
WORLD WAR I TO WORLD WAR IV: A DEMOCRATIC-ECONOMIC PERSPECTIVE

Fred M. Carr, University of Akron

ABSTRACT

This paper analyses the idea that the world has not only experienced World War I and World War II but has also fought World War III and is currently waging World War IV. Socio-political and economic factors are applied to the wars of the 20th and 21st Centuries to make the case that these four World Wars should be reclassified and taught as such. The wars of the 20th and 21st Centuries are termed the Wars of Democracy, given that fact that all of the wars involve nations that were democratic in governance against forces that were non-democratic in governance. A simplified classification of the World Wars for Democracy I, II, III, and IV is presented. The non-democratic antagonists are recognized as promoting the causes of Imperialism (World War I), Fascism (World War II), Communism (World War III) and Religious Fanaticism (World War IV). These non-democratic antagonists share commonalities necessary for the existence of their causes. Each non-democratic group found it necessary to identify weaker, easy to persecute, opponents either within or without their countries. These weaker groups were used as threats to the non-democratic causes that needed to be conquered and/or annihilated. Second, each non-democratic protagonist was compelled to constantly imprison, execute and combat oppressed groups within their homeland and conquered borders. These oppressive actions had an economic consequence since the actions caused the non-democratic forces to utilize scarce resources in less advantageous ways. Thirdly, all of the non-democratic forces had fewer resources and productive capacity than the democratic forces. Due to the constant strain on economic resources, it can be reasonably deduced, that the non-democratic forces did not possess

or could not maintain technological proficiency over their enemies. Fourth, the non-democratic forces did not provide a compelling socio-political, economic or religious/moral appeal to their citizenry, outside the realm of physical force, to enable a long-term plan of conquest. Religious fanatics waging World War IV have all four of the above factors working against them.

Misconceptions about world wars are also presented. One basic misconception is about the linear nature of war. War is seen as occurring during a finite period of time and each specific war is occurring as a unique singular event. When actual time lines of various conflicts are studied, one finds that World Wars are overlapping. A second misconception is that wars end in a specific year. World War I is considered to be over as is World War II, however, the socio-political, religious, and economic causes of these wars have not ended. Timelines also demonstrate that World Wars do not end even though the major conflicts of that war may be declared over by major conflict de facto cessation or treaty. Subtle non-violent aggression, often economic in nature, continues on a regular basis, promoted by state sponsored political and economic policies.

Lastly, the paper presents the case that economics is the primal cause behind all wars. A major assumption of this work is that in answering the economic question of 'who gets it' the death and destruction of war is perpetrated. Non-democratic leaderships and those that still follow their causes, to accomplish their ends, all call for the forceful seizure of wealth, by the confiscation of private property or natural resources. Their causes cannot compete in laissez-faire, wealth creation types of markets and procedures, with free democratic institutions, and freedom of religious choice.

INTRODUCTION

It is the premise of this paper that conventional referencing of the wars that occurred in the 20th Century and the referencing of wars that continue into the 21st Century are in need of reformation. This reformation is necessary to obtain a better understanding among the general population

and especially among teachers and students as to the cause and effects of these wars. To justify the reclassification of wars as they are currently studied and presented one needs to look at the democratic and economic aspects involved in these wars. This paper will make the case that the World has not only experienced World War I and World War II but that the United States has also fought and is currently fighting communism in World War III and that we are at the beginning stages of fighting World War IV. In researching this paper, the classification of four World Wars was posited in 2001 (Cohen, 2001). Since Cohen's article appeared other distinguished authorities have recognized that World War IV exists or is close to occurring. Paul Craig Roberts commented on the intent of Middle East fanatics "They will stop at nothing to achieve their goal of World War IV in the Middle East" (Roberts 2003). Daniel Pipes agreed with Cohen in his analysis of World War III and World War IV by stating Cohen, "... captures two points: that the cold war was in fact World War III and that the war on terror is as global, as varied, and as important as prior World Wars" (Pipes, 2003). James Woolsey, former Director of the Central Intelligence Agency stated, "I have adopted Eliot Cohen's formulation, distinguished professor at Johns Hopkins School for Advanced International Studies, that we are in World War IV, World War III having been the Cold War. And I think Eliot's formulation fits the circumstances really better than describing this as a war on terrorism" (Woolsey, 2002). Thomas Hayden went so far as to date the wars, "Many may not realize it but the United States is engaged in our fourth World War. There was World War I (1914-1918), World War II (1939-1945), World War III (The Cold War: 1950-1990), and now World War IV, which started 9-11-01 and expanded with the invasion of Iraq and is now spreading all over the world" (Hayden, 2004). While this paper disputes the fact that world wars necessarily have a finite ending date, it agrees with the basic premise that there are four world wars. If there is a reluctance to admitting that World War III and World War IV has been and is being fought it may derive from the common belief that

World War III is the name given to a hypothetical World War, initially supposed to be fought between superpowers with weapons of mass destruction, including nuclear weapons. Superpower confrontation was deemed to be the major threat in the latter half of the 20th century. This conflict was presumed to result in the extermination or technological impoverishment of humanity.... When asked what kind of weapons World War III would be fought with, Albert Einstein, lamented that 'I know not with what weapons World War III will be fought, but World War IV will be fought with sticks and stones.' Effectively civilization would be ended (Wikipedia, 2004).

These World War III predictions do not meet the realities of what has and is occurring in the world today.

MISCONCEPTIONS OF WARS

It can be conjectured that there are several basic misconceptions about the linear nature of war. War is seen as occurring during a finite period of time and each specific war is occurring as a unique singular event, when actual time lines of various conflicts are studied, one finds that World Wars are overlapping and while one may be at the middle or end stage another World War may be beginning. It could be said that World War II grew out of the ashes of World War I. Germany was decimated economically at the end of World War I and a destitute German people seized on the promises of a better life by following Adolph Hitler. Every war seems to contain the seeds to produce future wars. This is because the true causes of wars have never been defeated. The seeds for World War III and World War IV also grew along side of and out the ashes of World War I. World War III saw the rise of Communism and was assisted by World War I weakening the ability of Czarist Russia to fight the revolt lead by Lenin and Trotsky. On November 6, 1917, the Bolshevik revolution established Communism in Russia. On May 4, 1919 the movement that resulted in the establishment of the Chinese Communist Party began when Chinese students in Peking protested the post-World War I Versailles conference that returned Shantung to Japan instead of China. World War IV was also given impetus as a result of treaties and agreements that were made and implemented after World War

I. On November 2, 1917 Chaim Weizmann persuaded Lord Balfour to implement the Balfour Declaration that established a homeland for Jews in Palestine. This was done as a reward for Jewish support in winning World War I. On August 10, 1920 the Treaty of Sevres divided the old Ottoman Empire into the Middle Eastern Countries of Jordan, Iraq, Syria, Lebanon, and Palestine. (Revolution and Revanchism, 2002). While WW IV cannot be directly related to these events the structure for growing Islamic fanaticism, which has brought about WW IV, was put in place.

Besides the non-linear succession of wars is the misconception that wars end in a specific year. World War I has been declared over as has World War II, however, the socio-religious-political causes of these wars have not ended. Fascist regimes can still be found in various countries throughout the world. All of these aggressive political, economic, and religious ideologies exist where they can, by force, and even though the forces of democracy declare a particular war over it needs to be emphasized that all these wars are still going on today, only without the massive armed conflicts of earlier years. Even today, at the expense of other democratic countries, France and Germany appear willing to work with Muslim religious fanatics and promote their own economic imperialistic designs in the Middle East and Africa. China, Cuba, Korea and various other countries still cling to Communistic ideologies, however, they face constant pressure to change from democratic economic forces. Historians and educators need to correct these time and cause misconceptions in their analysis of World Wars.

CLASSIFICATIONS OF WARS

One could classify the wars of the 20th Century as Wars for Democracy. World War I and World War II were wars that pitted democratic countries against countries that practiced Imperialism (I) and Fascism (II). The author distinguishes between I and II in the fact that I had as basic goals, land acquisition and empire control, while II added the odious concept of a 'superior race'. The lead antagonist Germany and its allies used nationalistic pretenses to obtain land and power. These countries also used nationalism as a pretense to treat weaker opponents and ethnic groups, such as the Jewish

people, as threats or 'outside aggressors' and as such, proceeded to annihilate them. World War III was a war of democratic countries against countries that practiced Communism. World War IV is being fought, today by democratic forces, against disparate individuals, groups, and countries that are practicing theological fanaticism. This fanaticism is directed against religions, races and gender. In a segment, which interviewed 'activist' British Muslims on CNN NewsNight with Aaron Brown, broadcast on August 17, 2004, the interviewed Muslims stated that Islam viewed the ideas of freedom and democracy as impositions of Western cultures and these impositions were not wanted or needed in Islam. How widespread these activists' beliefs are throughout the Islamic religion is unknown but, based on the analysis presented below, the result of World War IV is not going to favor their success.

A simplified classification of the World Wars for Democracy I, II, III, and IV should recognize the non-democratic antagonists socio-political and religious causes. These causes were Imperialism (World War I), Fascism (World War II), Communism (World War III) and Religious Fanaticism (World War IV). The common factors in all of these Wars for Democracy I, II, III and IV was that the non-democratic antagonist shared the same traits. Their cause had to be supported by violence and armed enforcement. Not one of the non-democratic antagonists could have their socio-political-religious ideology exist without force. All demonstrated extreme violence against weak non-violent third parties. Imperialists attacked weaker neighbors and enslaved them while Fascists used the Jewish population as scapegoats. Communists attack capitalist wealth creators and developed class warfare, and Religious Muslim Fanatics specifically target women, Jews and Christians.

Fanatic political ideology or fanatic religious theology cannot exist by allowing free choice. Muhammad would not have been able to make his religion the uniting force it was in the Arab world without force.

"Muhammad, unlike Christ, was a man of violence; He bore arms, was wounded in battle and preached a holy war, jihad, against those who defied the will of God, as revealed to him. His successors perceived the world as divided into, Dar al-Islam - The House of Submission, submission to the teachings of Muhammad, collected in the Koran-and Dar al-Harb, the House of War, which were those parts yet to be conquered"(Ayalon, 1975).

Indeed, by their actions of war and enforced compliance, fanatic Muslim groups signal that they do not believe Islam can exist in societies where free choice of religion exists. Islam, to them, is an endangered religion that must be propagated by threat and murder. In reality there is no difference among the ideology of Fascism, Communism, Imperialism, or Religious Fanaticism. All must use intimidation, 'outside aggressors' as scapegoats, non-democratic leadership, and murderous force to maintain existence. In addition, these non-democratic forces also utilize and draw support from populations most sensitive to the economic disparities within the affected countries.

ECONOMIC ASPECTS OF WAR

In 1832, General Carl Von Clausewitz recognized the political aspect of war when he stated "...war is nothing but a continuation of political intercourse, with a mixture of other means" (Clausewitz, 1873). All wars possess varying emphases on social, political, religious and economic factors. Genghis Khan is quoted as saying "Man's greatest good fortune is to chase and defeat his enemy, seize his total possessions, leave his married women weeping and wailing, ride his gelding (and) use the bodies of his women as a nightshirt and support" (Ratchnevsky, 1991). Khan recognized the rewards of war as the attainment of the enemy's most valuable resources. A more accurate analysis of the wars calls for the introduction of economics as a primal cause of all wars and the addition of democratic infusion into the prevalent religious and socio-political analysis that is commonly presented. It has been accurately stated, "Much of human history has consisted of unequal conflicts between the haves and the have-nots" (Diamond, 1999). When speaking of this economic referencing of the wars of the 20th and 21st

Centuries, it should not be confused with the concept of waging economic war which can be defined as separately (Eatwell, Milgate & Newman, 1987).

All one needs to understand in order to interpret the major economic cause of wars is to understanding that every society must determine three economic questions. These three questions are fundamental in economic teaching. Each country or society must decide first, what to produce, second, how to produce what will be made, and then thirdly, to determine who gets the products and resources that are produced. It is the assumption of this work that it is in answering this third economic question of 'who get it' that leads to the death and destruction of war. At a minimum, this assumption needs to be applied to analyzing any war. The 20th-century and 21st century slaughter of human life in Africa, Ireland, the Balkans and sundry other places have been placed on tribal differences ethnic origin and/or religion. Underlying it all, however, is the economic reason that people are arguing struggling and killing each other. The universal economic reason is that these warring individuals, tribes, or religious groups want to be the ones who 'get it'. The victors of the warring parties want to be the ones that control the factors of production determining who will get the best job positions, who will control the allocation of and obtain revenues from scarce resources, and who will control societal institutions.

This economic interpretation of the cause of wars is reinforced when analyzing key facets of all four World Wars. John Keegan states, "... that the tide of war tends to flow one way - from poor lands to rich, and very rarely in the opposite direction. ... It was only when they broke into the rich lands that they were able to accumulate the stocks of provender which made deeper penetration, and eventual conquest, a possibility" (Keegan, 1993). The author would assert that the desire for imperialistic ownership of land and resources lead to the German aggression in World War I. The hyperinflation that occurred after World War I, in Germany between 1920 and 1923, was the result of the misunderstanding about what causes inflation. The German government, during that period, actually believed that they could print enough money to cause an economic expansion that will alleviate the economic problems encountered by their destitute population caused by World War I. They did not see a cause and effect between money supply and

the production of goods and services. This allowed Adolph Hitler an economic window with which to appeal to the people of Germany and develop political strength for his Nazi party.

In 1917 Lenin used the valuable resource decimation and economic destabilization of Russia, because of World War I, as an opportunity to launch the communist revolution. Later, World War III, what is called the Cold War, was justified on the basis of the Marxist philosophy that obtains power by falsely promising a redistribution of wealth by creating class battles between haves and have-nots. "Marx drew the conclusion that the process of mass production in an economic system where a worker did not own the means of production made revolution inevitable" (Keegan, 1993). This revolution occurred worldwide from Eastern Europe, China, Korea, and Vietnam to numerous other countries in Africa, and South America throughout the 20th Century. It is, in the author's analysis, an egregious error to treat disparate regional wars and conflicts, such as Korea and Vietnam, as non-connected unique events. All of these wars should be treated instead for what they actually were; decades long battles against communism making up World War III.

World War IV grew out of middle ages and had its roots in the theological and economic dynamics unique at that time. Under the justification of avenging the assassination of Ramiro I, King of Aragon in 1603 by the Moslems, the idea for the First Crusade,

"... was developed in 1073 by Gregory VII who helped an international army to assemble for Spanish campaigning, guaranteeing canonically that any Christian knight could keep the lands he conquered, provided he acknowledged that the Spanish kingdom belonged to the see of St Peter. Papal expansionism, linked to the colonial appetite for acquiring land, thus supplied strong political and economic motives" (Johnson, 1976).

In furthering the economic explanations for further Crusades, Johnson goes on to explain,

"Most of these people were very poor; they had been unable to obtain land on any lease, or agricultural work during an acute and prolonged labour surplus; they intended to settle. So, of course, did the most determined of the knights. Most of them had no money or lands. ...all the crusaders who settled in the Holy Land were poor men; the rich, ... returned to Europe as quickly as they honorably could" (Johnson, 1976).

The followers of Islam also recognized the importance of gaining wealth to further their faith. "Muhammad, by contrast, had been a merchant, had a keen understanding of the value of wealth, properly used, expected the umma to accumulate it and saw it as a means of doing good, both collectively and individually. He himself raided the caravan of the rich, unbelieving merchants of Mecca, and spent the loot to further his cause. That was the example that his holy warriors followed in their assault on the rich kingdoms of Byzantium and Persia" (Keegan, 1993). It can be conjectured that the fanatical members of the Islamic population are driven by the concept involved in answering the economic question of 'who will get ownership, control and use of valuable resources' just as Muhammad did. The leadership of this Islamic radical faction certainly has economic power designs just as the leadership of imperialistic Germany in World War I and its aligned nations, the Axis powers of World War II, and the U.S.S.R in World War III. These leaderships and those that still follow their causes, to accomplish their ends, all call for the forceful seizure of wealth, whether in the form of private property confiscation or natural resources. Their causes cannot compete in laissez-faire, wealth creation types of markets and procedures, with free democratic institutions and freedom of religious choice.

CONCLUSIONS

Diamond notes, in the long view of the history of war that, "... what makes patriotic and religious fanatics such dangerous opponents is not the deaths of the fanatics themselves, but their willingness to accept the deaths of a fraction of their number in order to annihilate or crush their infidel enemy. Fanaticism in war, of the type that drove recorded Christian and

Islamic conquests, was probably unknown on Earth until chiefdoms and especially states emerged within the last 6,000 years" (Diamond, 1999). This fanaticism can be seen in all of the four World Wars. While the degree of fanaticism is not easily estimable, what is discernable is that World Wars in the last two centuries have a socio-political, a religious/moral, and an economic component. The only unanswerable question is how much the fanatic forces are driven by nationalistic and/or religious devotion and how much they are driven by economic attainment of wealth and power.

To better understand the wars of the 20th and 21st Centuries, it is the prognosis of this work that a variety of changes need to be made in the analysis and classifications of those conflicts. The first change needs to be the recognition of the major conceptual philosophies that caused the wars. These major conceptual philosophies, while intermixed within each war were, World War I - Imperialism, World War II - Fascism, World War III - Communism and World War IV - Religious Fanaticism. The second change needs to be greater recognition and analysis of the economic incentives that drove and drives the perpetrators of these World Wars. Without wealth and the access to it, it is the author's conjecture that, power cannot be maintained for any substantial period of time. The third change that needs to be made is the idea that world wars occur one after the other in linear time progression. This linearity, in actuality, does not occur. Timelines show that these wars can occur simultaneously with major conflicts of one war occurring in one sector of the world while the conflicts of another World War is taking place, sometimes, in very close proximity. The causal philosophies of the World Wars can be given the opportunity to take root and grow during or in the near aftermath of other wars. Timelines also demonstrate that World Wars do not end even though the major conflicts of that war may be declared over by major conflict de facto cessation or treaty. Subtle non-violent aggression, often economic in nature, continues on a regular basis, promoted by state sponsored political and economic policies.

World War I, World War II, World War III, and World War IV can be classified as the Wars for Democracy. In the final analysis, there is no difference operationally, between Imperialism, Fascism, Communism, or Religious Fanaticism. These World Wars were instigated by non-democratic

forces that came to power by force and can only be maintained by force. The recognition of four World Wars is not easily discernable because each had radically different formative and procedural characteristics. These wars do not become readily comprehensible in classification until one formulizes within them the unifying factors of economics and democracy. When one analyses the results of World War I II and III, one finds that losers (to date) of those wars had a variety of socio-political and economic factors that allows one to reasonably predict the outcome of World War IV. First, each vanquished foe had less economic resources and productive capacity than the victors. Each non-democratic group had to find weaker, easy to persecute, opponents either within or without their countries. These weaker groups were used as threats to the non-democratic causes that needed to be conquered and/or annihilated. Second, each non-democratic protagonist was compelled to constantly imprison, execute and combat oppressed groups within their homeland and conquered borders. These oppressive actions had an economic consequence since the actions caused the non-democratic forces to utilize scarce resources in less advantageous ways. Thirdly, due to the constant strain on economic resources the non-democratic forces could not maintain technological proficiency over their enemies. Fourth, the non-democratic forces did not provide a compelling socio-political, economic or religious/moral appeal to their citizenry, outside the realm of physical force, to enable a long-term plan of conquest. Religious fanatics waging World War IV have all four of the above factors working against them. It may reasonably be concluded that by promoting democratic processes and providing economic incentives, which induce wealth creation, the outcome of World War IV will favor the democratic forces. History has shown that no ideology, religion, or race has ever been successful in world conquest. It can also be reasonable to conclude that, given the economic resources possessed by the democratic forces involved in World War IV, the fanatical religious forces will fail.

REFERENCES

- Ayalon, D. (1975). Preliminary Remarks on the Mamluk Institutions in Islam. In Parry & Yapp (Eds.), *War, Technology and Society in the Middle East* London: Oxford University Press, 44..
- Clausewitz, C. (1873). On War. In J.J. Graham translation. *War is an Instrument of Policy* (Chapter VI B). London: The 1976/84 Howard/Paret version. From http://WorldWarw.clausewitz.com/CWZHOME/On_War/Bk8ch06.html.
- Cohen, E. A. (2001). What's In A Name. *Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved August 19, 2004, from <http://WorldWarw.opinionjournal.com/editorial/feature.html?id=95001493>.
- Diamond, J. (1999). *Guns, Germs, and Steel: The Fates of Human Societies*. New York: W.W. Norton, 93, 282.
- Eatwell, J., M. Milgate & P. Newman, (Eds.) (1987). *The New Palgrave: A Dictionary of Economics*, 2 New York: The Stockton Press, 77..
- Hayden, T. H. (2004). World War IV. Retrieved July 28, 2004, from http://WorldWarw.military.com/NewContent/0,13190,Hayden_071204,00.html.
- Johnson, P. (1976). *A History of Christianity*. New York: Macmillan Company, 243, 245..
- Keegan, J. (1993). *A History of Warfare*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, Inc., 75, 18, 194.
- Pipes, D. (2003). Is The "War on Terror" Really World War IV? Retrieved August 16, 2004, from <http://WorldWarw.capmag.com/article.asp?ID=3167>.
- Ratchnevsky, P. (1991). *Genghis Khan*, (p. 155). UK: Oxford.
- Revolution and Revanchism 1917-1929. (2002). Retrieved August 18, 2004, from <http://history.acusd.edu/gen/WorldWar2timeline/revanchism.html>.
- Roberts, P. C. (2003). Neo-Jacobins Push For World War IV. Retrieved August 18, 2004, from <http://WorldWarw.lewrockwell.com/roberts/roberts8.html>.
- Wikipedia, (2004). World War III. Retrieved August 19, 2004, from http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_War_III.

Woolsey J. R. (2002). World War IV. Front Page Magazine. Presented to the Restoration Weekend, Retrieved August 18, 2004, from [http://World Warw.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=4718](http://WorldWarw.frontpagemag.com/Articles/ReadArticle.asp?ID=4718).

www.alliedacademies.org

www.alliedacademies.org