



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

< [Previous \(Military Industrial Co...\)](#)[\(Rights, Rights, and Mo...\) 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](#)**Ike was right!** by **Barry Sommer** - Saturday, May 25, 2013, 9:02 PM

But do we learn from history?

The observation by Eisenhower that we needed to be afraid of this new government/civilian hydra has obviously come true. We see how the infinite loop works now, after the fact and as per his warning we are now reaping what we foolishly sowed. The word complex did not mean (to me) that there were many facets to the beast, although we know there are, I saw it more as a reference to a large setting of buildings covering many acres where on one side we see the military, the other side industry, and in the middle are great doors from which spews the fruits of their cooperation. Today it is a lobby but back then the word complex is perfectly appropriate.

As a military man it would be natural for Eisenhower to hold dear his military history. I see no contradiction between his comment about the M/I complex and his support of a strong military. As his term as President started at the beginning of the Cold War he was not presented with as firm a threat as Kennedy and Cuba, but he knew very well the dangers of the USSR and even as he warned about the M/I complex and the threat to freedom and liberty it posed, I believe he thought the threat from the Soviets

was greater (maybe by only millimeters) than from the M/I complex.

The biggest problem with comparisons is that one side is usually misrepresented. To try and compare wars without exploring the underlying meme of those wars does nothing to advance a coherent conclusion. One may try to use the general rubric of "ideological" to pigeonhole a description, but that only narrows the definition. Viet Nam was a response to the "domino theory" where if one country falls to the communists, it will push others and as they fall they push others...and so on. Korea was ideological, and so was WWII, but Afghanistan and Iraq, we had no concrete plan or exit strategy and never identified what ideology drove the enemy there. Those were bound to fail and as we watch, the countries we supposedly liberated are now almost back to where they were before we intervened.

As the worlds policeman we constantly get involved in others "little wars" and it matters not whether Democrat or Republican. Believing that the world will end if we don't send more troops and then only sending 30,000 belies a thought process that does not think about winning. Saying at the same time that once the 30K are there the draw-down would commence shows a lack of backbone and a refusal to address the truths about why we are fighting.

History shows that our dear leaders suffer the same malady as the common man; a belief that all is possible with a few guns. Whether Wilson in WWI trying to get industry together to make the machines of war, to Roosevelt and his many offices of "make more war stuff" or Johnson and his orders to expand the war in Viet Nam by bombing Cambodia (and secretly Laos) it is, unfortunately the M/I complex that has provided the weaponry to wage that war. Their motto could be "The Military/Industrial Complex; making war possible since 1950!"

We began our military build-up around 1810 after having to deal with the Barbary Coast pirates and their constant demands for protection money for safe passage of American vessels. The USS Constitution (Old Ironsides) is a direct result of our desire to build a navy. Our warships in WWI like the battleship were directly tied to our fear we would be beaten by anothers navel firepower. Aircraft carriers were meant to carry both planes and Marines, and to deliver both to the battlefield as fast as possible. We have built a self-perpetuating weapons factory that feeds on the fight, and the future holds little hope we will stop this marriage of dangerous technology and almost unlimited finances.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

3

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Military Industrial Complex

by Nichole Sherman - Tuesday, May 28, 2013, 12:02 AM

After watching both videos and reading the article on President Obama i have come to the conclusion that we cannot compare other wars to the war on terror or any other way for that matter. I believe that these videos and the article reveal that our presidents know what to say to the American people to get their liking or vote in an election year. This showed how one person can take a leaders words and change them into something different. For example the commentor took the Military Industrial Complex and said it should have been called Military Industial Lobbying because complex makes it seem a lot scarier. This videos and article shows that all leaders

try to do what they think is right when it comes to national threats. I believe that although Obama lied about bringing our troops home that he thought he would be able to. Eisenhower and Obama have both done what they thought right. Eisenhower made our country able to provide for better in a way Obama is trying to end a way started by another president.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Military Industrial Complex

by Francisco Reyes - Tuesday, May 28, 2013, 12:13 PM

To my understanding Military Industrial Complex is the development between government forces and defense. It is set up for waging an effective war while furthering political interests abroad while still having proper defense in our homeland. The driving force behind this initiative of Military Industrial Complex explained in the 2009 podcast was as a result of the Korean War. Eisenhower didn't want the U.S.A to seem weak enough for other countries to provoke an attack. This was generally to scare any potential foe and, therefore, establish a large military force to counter the moves of any potential enemy. As it further explains in the podcast, as a general, Eisenhower always felt that his troops needed more equipment than what was provided to them. So the buildup of the Military Industrial Complex would give troops the necessary equipment when it was needed and no longer would the whole nation have to change from a civilian state to a militarized state that's sole purpose was to create weapons in time of need. In turn companies like Ford would no longer be in charge of making tanks for the U.S.A, but now private companies funded by the government would take charge of making militarized weapons.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Comparing Wars

by Brenda Contreras - Tuesday, May 28, 2013, 12:30 PM

When it comes to comparing wars, facts tend to get twisted in a way that benefits the person twisting them. Each war was different, and was lead by different leaders. Obama wanted to have troops out of Iraq by the summer of 2011, yet he ended up adding more. Things aren't always what they seem, and maybe this is why the President sent more troops. In the article, it gives a list of the number of troops that went to Vietnam, Korea, and then it compares it to the number of troops that went to Afghanistan. The Vietnam and Korean wars took months of strategic planning, and estimating on how many troops would be deployed. President Bush only took a few months before going to war, and there were roomers spreading that he used 9/11 as an excuse to go to war with Afghanistan.

Source

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Re: Comparing Wars

by Nichole Sherman - Thursday, May 30, 2013, 10:13 PM

You are very much correct when you point out that we went to war with Afganastain much quicker then we have gone to war in the past. No war should be compared because facts are twisted by the person that is collecting them, therefore making our historical data incorrect.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Re: Military Industrial Complex

by Veronica Wilkens - Saturday, June 1, 2013, 7:55 AM

I don't understand why Eisenhower wouldn't have a military build up, especially as a former military man. I think it is only natural to see a threat, even if a small (but building) possibility, and from past experiences want to take measures to protect yourself and those important to you (in this case his whole country). Despite the fact that so many people want our troops out, I can see why Obama said what he did. He must protect the important people before he can begin to pull them out. Let the dust being to settle, so to speak.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Re: Military Industrial Complex

by Nichole Sherman - Saturday, June 1, 2013, 11:44 PM

I agree. There is still a threat so Obama like Einsenhower must protect his country and his people. It makes since to me to build up a military even if it is small. Besides, by helping to build the military up he is increasing the economy jobs.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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

[< Previous \(Military Industrial Co...\)](#)

[\(Rights, Rights, and Mo...\) Next >](#)

 Moodle Docs for this page

