Giddens mentioned in his book titled *The Nation-State and Violence*,

---

[13] Hew Strachan mentioned that "total war" as military concept means the annihilation or destruction of enemies and implies the cooperation of people who are involved in the war whether they are soldiers or civilians. The concept of "total war" has almost the same meaning as "absolute war" (Clausewitz) waged thoroughly, while the concept of "modern war" implies war waged by using all equipment of industrialized technologies. Strachan argues, therefore, that it is more faithful to the historical evidence to express wars in the 20th century, in particular, the two world wars as "modern war" rather than "total war." He also points out that philosophical and ideological dimensions became dominant in World War I and World War II so that the true "war of ideas" was waged. For more detail, see Arthur Marwick, Clive Emsley, "Introduction," in Marwick, Emsley, Simpson, eds., *Total War and Historical Change*, pp.1-23; Hew Strachan, "Total War in the Twentieth Century," in Marwick, Emsley, Simpson, eds., *Total War and Historical Change*, pp.255-283.

[14] Brian Bond mentions that the concept of total war itself is nothing but a great myth the same as the concepts of "decisive victory" and "decisive defeat." For more detail, see B. Bond, *War and Society in Europe, 1890-1970* (London, Fontana, 1984), p.168.

[15] For more detail, see Marwick, Emsley, "Introduction," in Marwick, Emsley, Simpson, eds., *Total War and Historical Change*, pp.1-23; Ian F. W. Beckett, "Total War," in Marwick, Emsley, Simpson, eds., *Total War and Historical Change*, pp.25-41.

[16] Ian F. W. Beckett, Keith Simpson. eds., *A Nation in Arms: A Social Study of the British Army in the First World*

"Anyone who was born in the 20th century cannot deny a huge impact of military power, war preparations and war itself on the social world even for a moment."[17] Now let us examine the argument of Marwick over total war and social changes in detail based on those points.

2. Four Dimensions of Social Change: Arthur Marwick and Total War

As the author has described earlier, Marwick examined total war from the functional perspective and developed a provocative argument that seemingly an irrational phenomenon called war paradoxically promotes streamlining, improvement of efficiency and modernization in some cases as a result of rational organization of all resources, personnel and systems to wage war.[18] According to Marwick, total war triggers social changes from four dimensions.[19] The first is "the destructive and disruptive dimension of war." Destruction and disruption lead to social changes by giving an impulse for revitalization or revitalization toward a better condition than before in some cases. Needless to say, the fact suggested by this first dimension is "lamentable loss" rather than "changes." Although war is an event that causes huge sacrifices and sorrow, no one can deny that the destruction itself generates an impulse for revitalization at the same time. In fact, studies on natural disasters, which are often compared as the analogy to war, indicate that such revitalization is toward something better than before.[20]

Disruption may result in the replacement of traditional behavioral patterns (for example in distant farming villages) with new behavioral patterns (for example youths decide to settle down in cities), and may give people a new situation or opportunity that cannot be encountered in peacetime (e.g. female

---

War (Manchester: Manchester University Press, 1985), p.27.

[17] Anthony Giddens, *Kokumin Kokka to Boryoku* (*The Nation-State and Violence*) (Translated by Kiyobumi Matsuo and Masatoshi Obata Jiritsu Shobo), 1991, p.22.

[18] "Social changes" Marwick meant to say consist of the following ten points. They are: 1) change of social geography which includes population, urbanization and industrial distribution; 2) Economic and technological change which includes theoretical and structural change; 3) Change of social structure; 4) Change of social cohesion. This issue is particularly related to state or ethnic minority; 5) Change of social welfare and social policy; 6) Change of material conditions; 7) Change of customs and behavior; 8) Change of artistic and intellectual ideas and practices and in popular culture; 9) change in the family and in the role and status of women and 10) Change of social and political values, institutions and ideas. See Arthur Marwick, "Introduction," in Marwick, ed., *Total War and Social Change*, p. xiv; Arthur Marwick, "Conclusion," in Marwick, ed., *Total War and Social Change*, pp.119-125 and Marwick, *War and Social Change in the Twentieth Century*, p. 222.

[19] Marwick argues four dimensions of wars and social changes using the expression "four-tier model." For more detail, see Marwick, *War and Social Change in the Twentieth Century*, pp.161-165.

[20] There are studies which explain that war is similar to natural disaster in some dimensions and that if there are similarities, there naturally exist differences. For example, see P. A. Sorokin, *Man and Society in Calamity: the Effects of War, Revolution, Famine, Pestilence Upon Human Mind, Behavior, Social Organization and Cultural Life* (New York: Dutton, 1943); G. W. Baker, D. D. Chapman, eds., *Man and Society in Disaster* (New York: Basic Books, 1962); A. H. Barton, *Social Organization under Stress: A Sociological Review of Disaster Studies* (New York: Nabu Press, 2010); F. C. Ikle, *The Social Impact of Bomb Destruction* (Oklahoma: University of Oklahoma Press, 1988); Quincy B. Wright, *A Study of War*, 2 vols. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942).

labor in wartime) even if it is an afterthought.[21] That is why war has often been captured as "creative destruction (Schumpeter)."[22]

The second is "the test dimension." Not only military systems directly related to the conduct of war but also the entire social, economic and political systems are tested to prove whether they can endure the conduct of war. It is natural that there is no room for the judgment of value in the argument here. Marwick's argument only describes the truth that war brings about tremendous stress and strain to the state's military, social, political and economic systems so that those systems have to adjust to their situations if that state tries to be spared the defeat and his argument has nothing to do with a positive opinion on war. If those systems are inappropriate, they would be destroyed as shown in the typical example of the Russian Empire in World War I.

Of course, it is true that various stress and strain associated with the conduct of war do not always bring about desirable social changes and that they may at times cause dictatorship, secret police, national censorship, concentration of power or secrecy. The "change" pointed out by Marwick is a value-neutral concept and does not necessarily mean "the progressive change."[23]

For Marwick, war, particularly total war, inevitably promote the social restructuring and are the ultimate test for existing systems, forcing system to be restructured for more efficiency. In that sense, war can be said as a great "auditor." As Marwick shrewdly indicated, the recognition that one may not able to survive will be the biggest cornerstone of organizational transformation. Such risk awareness is the strongest force for changing the social, political and economic structures.

The third is "the participation dimension." The conditions for the social participation are set for people from whom the authority and power to participate in various social activities have been taken away up to that point. Total war forces groups (e.g. working class, women, ethnic minority) to which privileges had not been given to be involved in them whether in military organizations or in the so-called home front in their country. The result of such participation provides possibilities of acquiring social gain or social minimum and at least arousing new self-consciousness and self-esteem. That is because people who are required the most for conducting total war can have the most favorable position for negotiation in that process and a situation where they look for payment in exchange for their labor arises. Probably, a state provides those groups with some sort of remuneration by causing social changes or provides such remuneration as one means for maintaining a high moral in those groups.[24] Examples of dimensions of such "participation" are working class, farmers, women and ethnic minority (black people, in particular,

---

[21]　Marwick, "Introduction," in Marwick, ed., *Total War and Social Change*, p. xv.
[22]　Yasushi Yamanouchi, "Hensha Jobun (Foreword of Editor)," Yasushi Yamanouchi, Naoki Sakai, eds, *Soryokusen Taisei kara Gurobarizeishon e* (*From Total War System to Globalization*) (Heibonsha, 2003), p.21.
[23]　Marwick, "Introduction," in Marwick, ed., *Total War and Social Change*, pp.xv-xvi.
[24]　Marwick, "Introduction," in Marwick, ed., *Total War and Social Change*, p.xvi.

in the U.S.).[25]

Thus, total war operates in a way that it eliminates domestic obstacles such as hierarchy for further national integration. The two world wars, especially World War II, were a decisive turning point for giving people and groups that had been outside the system in the past a certain role by actively incorporating them into the system and promoting the vitalization and concentration of human resources. People has been homogenized toward beings required by state after total war. This recognition of Marwick is similar to the Yamanouchi's historical view to be described later.

The fourth pointed out by Marwick is "the psychological dimension" and this generates a feeling that war must lead to something new, because people are subject to strong psychological shock by the war.[26] It is true that war is a grand place for emotional experiences. During that period, people strengthen the integrity to a group to which they belong or into which they assimilate, while they intensify the hostility toward their enemy. Awareness takes root in people that even a horrendous genocide must have a noble objective. Such emotional experiences including fear for war are accumulated particularly in the cultural sphere and evoke new intellectual and artistic reactions.[27] War is probably a phenomenon equipped with something that forces people to make a mental preparation for accepting new thoughts and behaviors. In fact, in the home front of a number of states that wage total war, a movement of "creating homes fit for heroes" has been born.[28]

There is no doubt that war is tragic and leaves people severe trauma. At the same time, war drives people to excitement and enthusiasm. As a result, they change not only the individual mentality but also the culture as a group.[29] Paul Fussel describes in his book titled *The Great War and Modern Memory* that the war, particularly, the irony of war has come to occupy part of literary consciousness of people and points out that it is the biggest factor of putting an end to the faith in progress and to optimism.[30]

---

[25] In addition to Marwick, Penny Summerfield, for example, examines the correlation of total wars and leveling of class in detail. For more detail, see Marwick and Emsley, "Introduction," in Marwick, Emsley, Simpson, eds., *Total War and Historical Change*, pp.1-23; Penny Summerfield, "The 'Leveling of Class,'" in Marwick, Emsley, Simpson, eds., *Total War and Historical Change*, pp.198-222. In addition, Stanislas Andrzejewski advocated the concept of "military participation ratio" in his book and verified the fact that there is some sort of causal correlation between the participation of the society in efforts for war and subsequent leveling of inequality in the society. S. Andrzejewski, *Military Organization and Society* (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1954).

[26] Marwick, "Introduction," in Marwick, ed., *Total War and Social Change*, pp.xv-xvii.

[27] Marwick, "Introduction," in Marwick, ed., *Total War and Social Change*, p.xvi; Paul Fussel, *The Great War and Modern Memory* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1975).

[28] Not to mention, the above-mentioned social changes pointed out by Marwick do not always occur as an "intentionally-guided" consequence of leaders. In many cases, they may occur as an "unguided" result of the process of those changes.

[29] For more detail concerning this point, see Martin van Creveld, *The Culture of War* (*Senso Bunkaron*) (translated and supervised by Tomoyuki Ishizu, Hara Shobo, Vol.1 and Vol.2, 2010) and Martin van Creveld, *The Transformation of War* (*Senso no Hensen*) (translated and supervised by Tomoyuki Ishizu, Hara Shobo, 2011).

[30] Fussel, *The Great War and Modern Memory*, pp.315-16. In this book, Fussel argues over the inheritances of World

3. Problems of the Functional Theory

What one needs to confirm first here is that the core of the Marwick's arguments is that it is necessary to consider the social conclusion of war in detail as a common belief and that war may even cause beneficial social changes in some cases. Needless to say, as Marwick himself admits, such arguments do not hide such facts as cruelty, fear and loss, which are another dimension of war.

However, the arguments over the relationship between total war and social changes advocated by Marwick have been severely criticized that social changes are the result of long-term progress and war is not necessarily their cause or that war has not promoted changes but inhibited them. In fact, there are clear differences in the tone of early works of Marwick in the early 1970's and those in the middle 1980's and after.[31]

To be sure, even if a change occurs after a war, it does not always mean that it was caused by that war. In addition, as Marwick himself admits, war is not the only catalyst of social changes or the most important one.[32] However, as Marwick describes, on the other hand, it is fully worth considering an issue of why a number of social changes occur during or immediately after war. An activity arises, a situation is created, a problem occurs and a process starts to progress in "society at war." Those changes could hardly happen in "society not at war."[33]

It is certain that war strengthens the control over a state, leading to the setback of so-called liberalism.[34] In fact the thoughts of free trade and market economy that could not endure the test of World War I were forced to be corrected finally to the thought of "big government" such as state management and state control. Nationalization of railroads was an essential condition for conducting war for all states, so were the introduction of summer time system and of the license system of sales of alcohols. The generous legal systems for labors and enhancement of welfare programs in factories,

---

War I to the British society in detail such as the regulation for working hours of pubs and the introduction of summer time.

[31] Yamanouchi, "Hensha Jobun (Foreword of Editor)," in Yanamouchi and Sakai, eds., *Soryokusen Taisei kara Gurobarizeishon e* (*From Total War System to Globalization*), p.15. Other than that, see, for example, Yasushi Yamanouchi, "Soryokusen no Jidai (The Times of Total War)"; "Senji Doin Taisei no Hikakushi-teki Kosatsu : Kon'nichi no Nihon wo Rikai Suru Tameni (Comparative-Historical Study on Wartime Mobilization System : To Understand Japan Today)" ; "Senji Doin Taisei (Wartime Mobilization System)" ; "Senjiki no Shakai Seisaku Ron Social Policy Theory in Wartime)" ; "Soryokusen kara Gurobarizeishon e (From Total War to Globalization)," in Yasushi Yamanouchi, *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Weba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience*) , Chikumashobo, 1999.

[32] For example, the German domestic society during World War II was specified decisively by the nature of the Nazi regime. Marwick, Waites, Emsley, Golby, eds., *War and Change in the Twentieth- Century Europe*, p.131.

[33] Marwick, "Introduction," in Marwick, ed., *Total War and Social Change*, p. xiv.

[34] For more detail concerning these points, see Marwick, *War and Social Change in the Twentieth Century*, pp.6-14 and Marwick, "Introduction: War and Social Change in Twentieth-century Britain," in Marwick, *The Deluge*, pp.11-48.

pension system and social welfare system are not always the negative inheritance of war. At the same time, however, they reveal the fact that "good old liberalism" is not valid any more in the face of the actual world of the 20th century.[35]

Obviously, social changes Marwick meant to say do not progress linearly nor pursue a certain direction. However, Marwick argues that a timing of social changes is severely affected by war. Of course, changes themselves are value neutral and may have positive effects on individuals, groups and the entire mankind but may often have negative effects on them. Let us reiterate that one should not confuse social changes Marwick meant to say with "progress," In fact, he fully recognizes a paradox that war brings about desirable social changes in some cases, while it causes unendurable calamities in other cases.

Not to mention, one needs to pay sufficient attention to the argument that no social changes would occur without war. As Wolfgang Mommsen described, the process of changes in the economic and social spheres may have already progressed for a while so that war may only have accelerated those changes. In that sense, the development that had already been progressing before war (structural changes) and approaches of political leaders and parties (guided changes or political changes) need to be distinguished.

The issues of the acquisition of the right to vote and working opportunities have always been controversial topics over "the participation dimension" advocated by Marwick, particularly war and social participation of women. Apart from right or wrong of those arguments, at least self-confidence and assertiveness demonstrated by women after the war are phenomena unimaginable before the war. In that sense, for example, it is problematic to apply the today's standard of value to that of the 1920's as it is. That is, what is trivial from the today's female perspective could be an extremely significant progress for women in those days.[36]

Beckett mentioned earlier admits the fact that war becomes one decisive factor of big social changes, while he describes that a social impact of total wars in the 20th century should not be overestimated. A question to be asked here is in what sense total war is a factor of bringing about important social changes.[37] That is to say, it is important to evaluate how much significance war, one factor of social changes, took on compared to other factors, for example, structural, political and ideological factors in the society. Also, whether total wars led to totalitarian states in the 20th century and totalitarian states caused the more total wars may be a major issue to be studied in the future.[38]

---

[35] Marwick, *War and Social Change in the Twentieth Century*, pp.53-73.

[36] As a representative negative opinion on the relationship of wars and social participation of female, see Chizuko Ueno, *Nashonarizumu to Jenda* (*Nationalism and Gender*) ,Seidosha, 1988.

[37] Marwick, "Introduction," in Marwick, ed., *Total War and Social Change*, p.xv.

[38] For more detail, see Marwick, Waites, Emsley, Golby, eds., *War and Change in the Twentieth-Century Europe*, pp.213-231.

4. "System Society" and Social Restructuring: Focusing on Yasushi Yamanouchi

Let us now examine the argument of Yasushi Yamanouchi who analyzed the relationship of total war and social changes from a slightly different perspective. Yamanouchi argues that a social restructuring has occurred due to the arrival of the age of total war in his works such as *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Beba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience*) and *Shisutemu Shakai no Gendaiteki Iso* (*Modern Phase of System Society*).[39] According to Yamanouchi, World War I and World War II were the first total wars in history and forced major countries to carry out a large-scale restructuring of the entire society to prepare for such wartime system. As a result, late comers such as Japan, Germany and Italy established the fascism total war system, while advanced countries such as the U.S. and the U.K. established the New Deal total war system. World War II is actually a battle for mobilization of resources between the two total war systems and the New Deal total war system won, because it succeeded in mobilization (conversion of society into total system) more efficiently.[40]

The above-mentioned point of Marwick's argument has been succeeded by the argument of Yamanouchi that one should reconsider the contemporary history from a perspective of social restructuring by total war system, focusing on the total war system in World War II in particular. That is, Yamanouchi argued that the form of the modern society that has included the distinction between so-called upper class and other people (hierarchy) in it from its formation has drastically changed in the current where human resources were mobilized to the fullest extent and the general public was incorporated into the system for waging war. In his argument, it is concluded that "the transformation from hierarchical society to system society" occurred as a result of the change.[41] Yamanouchi called a society formed by such process as "contemporary society" in contrast to "modern society."

According to Yamanouchi, it was a basic position of the postwar historical studies of Japan to argue that the defeat of Japan in the Pacific War in 1945 and a series of reforms after the war eliminated old-fashioned irrationality and that the post war period should be clearly distinguished from the wartime.

---

[39] Yamanouchi, "Soryokusen no Jidai (The Times of Total War)"; "Senji Doin Taisei no Hikakushi-teki Kosatsu : Kon-nichi no Nihon wo Rikai Suru Tameni (Comparative-Historical Study on Wartime Mobilization System : To Understand Japan Today)"; "Senji Doin Taisei (Wartime Mobilization System)"; "Senjiki no Shakai Seisaku Ron (Social Policy Theory in Wartime)"; "Soryokusen kara Gurobarizeishon e (From Total War to Globalization)," in Yasushi Yamanouchi, *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Weba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience*); and Yasushi Yamanouchi, *Shisutemu Shakai no Gendaiteki Iso* (*Modern Phase of System Society*), Nippon Hyoron Sha,1982.

[40] Also see Hatakeyama, *Doinshi-kan Jyosetsu* (*Introduction to Historical Perspective of Mobilization*), p.179.

[41] Yasushi Yamanouchi, "Hohoteki Josetsu – Soryokusen to Shisutemu Togo (Methodological Introduction: Total War and System Integration)," in Yasushi Yamanouchi, J. Victor Koschmann, Ryuichi Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization,*) Kashiwashobo Publishing, 1995, pp.9-53. See also its English version, Yasushi Yamanouchi, J. Victor Koschmann, Ryuichi Narita, eds., *Total War and 'Modernization'* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1998).

That is a historical view that a new history has started from August 1945.[42]

On the contrary, a historical view has emerged that shows an interpretation that the wartime is closely linked to the postwar period and the wartime is actually a basic condition for the postwar period and argues that it is wrong to consider the postwar period as a separated period in Japan's history.[43] It is certain that the historical view that captures the two ages, "the dark age" during the war and "the enlightenment age" in the postwar period, as dichotomy has a number of questions. Indeed, the two ages have complicity in some dimensions. Yamanouchi argued that the transition from the prewar period through the war period to the postwar period is a change from "hierarchical society" to "system society" not only in Japan but also in Western Europe and the U.S. and he intended to explain such change by using the concept *Gleichschaltung* ("forced homogenization" or "forced assimilation").

Focusing on Japan, a historical view that a series of postwar reforms that started at the end of the Pacific War in 1945 have returned Japanese history to "the course of *Taisho* Democracy" was dominant in the past. It is backed by a historical recognition that interprets the structure of World War II as the battle between the irrational and dictatorial fascism system (Japan, Germany, Italy) on one hand, and the rational and democratic New Deal system (the U.S., the U.K., France)on the other.[44] However, according to Yamanouchi, all fields in the society have been organized to a gigantic organization even in the New Deal democratic system and a strong sign of so to speak totalitarianism was observed even in New Deal states.[45] That is, both the New Deal society and the fascism society went through the drastic restructuring by general mobilization called for by the two world wars as an essential condition. That is why Yamanouchi did not draw the contemporary history as a battle between fascism and New Deal and pointed out the necessity of considering it from the perspective of social restructuring by the total war system.[46] Although the New Deal society that was more efficient in terms of entire functional mobilization won due to World War II, Yamanouchi points out that one cannot underestimate, for example, the totalitarian trend in the American society. At least, a simple dichotomy of the liberal democratic system and the totalitarian system is not accurate as the historical fact of World War II.[47]

In addition, Yamanouchi points out the importance of the fact that the modern society has

---

[42] J. Victor Koschmann, "Introduction to the English Version," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization*), p.ii.

[43] J. Victor Koschmann, "Introduction to the English Version," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization*), p.iii.

[44] Yamanouchi, "Hohoteki Joron (Methodological Introduction)," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization*), p.9.

[45] Yamanouchi, "Hoho-teki Joron (Methodological Introduction)," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization*), p.10.

[46] Yamanouchi, "Hohoteki Joron (Methodological Introduction)," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization*), p.10.

[47] Hatakeyama, *Doinshi-kan Josetsu* (*Introduction to Historical Perspective of Mobilization*), p.191.

incorporated the division of upper class and other people (hierarchy) after its formation in the above-mentioned process.[48] In the total war system, not only economic resources of a country but also its human resources had to be mobilized to the fullest extent to wage war, but the existence of lower-class people may be a serious obstacle to the conduct of total war. That is because lower-class people who did not have legitimacy as citizens were not in position of assuming a political responsibility so that they lacked an internal motivation for being subjective players of conducting total war.

Furthermore, David Schoenbaum expressed "the forced homogenization" by Nazi Germany as "the social revolution of Hitler," but it is ironic that social class discrimination of the German nation was abolished under the slogan of common destiny in the age of total war inside Nazi Germany that had an ambition of global domination.[49] In addition, Ralf Dahrendorf mentioned that Nazism had promoted the modernization of German society regardless of the intention of authority as "an unintended result."[50] As such, the fact that "forced homogenization" that strived to integrate the entire nation was promoted by extraordinary and irrational situations called the conduct of war is important and that promoted rationalization. That is, it was expected for the nation to assume the responsibility of social functions necessary for conducting war through "forced homogenization."[51]

The total war system was to streamline the entire society toward functionality for conducting war.[52]

---

[48] Yamanouchi, "Hohoteki Joron (Methodological Introduction)," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization)*, p.10.

[49] Yamanouchi, "Hohoteki Joron (Methodological Introduction)," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization*), p.11. The policy of "forced homogenization" was actually used by all states that participated in World War II. In fact, the participation of women in workplaces was an inevitable result in the home front where men were scarce. In addition, as a social philosopher Paul Virilio demonstrated, the functional social participation of a large number of the physically-handicapped in Germany including the use of artificial foots was a logical extension of the same forced national competitive mobilization. Hatakeyama, *Doinshi-kan Josetsu* (*Introduction to Historical Perspective of Mobilization*), p.181.

[50] Yamanouchi Yasushi, "Senji Doin Taisei no Hikakushi-teki Kosatsu : Kon-nichi no Nihon wo Rikai Suru Tameni (Comparative-Historical Study on Wartime Mobilization System: To Understand Japan Today)," *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Weba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience*), p.105 and Yamanouchi, "Senji Doin Taisei (Wartime Mobilization System)," in Yamanouchi, *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Weba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience*), p.137.

[51] Yamanouchi, "Hohoteki Josetsu (Methodological Introduction)," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization*), p.12.

[52] Yamanouchi, "Hoho-teki Josetsu (Methodological Introduction)," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization*), p.12. According to Yamanouchi, there were persons who noticed this fact at an early stage. Kazuo Ookochi argued after the Pacific War that the wartime economy has a reasonably-rational characteristic and the results of reforms achieved by that rationality should not be set back. In addition, according to him, the organization of labor force that has characterized the Japanese economy after the Pacific War and has been a pillar of its high growth was not formed by postwar reforms for the first time, but its base was laid by the wartime mobilization system (Yamanouchi, "Hohoteki Josetsu (Methodological Introduction)," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization*), p.36). Ookochi argued that it becomes possible to organize the Japanese society more rationally by social policies promoted by a total war state or a new standard of industries called for by the age of total war, that is, modernization which is an indispensable requirement of the wartime system. This is precisely the historical view of rationalization promoted by total war. He

Such historical view has a number of similarities with the theory of "the 1940-system" discussed below.[53] In fact, Yamanouchi points out that though many states have returned to a peaceful ordinary system after the end of World War II, this return does not mean the recovery to prewar conditions. Each country's society after World War II has taken a new line of functionalistic restructuring of the society fostered by the total war system and the life has recovered on this line.[54]

If so, the content of policies of many states after World War II has been prescribed to a large extent by "system society" where its line was laid by wartime mobilization so that "welfare-states" realized there are actually equal to "warfare-states."[55] That is why any democratic reform cannot be free from the tendency to further reinforce the integration by states.[56] Taking the U.K. for example, policies of state intervention which are the prototype of subsequent welfare states extended through the two world wars, but a large number of talented people are required in war between states and a restructuring of society

recognized that the wartime economy is not just a period of waste from the perspective of physical facilities, human factors and industrial structure, and that rather, the wartime economy intermediates a new postwar economic order and it is inseparable from it. A series of reforms after the war should be understood as an extension of solutions subjectively incorporated already in the wartime (Yamanouchi, "Senji-ki no Shakai Seisaku-ron (Social Policy Theory in Wartime)," in Yamanouchi, *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Weba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience)*, p.148).

[53] Anthony Giddens also emphasizes the fact that the formation of modern society has been consistently borne by nation states accompanied by preparations and mobilization for war in his book titled *The Nation-State and Violence*. Furthermore, Tokuchi Tada distinguishes the view of war based on national general mobilization cried out after World War I from the view of war based on national total war in the late 1930's and argues that "the former intends to centralize, integrate and exercise the full power of a state mainly for military battles, while the latter emphasizes a total war as the last unavoidable means for decisive battle. A project of war is deployed in a way that independent battles are permitted in all cultural fields such as politics (foreign diplomacy and domestic affairs), economy, thoughts, religions, arts, education in parallel to or before and after the war and all battles in each field are connected in an unifying way (to be more accurate, organically and integrally) ." Tada also describes that, in a war based on national total war, hundreds of cultural projects and all social classes such as thoughts, economy, politics, military forces as well as religions and education have an interconnection and an organic and additional-cultural unity. For more detail, see Yamanouchi, "Hoho-teki Joron (Methodological Introduction)," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization*), p.325.

[54] Yamanouchi, "Hohoteki Joron (Methodological Introduction)," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization*), p.12. In addition, Talcott Parsons analyzed the transition from "hierarchical society" to "system society" based on the situation of the age of total war (quoted in Yamanouchi, "Hototeki Joron (Methodological Introduction)," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization)*, p.13). According to Parsons, in the process of establishing the total war system, the transition of capitalism from "hierarchical society" where there are irreconcilable hierarchical conflicts in it to functionalistic "system society" where various interests are restructured to different social roles was a momentum for the emergence of the contemporary society (Yamanouchi, "Senji-ki no Shakai Seisaku-ron (Social Policy Theory in Wartime)," in Yamanouchi, *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Weba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience)*, p.140).

[55] Yamanouchi, "Hohoteki Joron (Methodological Introduction)," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization*), p.38. It was Sheldon Wolin who described that a welfare state is other name of a warfare state (Yamanouchi, "Soryokusen no Jidai (The Times of Total War)," in Yamanouchi, *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Weba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience*), p.95).

[56] Yamanouchi, "Hohoteki Joron (Methodological Introduction)," in Yamanouchi, Koschmann and Narita, eds., *Soryokusen to Gendaika* (*Total War and Modernization*), p.38.

with the capability of dealing with such war was required. As a result, it became necessary to review the society from its bases including the formation of warrior-type body and the improvement of the literacy rate.[57]

Same as Marwick' argument, those arguments of Yamanouchi reflect the paradox of good will included in state and war. Ironically, although it has been believed that reason can oust violence since the modern age, violence has reached its climax in the age when reason has become the most rational. Michel Foucault noticed "a strangeness that state has started to slaughter the public in the form of war in the age when state has started to take care of the national health."[58] German "slave labor camp" and extermination camp reflect an efficient and bureaucratic form made by the same method that extreme impersonality used for managing other dimensions of efforts for conducting war. They are examples that show the fact that a moral ambiguity is concealed without exception when mankind enhances its power to manage and control its own natural and social environments in the severest manner in modern history.[59] In the age of total war, nation is not a name for persons who have the right and obligation to participate in politics but a name for persons who belong to the same destiny toward death and share a sentiment that affirms death. In that sense, it is a type of pseudo religion consisting of persons who share the fate of death in war and the national concept as "Imagined Communities" (Benedict Anderson) has completed in the age of total war.[60]

5. "Expansion of State" and "Managed Economy": with Focus on William McNeill

This article has been somewhat conceptual so far, but what has changed specifically as a result of total war? Let us now turn to the domestic factors to see how the society has actually changed by the emergence of the total war called World War I.

Marwick mentioned earlier divided the period during World War I into four periods and analyzed their characteristics. According to his analysis, the first period is from August 1914 when the war started to the middle of 1915 and this period is positioned as "illusionary war." The second period is from the middle of 1915 to 1917 and it is expressed as "the commencement of total war." The period of "the

---

[57] Hatakeyama, *Doinshi-kan Josetsu* (*Introduction to Historical Perspective of Mobilization*), p.189.

[58] Quoted in Hatakeyama, *Doinshi-kan Josetsu* (*Introduction to Historical Perspective of Mobilization)*, p.229. As for Foucault, see Sonoe Omoda, *Misheru Fuko : Kindai wo Ura kara Yomu* (*Michel Foucault: Understanding the background of Modern Age*), Chikumashobo, 2011 and Tatsuya Higaki, *Fuko Kogi* (*Foucault Lecture*), Kawade Shobo Shinsha, 2010.

[59] William McNeill, Translated by Hitoshi Takahashi, *Senso no Sekaishi : Gijyutsu to Guntai to Shakai* (*The Pursuit of Power: Technology, Armed Force and Society since A.D. 1000*) (Tosui Shobo, 2002), p.489.

[60] Yamanouchi, "Soryokusen no Jidai (The Times of Total War)," in Yamanouchi, *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Weba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience*), p.94.

commencement of total war" needs more explanations in relation to this article.

A characteristic of this period is that the war has obviously become an overwhelming war of attrition. A symbolic example is the Battle of Verdun in 1916. A stalemate in trench warfare since the outbreak of World War I had been used in a way that it contributed to the attritional strategy advocated by Erich von Falkenhayn of German Chief of the General Staff at that time. In that strategy, manpower and morale not only of the army but also of the entire state were tested to kill the enemy by "loss of blood."[61] As a result, the awareness of total war has been raised further and the mobilization of the home front in relation to the battle front, particularly the establishment of the wartime economy system was launched on a full scale. Germany had been forced to move into the wartime economic system from a relatively early stage due to the economic blockage and Russia had completed the establishment of its production system in May 1915. On the other hand, the shortage of ammunition became an issue in the Parliament in the U.K. (Shell Scandal) and the Ministry of Munitions (this is also a significant characteristic of the age of total war) was newly established under the new coalition government in which the Labour Party participated for the first time. The National Registration Act which obligates the registration of occupation was enacted in the summer of 1915 and the conscription system of single males was introduced for the first time in the British history in 1916.[62]

The third period of the Marwick's analysis is 1917 and it was positioned as "the crisis of the wartime system and the Russian Revolution." The fourth period is 1918 and it was positioned as "the new foreign diplomacy/new system and the conclusion of the war."

In the progress of the total war, the first point to be emphasized in relation to this article is "the expansion of state."[63] Before World War I, it was said that general British people did not have any contact with state institutions throughout a lifetime except the police and post offices. However, such liberalistic "invisible sate" has completely become the thing of the past by World War I. The intensified centralization of state power and bloated administrative agencies are the most notable characteristics under World War I. Werner Sombart pointed out that the war and a huge demand generated by it significantly contributed to the formation of modern capitalism in his book titled *War and Capitalism*.[64] In addition, Max Weber focused on the fact that war brings about social discipline and rationalization, and

---

[61] For more detail, see Foley, *German Strategy and the Path to Verdun*.

[62] For more detail concerning the above-mentioned points, see Seiji Kimura, *Futatsu no Sekai Taisen* (*Two World Wars*), Yamakawa Shuppansha, 1996.

[63] Christopher Dandecker points out that civil rights were enhanced in parallel with the development of nation state together with the emergence of modern nation state in his book titled *Surveillance, Power and Modernity: Bureaucracy and Discipline from 1700 to the Present Day*. He stated that the supreme military objective has dramatically expanded across the surveillance capability of modern states by the total war (Yamanouchi, "Senjiki no Shakaiseisaku-ron (Social Policy Theory in Wartime)," in Yamanouchi, *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Weba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience*), p.149).

[64] Werner Sombart, *War and Capitalism* (*Senso to Shihonshugi*) (translated by Seiya Kanamori, Kodansha, 2010).

Bernard Waites employed this theory and states that the theory of Weber was appropriate in terms of World War I in that the national vehicle as a bureaucratic machine is linked to the conduct of war and becomes enlarged and that this state implements proactive actions in areas such as the preparation of the pension system, promotion of scientific and technological researches and extension of the education system.[65]

The equalization (leveling) of obligations and burden on the nation through the war made it assure that the right to participate in politics and the equalization (leveling) of interests are legitimate.[66] The concept of leveling, one of the results of the total war, appears here. How to bridge the gap between obligations and rights of nation decided the national unifying power of each state during World War I. "Social disruption and conflicts are the threat for the unification of state the same degree as military defeat (Bernard Waites)."[67] A state that totally mobilizes its nation for the cooperation in war needed to be a state which guarantees a basic level of subsistence of the nation. That is how a number of states enhanced their social policies during World War I and started to put on a characteristic of welfare state.[68]

The necessity of recruitment of a large number of soldiers and the call for dramatic production increase in munitions and military goods had caused the shortage of labor force. States have come to attach a high value to the cooperation with labor unions that are organizations of labors and this is closely related to the issue of procurement and distribution of labor force. Many labor unions cooperated in war production by cancelling strikes during the war.[69] So-called "*Burgfrieden*" was achieved. In addition, an illusion called "wartime socialism" had emerged among labor unions and socialists due to their cooperative relation with state and military.[70]

---

[65] Yamanouchi, "Senji Doin Taisei no Hikakushi-teki Kosatsu : Kon-nichi no Nihon wo Rikai Suru Tameni (Comparative-Historical Study on Wartime Mobilization System: To Understand Japan Today)," in Yamanouchi, *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Weba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience*), p.106.

[66] In fact, in Chapter 4, *Kokubo Kokusaku Kyoka no Teisho* (Suggestion of Reinforcement of National Defense and National Policy) of *Kokubo no Hongi to sono Kyoka no Teisho* (*Essence of National Defense and Suggestion of its Reinforcement)* (presented on October 1, 1934), to achieve national unity by enhancing and cultivating human elements, "it should not be permitted for some subjects to enjoy economic benefits, particularly unearned income so that the majority suffers from poverty, causing class conflicts." It particularly emphasizes the need for "social policies to provide rural areas with public welfare" and to save suffering farming communities (Yamanouchi, "Senjiki no Shakaiseisaku-ron (Social Policy Theory in Wartime)," in Yamanouchi, *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Weba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience*), p.160. As for the social policy theory during the wartime, see Yasushi Yamanouchi, "Sanka to Doin : Senjiki Chishikijin no Purofiiru (Participation and Mobilization: Profile of Wartime Intellectuals)," in Yamanouchi, *Shisutemu Shakai no Gendaiteki Iso* (*Modern Phase of System Society*), Iwanami Shoten, 1996.

[67] Yamanouchi, "Senji Doin Taisei no Hikakushi-teki Iso : Konnichi no Nihon wo Rikaisuru Tame ni (Comparative-Historical Study on Wartime Mobilization System: To Understand Japan Today)," in Yamanouchi, *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Weba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience)*, p.102.

[68] For more detail concerning "the expansion of states", see Kimura, *Futatsu no Sekai Taisen* (Two World Wars), p.29.

[69] Kimura, *Futatsu no Sekai Taisen* (*Two World Wars*), p.32.

[70] Kimura, *Futatsu no Sekai Taisen* (*Two World Wars*), pp.32-33.

The shortage of male work force due to war promoted the participation of women in workplaces and this later resulted in the realization of women's suffrage which had been rejected by that time. As described above, although this issue over the employment of women and the realization of suffrage is still a controversial topic now, but what one can say in this article is the fact that the women's suffrage was realized in the U.K. in 1918 during World War I and in the U.S. in 1920.[71] The medical and health areas also became subject to intervention and management of government. As for army soldiers, a variety of infectious diseases had cost a large number of victims rather than enemy's attacks in every war before World War I. However, vaccinations against those infectious diseases and other organized preventive measures were implemented during World War I so that a stalemate by trench warfare could last for such a long time.[72]

Although there are various reasons, one cannot deny the fact that labors, women and ethnic minority have gained a greater voice for the first time through the total war (World War I). Of course, different disruptions and conflicts in the society could not be completely resolved, but one should not miss the fact that the war further strengthened a sense of belonging to each state.[73]

One can say, therefore, that the emergence of total war was a main factor of strong influence on the change of social, political and economic structures of warring countries. If one tries to express the result of such a total war with one word, it is "social homogeneity" or "forced homogeneity" according to the expression of Yamanouchi.[74] The author wants to reiterate that hierarchy that had existed in each society was relativized in the process of total war and the trend of leveling members in society had been promoted.

So far, the author has considered the changes of total war and domestic society. Lastly, let us cite an example of total war and changes of international society. In the U.K., one cannot deny the fact that so-called "Imperial Total War" became a momentum of the independence of the Dominions and Colonies due to World War I. For example, Gandhi returned from South Africa to India as soon as World War I broke out and strongly advocated the military cooperation of India with the U.K. His attitude did not change until the conclusion of the war. That is because for Gandhi World War I was a battle for autonomy and independence in the future, requesting India to be recognized as partner in the British Empire.[75]

---

[71] Kibata, "Soryokusen toshit no Futatsu no Sekai Taisen (Two World Wars as Total Wars)," in Kibata, ed., *Nijusseiki no Senso towa Nandeattaka* (*What Do Wars in the 20th Century Mean?*), p.81.
[72] McNeill, *The Pursuit of Power*, pp.456-458.
[73] Kimura, *Futatsu no Sekai Taisen* (*Two World Wars*), p.38.
[74] For more detail concerning this point, see Shinichi Arai, *Senso Sekininron : Gendaishi karano Toi* (T*he War Responsibility: Question from Contemporary History*) , Iwanami Shoten, 1995, p.31.
[75] Kibata, "Soryokusen toshiteno Futatsu no Sekai Taisen (Two World Wars as Total War)," in Kibata, ed., *Nijusseiki no Senso towa Nandeattaka* (*What Do Wars in the 20th Century Mean?*), p.83.

This article has mainly introduced the arguments of Marwick and Yamanouchi, but there are actually many political scientists/historians who have the same awareness and historical view. The author would like to introduce the argument of William H McNeill first. His work titled *The Pursuit of Power: Technology, Armed Force, and Society since A. D. 1000* [Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1982] (*Senso no Sekaishi : Gijutsu to Guntai to Shakai*) (translated by Hitoshi Takahashi, Tosui Shobo, 2002) is an excellent book that considers history of major act of mankind called war in a broad context of society.[76]

This book points out the fact that states could be self-restructured to battle wars out in a way no one could predict as a remarkable characteristic in the age of total war and cites another important fact that "managed economy" which has been a major characteristic of society until now was born in the same age. As McNeill keenly pointed out, it is highly probable that this fact would be of the greatest historical significance of World War I in the future, taking into account "managed economy" that has become common worldwide in the late 20th century.[77] It was natural that the economic control was strengthened as the state control intensified. This is called "guided" social changes.[78] In fact, "corporatism" and its challenge to market economy became a major characteristic of the age after World War I. After World War II, in particular, the actual condition of so-called capitalist state was "managed state capitalism" or "managed economy" according to the expression of McNeill. It was as if the validity of the Keynesian economic theory was proved.

In the industrial dimension of "managed economy," the most important one among common changes in warring countries was said to be the introduction of mass production method. This method was introduced to the production of ammunition first and then of almost all military equipment. The method of intentional and planned invention at the time of designing new weapons and machines was introduced and this was as significant as the mass production method. McNeill expressed this method as "ordered invention." A good example of such an invention is the development of tanks.

Furthermore, McNeill expresses the same view as Marwick and Yamanouchi that changes of the society and day-to-day routines, some of which were caused intentionally or "under guidance," were occurring in parallel to the above-mentioned significant changes in technological areas. According to

---

[76] In addition to the work of McNeill, there is an excellent work that comprehensively argues the history of wars, Martin van Creveld, *The Transformation of War* (New York: The Free Press, 1991) (*Senso no Hensen*) (edited and translated by Tomoyuki Ishizu, Hara Shobo, 2011), John Keegan, *A History of Warfare* (New York: Hutchinson, 1993) (*Senryaku no Rekishi*) (translated by Toshikuni Endo, Shinkosha, 1997); John Keegan, *War and Our World* (London: Hutchinson, 1998) (*Senso to Ningen no Rekishi : Ningen wa Naze Senso wo Surunoka?*) (Translated by Takahiro Inoue, Tosui Shobo, 2000).

[77] McNeill, (translated) *Senso no Sekaishi* (*The Pursuit of Power*), p.470.

[78] For more detail, see Beckett, "Total War," in Marwick, Emsley, Simpson, eds., *Total War and Historical Change*, pp.24-41; Beckett, Simpson, eds., *A Nation in Arms*.

McNeill, for example, an efficient distribution of labor force has become a serious factor that decides success or failure of the conduct of war of a state so that much value has started to be placed on welfare not only of soldiers but also of labors. It is because the maximum production cannot be expected, if a nutritional status of labors is compromised or they have complaints. At the same time, the role of labor unions has extended in line with welfare measures provided by the side of management of factories.

In addition, as early as in 1916, the ration of food and other consumer goods was already shaking the inequality of consumption that had been a custom in the society of citizens before World War I (leveling). The connection of welfare and war had become even closer by World War II. For example, nutritional science was developed in the so-called interwar period and knowledge of essential nutrients that should be taken by humans as food has been accumulated. As a result, it became possible to scientifically ration out people with food during World War II. That is, the required intake of vitamins, calorie and protein was accurately calculated for each group of state and the required amount was accurately rationed out within the limit of goods. In fact, health conditions of British people rather improved during the war, and this seems to be attributable mainly to food rations.[79] Nutrition conditions of British people were leveled and the national eating habit was leveled and systematized.

According to McNeill, a system precisely called "national socialism" has emerged through total war.[80]

Conclusion: Inheritance of "the 1940-System" or Total War

In Japan, the theory of "the 1940-system" had attracted attention for a period of time. The concept that the current Japanese-style economic system is rooted in the long history and culture of Japan has a strong tendency to be directly linked to the fatalistic view of "that's why it is impossible to change." However, according to the theory of Yukio Noguchi, most things thought to be "Japanese-style" did not actually originate in ancient Japan but are actually an inheritance of "the 1940-system."[81]

The main theme of Noguchi's work titled *1940-Nen Shisutemu* (*The 1940-System*) is that key elements constituting the current Japanese economy were created during World War II, around 1940, in order to cope during a period of total war.[82] That is to say, those things which were different from the previous Japanese economy system was created during wartime: systems that had not existed, such as Japanese-style enterprises, the tax system centering on direct taxation in the indirect finance system, and

---

[79] McNeill, (translated) *Senso no Sekaishi* (*The Pursuit of Power*), p.488.
[80] McNeill, (translated) *Senso no Sekaishi* (*The Pursuit of Power*), pp.456-458.
[81] Yukio Noguchi, *1940-nen Taisei : Saraba Senji Keizai* (*The 1940-System: Farewell to Wartime Economy:* enlarged edition) (Toyo Keizai, 2010), pp.viii-ix.
[82] Noguchi, *1940-nen Taisei* (*The 1940 System*), pp.viii-ix.

the centralized financial system, were introduced strategically in order to respond to the request for total war. As is known, the tax system consisting mainly of withholding employment income, which was introduced to collect funding for the war, still exists in contemporary Japan.

Another point of "the 1940-system" is the fact that such systems continued to exist even after World War II. This is a great challenge to the traditional belief that there was a huge discontinuity —break— between Japan before defeat and that after defeat. The common belief has emphasized the discontinuity from the traditional Japanese system by highlighting the fact that a series of post-war reforms took place after Japan's defeat in the war, such as the enactment of a new constitution, purging of public officials, the dissolution of the *Zaibatsu* (business conglomerates), the farmland reform and labor legislation. However, Noguchi, similar to Yamanouchi mentioned above, raised objections to this interpretation of history. To say nothing of the endurance of these systems, Noguchi points out that the people's continuing awareness brings about a big problem today.[83] Needless to say, Noguchi's theory of "the 1940-system" is deeply related to the enactment of the "National General Mobilization Act" in 1938 in Japan.

"The 1940-system" had characteristics that strengthened not only the productive capacity for   total war, but also that of social policy. As a typical case of the policy, Noguchi cites the enactment of "Act on Land and Building Leases" and the "Staple Food Control Act." He argues that such acts were for measures introduced to protect so-called "the weak" under the war-time economy; in other words, "leveling."[84] As seen in the above-mentioned establishment of laws and the social assurance system, policies that could not be realized in peacetime were systematized in wartime Japan, backed by the necessity for providing the large workforce employed in wartime with minimum life security. Such a historical view by Noguchi is similar to those of Marwick, Yamanouchi and McNeill.

As for the bureaucratic organization of Japan, although the military disappeared and the Ministry of Interior was dissolved after the Pacific War ended in 1945, other government offices have remained almost untouched. The philosophy of so-called "reformist bureaucrats" that used to be regarded as an "extreme idea" in 1940 in Japan, became the Japanese standard in the postwar period and it has remained so until now.[85] According to Noguchi, contrary to popular belief, such political efforts made by bureaucrats were not directed to an advanced part of economy but at sectors left behind by the economic growth.[86]

---

[83] Noguchi, *1940-nen Taisei* (*The 1940 System*), pp.viii-ix.
[84] Noguchi, *1940-nen Taisei* (*The 1940 System*), p.65.
[85] Noguchi, *1940-nen Taisei* (*The 1940 System*), p.225.
[86] Noguchi, *1940-nen Taisei* (*The 1940 System*), p.117. In addition, as "the 1940 system" intended to reinforce production capacity integrally by the entire nation, "manufacturer first policy" and "competition denial policy" introduced at that time were reinforced during the process of high economic growth and raised to a kind of values.

The total war system has changed systems of states that have been involved in total war in political, economic, social and cultural fields. War after World War I have assumed a global character in contrast to traditional war and required general mobilization of all resources without fail. However, a major part of social changes pushed forward under the total war system has been succeeded by the post-war period, even the war ended and peace has been restored. This is the core of the argument of Yamanouchi introduced in this article in detail. An American sociologist John W. Dower also develops an argument on Japan from a similar perspective.[87]

According to the Dower's article titled "The Useful War" in his *Japan in War & Peace: Selected Essays* in 1993, an enormous restructuring of the Japanese social system caused in the process of World War II or the Pacific War – structural changes under the total war system – and its basic trace have been maintained as they are as one of the key elements that should set the framework of the post-war Japanese society despite post-war reforms conducted under the direction of the GHQ.[88] Dower argues that the most important thing that has been succeeded to post-war Japan among social changes occurred under the total war system was the development of administrative bureaucracy equipped with capabilities of accomplishing advanced mobilization of resources on a national scale and of social engineering design.[89]

This discussion of Dower also reveals the fact that the order that became the axis of the Western society after World War II surprisingly originates with the restructuring in the period of total war system. It is true that war has left a character of a temporal project in the past and been regarded as an everlasting national project due to the emergence of social-engineering designers. A state itself becomes an

---

According to Noguchi, the reason why "consumerism society" and "relaxation of regulations" have not been realized in spite of the call for them is that those values still remain at the root of the Japanese society (Noguchi, *1940-Nen Taisei* (*The 1940-System*), p.135). In addition, Noguchi points out that as the establishment of the 1940 system was a major reform that could be achieved under an extraordinary situation of war, it is difficult to undertake a reform to destroy it in peacetime. The conclusion of Noguchi's theory is that the war-time system for the Pacific War has not ended in Japan even today. On the other hand, Yamanouchi has a slightly different view in this respect. According to Yamanouchi, the centralized bureaucratic administration developed under the total war system and mobilization-type industrial organizations that had single-mindedly increased economic effects in accordance with such administration are a model of success as long as they increase productivity and can back up financial expenditures called for by a welfare state. However, Japanese-style economic policies premised on a strong centralized state have been isolated under the criticism that Japan is monopolizing the world trade surplus. That is why Japan had to abandon the ground for its existence - strong national unification originating from wartime mobilization - from 1985 (Yamanouchi, "Hensha Jobun (Foreword of Editor)," in Yamanouchi and Sakai, eds., *Soryokusen Taisei kara Gurobarizeishon e* (*From Total War System to Globalization*), p.19).

[87] John W. Dower, "The Useful War," in John W. Dower, *Japan in War & Peace: Selected Essays* (New York: The New Press, 1993), pp.9-32.

[88] Dower, "The Useful War," in Dower, *Japan in War & Peace*, pp.9-10. Dower argues that the period of about 15 years from around 1930 to 1945 was "useful" for post-war Japan.

[89] According to Dower, the war strengthened Japanese bureaucracy and a series of occupation policies implemented mainly by the U.S. for about seven years after the Pacific War further strengthened that bureaucracy. Dower calls Japanese bureaucrats as "social bureaucrats" and also uses the expression of "guided" changes. Dower, "The Useful War," in Dower, *Japan in War & Peace*, p.22.

organization that aims at the conduct of war. The historical recognition on the continuity from the war-time mobilization system to the post-war system shown by Dower in "The Useful War" is very thought-provoking to consider current situations of Japan same as the argument of Noguchi.[90]

Ulrich Beck argued that no one on the earth is allowed to stand by and watch catastrophes represented by the Chernobyl accident as a tragedy of others, in his book *World Risk Society*. Today's risks have surely reached a global scale and require global response.[91] According to Beck, a "risk society" includes the inevitable tendency to head to so-called totalitarianism as a result of social orthodoxy principle called "risk defense."[92] To be sure, in response to thorough militarization of industries during World War II, the military was thoroughly industrialized so that its totalitarian phase has notably emerged.[93] In addition, after the "September 11 terrorist attacks," the slogan claimed by Americans, "stern retaliation to protect freedom," means that "freedom" calls for "constant preparations for war (militarization of the entire society)."[94]

Let us consider the significance of total war today based on those facts. Firstly, it is necessary to confirm the fact that phenomenon of total war is naturally a series of processes that take a long period of time. It is a kind of social phenomenon that emerged in the age of the German Wars of Unification and the American Civil War and reached its ultimatum in World War II through World War I. The second point, while it is related to the first point, the word total war is a "historical term" that mainly refers to the period from World War I and World War II. That is why the word total war is not generally used referring to the aspect of today's war.[95]

However, the third point is that the age of war that fits to the naming of total war is actually continuing even now in a true sense. For example, age of the confrontation between U.S. and the Soviet Union by "balance of terror" using nuclear weapons after 1945 was age of total war because of the

---

[90] Dower, "The Useful War," in Dower, *Japan in War & Peace*, p.26. It is widely known that Dower expressed Japanese capitalism as "brokered capitalism" and Charmers Johnson called Japanese economic bureaucrats as "economic general staff." More recently, Richard J. Samuels also emphasizes the continuity between pre-war period, war period and post-war period in Japan. For more detail, see Charmers Johnson, *MITI and the Japanese Miracle: The Growth of Industrial Policy 1925-1975* (Stanford: Stanford University Press); Richard J. Samuels, *The Business of Japanese State: Energy Market in Comparative and Historical Perspective* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1987).
[91] Ulrich Beck, *World Risk Society: Terrorism, War and Destruction of Nature* (*Sekai Risuku Shakai-ron – Tero, Senso, Shizen Hakai*) (Translated by Kenichi Shimamura,) (Chikumashobo, 2010).
[92] Yamanouchi, "Soron : Soryokusen Taisei kara Gurobarizeishon e (Overview: From Total War System to Globalization)," in Yamanouchi and Sakai eds., *Soryokusen Taisei kara Gurobarizeishon e* (*From Total War System to Globalization*), p.54.
[93] There is a very interesting book that keenly considers the significance of wars in the 20the century. See Coker, *War and the 20th Century.*
[94] Yamanouchi, "Soron : Soryokusen Taisei kara Gurobarizeishon e (Overview: From Total War System to Globalization)," in Yamanouchi and Sakai eds., *Soryokusen Taisei kara Gurobarizeishon e* (*From Total War System to Globalization*), p.62.
[95] In recent years, expressions such as "general war" and "all-out war" are more common.

existence of nuclear weapons created as a result of the essence of science technology created by mankind and in a sense that literally all mankind had constantly been hostage of war.[96] Focusing on such a dimension, the expression called "cold war" is not so far from the mark. The cold war was a cold but fierce war. It became almost impossible to distinguish war and peace in the 20th century. Especially, as a result of the emergence of nuclear weapons in particular, not only armies but also nations have become constantly subject to war preparedness.

The Gulf War and the Iraq War in recent years can be understood as being total war by entire state due to the operation of high-tech weapons in wide space including outer space and cyber space and control and manipulation of domestic and international public opinions by media. As mankind is in the age of globalization where there is no more unidentified space, an urgent integration of military forces is called for today. Carl Schmitt presented his work titled *Land und Meer. Eine weltgeschichtliche Betrachtung* to the world, but today a battle space is integrated with the land, seas and sky, and outer space and cyber space.[97]

It might seem that the degree of direct involvement of states and their nation in war is decreasing, because the number of soldiers who really fight and equipment represented by tanks and aircraft are remarkably decreasing in today's war. However, the immeasurable indirect involvement of such as economic, financial and technological capabilities that support those military capabilities and national support and moral force requires collective efforts of a state. Even if one limits today's war only to the military field, the naming of total war exactly fits to the aspect of today's war considering the importance of logistics in war which is expressed as "tail" into account.

In other words, war in the 20th century can be expressed as completion of "totalitarian style of warfare."[98] This is phenomenon seen in both democratic sates and dictatorial states. In addition, people in the 20th century became constantly subject to war preparedness due to the emergence of nuclear weapons in particular. In fact, the world had been under the cold war till the collapse of the Berlin wall and the breakup of the Soviet Union so that the war-time mobilization system was not dissolved.[99] Arnold Toynbee was one of persons who used the word "post-modern" for the first time. For Toynbee, World War I was the first post-modern war. That is because World War I and the subsequent World War

---

[96] Coker, "War and the 20th Century," in Coker, *War and the 20th Century,* p. 20.

[97] For the discussion of Schmitt, see Carl Schmitt, *Land und Meer. Eine weltgeschichtlisch Betrachtung* (*Riku to Umi to : Sekaishi-teki Ichi Kosatsu*) (Translated by Keizo Ikimatsu and Mitsuhiro Maeno, (reprinted edition, Jigakusha Publishing Corporation, 2006). In addition, for the problem of integration of military capabilities, see Tomoyuki Ishizu, "Ea Pawa to Nihon no Kokka Senryaku (Air Power and Japanese National Strategy)," in Tomoyuki Ishizu and Williamson Murray eds., *Nijuisseiki no Ea Pawa : Nihon no Anzen Hosho wo Kangaeru* (*Air Power in the 21st Century: Security of Japan*) (Fuyo Shobo Shuppan, 2006).

[98] Coker, "War and the 20th Century," in Coker, *War and the 20th Century,* pp.23-28.

[99] Yamanouchi, "Soryokusen no Jidai (Age of Total War)," in Yamanouchi, *Nihon no Shakaikagaku to Weba Taiken* (*Japanese Social Science and Max Weber Experience*), p.93.

II seriously threatened the basis of traditional mainstream thoughts, that is, the confidence of people that the progress of mankind would last forever mainly by the development of science technology. Then, it can be said that, as Christopher Coker keenly pointed out, the post-modern era is the time of the establishment of a state where war has ultimately been systematized on a global scale, which is the age when "totalitarian style of warfare" has completed.

Lastly, the Zollverein Coal Mine Industrial Complex, that is registered as a world heritage site and highly evaluated as the masterpiece of the history of the modern German construction, has buildings that demonstrate the situations of the age of total war considered in this article most accurately. They are characterized by not having any decoration different from traditional European buildings, giving top priority to consideration for labors who work inside by securing much space of windows by using reinforced concrete and having the flat roofs to secure much inside space. This Zollverein Coal Mine Industrial Complex that was rebuilt after World War I is a witness of the *"Zeitgeist"* of total war by pursuing rationality and efficiency to the limits.