



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (Rights, Rights, and Mo...)

(Military Industrial Co...) Next >



Military Industrial Complex

by Joe Escobar - Saturday, May 25, 2013, 10:48 AM

This forum thread is for Military Industrial Complex posts and replies.

After studying the required materials, address the individual questions in SEPARATE posts.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post.

To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post.

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply



Mulligan

by Agina Hale - Monday, May 27, 2013, 8:55 AM

I have thought a lot about this problem over the years, i'm sure everyone has. You love what you hear in a candidate. They sound amazing! They have grandiose ideas and formulas to end the woes of the economy. We elect them, and sit back and watch. Usually, it's pretty disappointing. We seem to get used to it, why? A long time ago someone told me that Iceland kept it's politicians held accountable to their platform they ran on. They had to get a certain percentage accomplished within the first 100 days, or they were kicked out. Since the fall of Iceland's economy, I haven't been able to find any information on anything in the past. It's a great idea though.

-On the fence- When I was concerned that I disagreed with President Bush on some of his foreign policy actions, I figured I would give him the benefit of the doubt. I'm not the president, his cabinet or any advisor. I'm not there in the room with full knowledge of the threats of the world around us. To presume that you have a better idea of what to do is a little bit arrogant. Some of it gets so old though. Now, with Obama giving us these broken promises about Afghanistan and Gitmo, i'm tired of the man behind the curtain. Should we have full disclosure, and decide as a nation the best way to proceed? That seems scary too. It seems that our foreign politics

have gotten so convoluted. Is there a way for us to slowly back away, without retribution?

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Mulligan

by Alex McNeil - Saturday, June 1, 2013, 11:38 PM

I've always been interested in the way that members of our generation think of our political system. It seems like most people are pretty skeptical about government's ability to effect real change.

But what's the alternative? I think that our system is pretty damn good. There are some minor problems in it that create large flaws--e.g. private funding for campaigns, the repeal of Glass-Steagall--, but America has demonstrated time and time again that it's an engine of forward progress. Maybe we're just in a bad time for politics. But, hey--the night's always darkest before the dawn.

What do you think?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Military Industrial Complex= Eventual Military Dictatorship

by Michael Maxey - Monday, May 27, 2013, 4:33 PM

Eisenhower was right about the M.I.C., it will continue to grab and increase its power during both war and peace time and spread its influence economically and politically if it isn't stopped. Eisenhower saw this when he was a General, taking a look at how Adolf Hitler gained a hold over Germany and parts of Europe through his M.I.C. and made Germany a war machine. That is what Eisenhower I believe was trying to warn the U.S. about; a military increasing its power and influence. A military build up should only take place during a time of war, but because of war profiteering and political agendas it stays the status quo. Military build ups seem to cause more problems than they seem to solve which is very little, besides making politicians and war product manufacturers rich. I do understand the situation of how this Military Industrial Complex runs, and how bad it can be during a time of peace even though it

has helped advance technological innovations.

As for Presidents pulling out troops from combat duties, Obama has taken more time to do so than previous Presidents have done. But, those President's decision's were dictated by war strategy, foreign policies, and how effective they were in being implamented. During the Korean and most of the Cold war the U.S. didn't have to provide training to allies to take care of themselves when the U.S. had to pull outfrom combat duties. Vietnam was the only major instance where we had to. Policies have changed over the years, and so have diplomatic relationships, which doesn't play out to well with pulling out troops from Iraq and Afghanistan, with our allies inefficiancy to build up a strong government, army, and security forces to defeat the terrorist's forces. Some leaders are stronger then others when pulling out our troops from combat, Obama on the other hand is taking far too long and has failed to meet the deadlines he set for withdrawl even though we have killed Bin Laden, Saddam, and devistated Al Queida. Unfortunately we have been going this war on Terrorism almost by ourselves so it makes it hard to pull out. During WWII, Korea, the Cold War, and Vietnam, we at least had allies taking the fight to the enemy with us. It doesn't matter party the President is, it's the situation that dictates the timetable for withdrawl. Some President's are slow to react to conflicts that will eventually involve the U.S. like the case in WWII, while others are quick to get on the ball, like Bush was after 9-11, and went straight after the terrorists. So it really all depends on the leaders reaction and the situation in which buildup or withdrawl timetables can be established.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



My thoughts on these military issues

by Lesley Pilz - Monday, May 27, 2013, 9:16 PM

I disagree with the commentator's opinion about the vocabulary used. Eisenhower had plenty of time to decide exactly what he wanted to say and I doubt he would have left something in if he didn't fully endorse the message at the time. I think he wanted it to come across as more harsh then lobby so we as a nation would take note and actually pay attention to the message. Typically when a message is given too weakly it is ignored.

Knowing that this happened during peace time helps me get a better perspective on what he might have thought and why he felt he must address the issue.

I think he took this position in the middle of the cold war because he was afraid of what might happen. Both sides were starting to stock pile military armaments. The power keg was getting ready to blow. Someone had to put a stop to it before things escalated to far too.

While comparing ears can sometimes less us down the wrong path and cause us to come to inaccurate conclusions it can also help us to determine what actions to take our avoid. The study of part ways have helped generals and leaders orange current ones for as long as people kept records of victories and how they were won.

presidents of both parties seem to me to focus too much on battles and ears the United states has been involved with and ignore similar situations in history that they could learn from but took place in a different part of the world. They also seem to discount the advanced any one on the opposing party made our twist the situation to sit the motives of their party so they retain their popularity. Many wouldn't be brave enough to admit that while the said our thought one way during the campaign, when they actually had access to all the information the president does that they now age with those former spent. instead they make it so either somehow the other party is to blame or find a way for their new positions to appeal to the demographic that voted for them.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



affected understanding

by Tyler Kennedy - Monday, May 27, 2013, 10:58 PM

Eisenhower's buildup of the military affects my understanding because in his exit speech he seems to be going against the idea of a military buildup. I think the reason he goes against the military buildup is because as a military man he knows what could happen if two nations build up their military and then tensions boil over.

Its really hard to compare wars, because they happen in different places at different times, with different people, thus they shouldn't be compared at all. It tells us that most politicians no matter what side of the isle they sit on will support any action in response to foreign threats, real or perceived. If you don't the ramifications on your political career could be devastating. You'll be known as "Senator Steve, who didn't support the war against terror"

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: affected understanding

by Tyler Kennedy - Monday, May 27, 2013, 11:03 PM

To me animal rights have some bearing, but plants rights is a joke. Seriously if you don't eat plants what else is there to eat? And does it hold any nutritional value and does it taste like cardboard?

To me plants rights obscures intelligent discussion, when you're debating with someone and they chime in with something about plants rights I won't be able to take them seriously.

Rights are a slippery slope and become problematic when something likes plants rights comes up. What's next paper rights? The paper you use in your printer doesn't like being used only as paper and wants equal protection under the law?

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



War Never Changes

by Michael Shaw - Tuesday, May 28, 2013, 1:28 AM

I don't think that WWII, the Cold War, and the War on Terror should be grouped together at all. When the word "war" hits the ears, it hits hard; bullets, gunfire, two militaristic factions butting heads in a massive conflict with only one clear winner. A stand-off with earth-cracking missiles and hunting down a bunch of religious psychos with a fist full of explosives are anything but.

Furthermore, it also goes to show how each President handles the situation. In our current time where talking to someone across the world is a few button presses away, diplomacy tends to be the first way to approach a potential crisis. At this point, our "War on Terror" could have ended years ago with one solid day of carpet-bombing the middle east until the terrorists either surrendered or became indistinguishable from the sand that they try to hide behind.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: War Never Changes

by Alex McNeil - Saturday, June 1, 2013, 11:30 PM

It seems like your definition of "war" might be a bit old-school. For the balance of human history war was defined by hand-to-hand combat. As our technology has improved--as we've found better (well, more deadly, at least--not sure if that's "better") ways of waging war--we've changed our definition of war to match status quo.

The invention of WMDs and the internationalization of our markets has forced the superpowers to be pacifists--at least towards each other. Mini-conflicts, incited by ideological differences between two or more factions, are the bread and butter of modern warfare (hey, that's a video game!). In my opinion, denying modern conflicts the appellation of "war" wouldn't be right. We need to update our collective definition of war to fit modern times.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Lobby or Complex?

by Jesse Nichols - Tuesday, May 28, 2013, 12:12 PM

I agree with the commentator that it would have been less problematic if Eisenhower had used the term "Lobby" instead of "Complex" but in reality it makes little difference. The fact that Eisenhower oversaw a military buildup in a time of peace shows that he was an intelligent man who knew what he was doing. A weak nation is

a vulnerable nation and he knew this. It is far more efficient to have companies constantly producing armaments than it is have companies like ford switch over to producing weapons at the onset of war.

I believe the article shows that wars are very difficult to compare. They take place in different territories, in different terrains ranging from deserts to jungles, and they are fought between different people.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Obama's Troop Surge

by Alex McNeil - Tuesday, May 28, 2013, 12:32 PM

With troop presences in Afghanistan, Iraq and Pakistan, the United States has spent the balance of the 21st century embattled in at least three foreign theaters of war. The three conflicts (among other, smaller ones across the globe) have composed the "war on terror," an enterprise of U.S. foreign policy initiated by George W. Bush and continued by Barack Obama. The terms of this war have been necessarily unclear, a shotgun-spray of U.S. engagements unified in purpose under the vague canopy of "protecting the world from terrorism."

When President Obama took office, many wondered about whether his stance on the war on terror would differ significantly from his predecessor's. The wars raging in Iraq, Afghanistan and Pakistan had proven to be sinkholes of taxpayer dollars--veritable gluttons that feasted on an already-high budget deficit.

Saddled with a collapsing economy and a need to trim fat, the Defense budget (and, by extension, the wars which it funded) seemed like the first to go. So it was a disappointment to many liberal Obama-ites (of which I and my family were some) when he decided to renew the contract of the war by committing to a 30,000-man troop surge in Afghanistan and doubling down on the same seemingly wasteful policies that had marooned our nation on Debt Island in the first place.

To scores of liberal Obama supporters, his continuation of a too-bloody, too-costly war was a departure from the ideologies on which he had run his campaign. It was a betrayal of liberal tenants. But therein lays the fallacy (or the misperception or whatever you want to call it): Obama isn't really a liberal, he's a moderate.

Socially and economically, President Obama is fairly progressive. He's come out in favor of legalization of gay marriage; pinned his hopes on Keynesian economics, contiving economic policies that leverage gov't. spending as a mechanism to reduce debt; recomitted to the closure of Guantanamo Bay, a "necessary evil" that defies constitutionality and is the remnant of an extremely conservative foreign policy.

But when it comes to foreign policy, Obama occupies the middle ground--and he's planted there. By no means should anyone have expected Obama to adopt a course of action much different from the one he did. With a troop surge, he breathed new life

into an insurgency that, though morally questionable, had a chance at seriously stabilizing a turbulent region of the globe. The apocalyptic rhetoric that was symptomatic of the early days of the war on terror may have been overblown, but beneath the rhetorical embellishments lay a legitimate danger. Obama's troop surge was a reasonable policy to adopt, and the first step down the road to an exit strategy.

Obama recognized the pointlessness in an immediate, unconditional withdrawal from the conflicts that the U.S. has sunk countless hours and dollars into, but he also recognized that the cost of fighting was bankrupting the nation. Obama's policies were congruent with his political persuasion and, considering the financial and ethical parameters bracketing the war, they were the right ones to adopt.

P.S. Even now Obama is continuing to narrow the scope of the war on terror. Check out this good article from the NYT about a recent speech given RE: the role America will play in future conflicts: http://www.nytimes.com/2013/05/24/us/politics/pivoting-from-a-war-footing-obama-acts-to-curtail-drones.html?pagewanted=all&_r=0

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Obama's Troop Surge

by Thomas Comings - Wednesday, May 29, 2013, 11:46 AM

Good points about his policy, Alex. Though I was not all too happy to see Obama surge troops after I elected him on what I thought was a partially anti-war platform, I do see the necessity in it. The more important truth that I hold important is that there is a commitment to ending our presence in those other countries within a reasonable time period. It seems to me that he understands that we no longer want to be a nation at war; people are fed up with all the money being spent and since the beginning it seems as if our conflicts have gone far beyond simply defending our nation. I believe that to be a sentiment that both sides of the aisle are beginning to embrace.

Also, in reference to the article you posted, I couldn't agree more with what Obama is trying to do. The idea of curtailing the use of drones and going back to a pre-2001 terror policy is going to be necessary for the country to get out under the rock of fear. We can understand the dangers without being overwhelmed by hatred and fear.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Obama's Troop Surge

by Agina Hale - Thursday, May 30, 2013, 8:51 PM

I'm sorry, I just had to write this in here. Talking about Obama supporting gay

marriage, because it's a pet peeve of mine. This cements my belief that no politician can be trusted. It bothers me that during his first campaign he received endorsements even with his stance that it was against his religion. I guess that's really where i'm upset. Having a different opinion, or changing your opinion is acceptable, but don't lead others on.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Barack_Obama_presidential_campaign_endo

<http://thinkprogress.org/lgbt/2011/06/22/250931/timeline-barack-obama-marriage-equality/>

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=N6K9dS9wI7U>

I used to be doe-eyed and ambitious with politics, but now I just don't trust any of them.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The Reality of the Modern Military Industry

by Thomas Comings - Tuesday, May 28, 2013, 12:39 PM

What the podcast commentator discussing Eisenhower's meaning failed to even remotely bring up was the fact that we've actually seen happen exactly what he was afraid of; and probably to a worse degree than he could even have anticipated. Just as any large interest group -- gender, racial, or industry based -- has an amount of political clout in our national government, so does the arms industry. With fantastic wealth and very persuasive means, they are an industry that has grown so much as to have the ability to disproportionately effect "defense" spending. In other words, doing everything in their considerable power to get the government to spend federal tax dollars on their goods.

We all know that war increases employment. More people are employed as soldiers and there are more domestic manufacturing jobs to be had, but there are corporations in this country that take that to a level of high-level personal profiteering at the expense of the lives of Americans and that is something truly sinister of which we should be very afraid. Whether we call it a "lobby" or a "complex" the fact remains that they've gained an astonishing amount of power and Eisenhower was right to be wary.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The Reality of the Modern Military Industry

by Minfeng Xu - Thursday, May 30, 2013, 8:52 AM

I totally agree when you address why military industry bad for United States. For example, "there are corporations in this country that take that to a level of high-level personal profiteering at the expense of the lives of Americans". This is

true. This kind of industry definitely will consume a big portion of government spending. On the other hand, it also creates more life pressure to US citizens because it must increase taxes when government needs to spend more. So, I think Eisenhower was wrong at that time.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Buildup the military industrial complex with reason



by Minfeng Xu - Wednesday, May 29, 2013, 9:13 PM

After World War 2 end, US and Soviet Union separated the world into two parts, capitalism and communism, and they even started the cold war. Few years later, both of them began to compete with military weapon, and this was known as Star War. In this background, Eisenhower launched military industrial complex. I think the idea of it was to against Soviet Union during the cold war period. Therefore, we can understand why Eisenhower thought "A military buildup in time of peace, rather than war."

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Lobby vs Complex?



by Chazz Milner - Thursday, May 30, 2013, 5:15 PM

The definition for political lobbying, by Wikipedia, is: the act of attempting to influence decisions made by officials in the government. Using this definition to understand the commentators idea of calling Eisenhower's "military industrial complex" a lobby, to me, doesn't make sense in terms of what "it" is(noun). However, if the idea of a constant, military industry is being presented to the people to decide on whether it is a good idea for our nation or not, the use of the word "lobby" does seem like a better word choice. It sounds more like a decision to be deliberated over and come to a majority decision. As a noun, after the decision has been made to begin building our military up, "complex" seems like a very suitable word. It ties all of the necessary steps needed for this buildup into a well worded package. The fact that Eisenhower proposes this build up in times of peace, I think, is planning well for the future. Like Eisenhower said, we have already been through four major wars and we "can no longer risk the emergency improvisation of national defense". He was thinking, honestly, about the future of our country, the power we now had, and the responsibilities that come along with attaining that world power. Obviously, non-peaceful situations are going to continue to happen. There has not been, and never was, a "war to end all wars" and if we wanted to talk a big game to other countries, we had better be able to come through.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Ike and the Military Industrial Complex

by Robert Badewitz - Saturday, June 1, 2013, 6:40 PM

I would have to agree with the commentator that the use of the work lobby would have better described the so called "military industrial complex." Though i can see why Eisenhower could have used the term "complex" to try and describe how large, complex and important it was. What Eisenhower called the "military industrial complex" further described by the commentator is exactly what a lobby is today.

The fact that Eisenhower oversaw military buildup during a time of peace does not really confuse anything for me. After the United States had seen so much war and did not have a permanently established armaments industry, it makes since that Eisenhower would work to build one. So that we would not be unprepared for if another conflict should ever arise.

Perhaps Eisenhower seems to be contradictory in his farewell speech because did not want Americans to have there freedoms and liberties threatened. With Communism being in complete contrast to the beliefs of the United States, keeping our freedoms and liberties untreated would help fight and prevent the spread of Communist beliefs during the Cold War.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



war

by Robert Badewitz - Saturday, June 1, 2013, 9:31 PM

This tells me that comparing wars is not something that should be done. Wars all have different variables and scenarios, making them unique. To compare unique wars such as the ones mentioned, to me would just cause confusion and help distort the truth. Though learning from mistakes in previous war, then applying the learned knowledge to make sure it never happens again is in every way a good thing.

After knowing that Obama did not follow through with what he promised and reading the information presented in this article, to me it shows that Republican leaders are better at getting out of war and making peace and creating prosperity. Presidents like to promise a lot, but that all seems to change when they take office. Maybe this is because they do not have all the information they need when they are campaigning.

Sum of ratings: (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Military Industrial Complex or Lobby?

by Lorena Hernandez - Saturday, June 1, 2013, 11:50 PM

the commentator was touching very specific points of today's realism we look forward to in armstice. I believe Eisenhower's farewell was a little different than the commantator speaks of. When leaving office, Eisenhower was leaving a country at

the brink of fighting communism with the world. He had seen and experienced those wars for himself and knew the validity of the economic help to support these wars and the U.S grow. I tend to think that when he left office, he knew he was leaving a difficult position and job, to handle the growing armstice the U.S had at the time.

Sum of ratings: (1)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

[< Previous \(Rights, Rights, and Mo...\)](#)

[\(Military Industrial Co...\) Next >](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar ([Logout](#))

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

