



Joe

[Home](#) [Lane CC Home](#) [Students](#) [Faculty](#) [Site News](#) [Academic Advising](#) [HELP](#)
[Home](#) ► [My courses](#) ► [Spring 15](#) ► [HST 203 Sp15 \(Escobar Meta\)](#) ► [May 24 - May 30](#) ► [Forum 4](#) ► [Military Industrial Complex](#)


Search forums

Forum 4

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

Move

**Military Industrial Complex**

by Joe Escobar - Friday, May 22, 2015, 10:57 AM

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

After studying the required materials, address the various questions. 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.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Military Industrial Complex

Sum of ratings: -

[Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**good turned bad**

by Dominic Christianson - Monday, May 25, 2015, 2:59 PM

I believe that the beginning beliefs of the military industrial complex about creating permanent armament industry had good intentions; however, with modern day interpretations with Obama's NSA program, it turned into what Eisenhower was warning us about: an industrial complex with too much power. The United States government spend \$711 billion dollars per year on military funding alone, whereas the next-largest country's spending on military is China at \$143 billion (Quora, 2014). We spend almost five times more on our military than China. This is more than a little excessive.

Works Cited:

How Much Stronger is the US Military Compared With the Next Strongest Power? Quora, 30 Jan. 2014 Web. 25 May 2015

Sum of ratings: 2 (1) 2

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: good turned bad**

by Nicolas Gibson - Saturday, May 30, 2015, 3:42 PM

Fear.

Fear of the unknown. Fear of not knowing for sure who we are fighting, who wants us dead, where they live, etc. WWII was the last true conventional war. Side A vs side B. When we declared war on Japan in 1942 that was a declaration of conventional war. We haven't had that since. We have been fighting wars where there is no true military. No uniformed enemy. Just average joes in the civilian population, with civilian attire, appearing and disappearing out of the crowds. We don't know who we truly are fighting. And because we are so curious we invest a ton of money to find these people, and destroy them before they are able to harm anyone else. Yes, war is expensive, but when we are gripped by the fear of the unknown, it can sometimes be worth it.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Fear is the strongest motivator**by [Woodrow Elsasser](#) - Saturday, May 30, 2015, 9:05 PM

"The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist" (USA TODAY article). It is the job of the United States, as the most powerful military on the planet, to put these powers at bay for the fear of what would happen if we did not. The United States has taken on this role as a global protector, and that is why we have, and will continue to have, the highest military spending of any nation on the globe by a large factor.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Wasteful spending**by [Adam Graves](#) - Tuesday, May 26, 2015, 7:23 PM

It's topics like this that probably drive certain people crazy. I definitely think that companies that have large government contracts have huge influences on politics that the general public aren't aware of. One of the articles mentioned the amount that certain corporations campaign contributions were, the sad thing is this is just the amount they directly contributed to each party. What it doesn't show is how much money these company contributed to 501c corporations that more directly influenced campaigns. Hence the whole dark money that help maintain these large interest groups to keep things in their favor.

But fear is what keeps people scared and keeps them believing that this spending is justified. I personally think that we probably have enough military infrastructure to handle our countries security needs. Maybe more money to help returning soldiers that are injured. We already have the number one military in the world, I'm sure there has to be a way to cut military spending in half and still protect ourselves from outside threats.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Wasteful spending**by [Tristan Ivie](#) - Wednesday, May 27, 2015, 10:42 AM

On 9/11, we lost almost 3,000 American citizens. One true failure in American defense. Since 9/11, the greatest loss of life on American ground to terrorist was 13 in the Fort Hood shooting. There is no denying that American defense is working. Why? Because we invest tons of money into keeping me, you, and all American citizens safe. Not sure if cutting the defense budget in half will help keep our defense strong. Not to mention the fact that we have to worry about North Korea and other parts of the world that want to destroy us. Also is it fear, or the fact that American defense works that keeps the defense spending justified?

(Works cited: TheReligionofPeace.com Islamic Terror Attacks on America Soil)

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Wasteful spending**by [Adam Graves](#) - Friday, May 29, 2015, 3:43 PM

Okay maybe in half is a bit drastic, but there as to be a way to reduce our defense budget without compromising national security. I realize that we terrorist are a threat and with ISSI using social media to recruit people on U.S. soil to try and carry out some sort of an attack is a legitimate concern. With the Homeland Security Act in addition to the Patriot Act have done a solid job of keeping an eye on suspicious activity, even if it's also infringed on regular american's civil liberties to do so, as Edward Snowden has shown us. America's defense budget shouldn't be more then the rest of the world's added up. As for North Korea, there ever growing nuclear program is a problem and needs to be addressed.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Wasteful spending**by [Jaalen Johnson](#) - Saturday, May 30, 2015, 11:32 PM

That is a fantastic fact that you found about the largest tragedy we've had on American soil since 9/11 is 13 casualties. I think it shows why the spending is justified to some nature. We spend money so that we don't have to worry about a bombing exploding at our feet. People complain constantly about having a tremendous national debt but I question those people to think of the alternative, war in our homeland, or another 9/11. So if my family and friends are safe and don't have to worry about war in our nation, I will gladly give some money out of my paycheck to help pay for that effort.

I also believe the second we are to cut our defense budget in half it gives rival nations incentive to attack. If half of our defense is gone we are technically a weaker nation. Even if we are still upon the top it makes it easier for different nations to justify attacking the U.S.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Let's Not Forget**by [Tristan Ivie](#) - Wednesday, May 27, 2015, 10:14 AM

"The United States is actually less friendly to business than many other countries are -- even the supposedly egalitarian ones such as Canada and Sweden. Washington imposes the second highest corporate tax rate among OECD countries, behind only Japan. And unlike nearly every capital in the world, Washington requires multinationals based in the United States to pay home taxes on profits earned abroad."(Works Cited: Why Vilifying Corporations Misses the Point By [Gary Hufbauer](#) and [Martin Vieiro](#).) This quote shows that maybe we are not as hand and hand with big business as some people think. When it comes to defense, We may be a touch more hand and hand with corporation. Is it necessary? The Military Industrial Complex are the cozy relationships between military spending and corporation. These relationships may be profitable for these corporations, However let's not forget that the world is a dangerous place. A very large number of people want to kill me and you just because we live in America. I want defense spending and the production of these defense materials by corporations to continue, because it scares the hell out of me that people want to kill me for just being an American.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Let's Not Forget**by [Adam Graves](#) - Friday, May 29, 2015, 4:14 PM

I would say that the government is very friendly with large corporations. Especially in the form of corporate welfare. The article that you reference was from 2011, might need a bit of an update. Even as most recently as May 27, Lockheed Martin would receive 87 million in bonds if they receive a contract to construct new light tactical vehicles in Arkansas that would create around 1000 jobs. Lockheed martin has several large contracts with the government and receives plenty of revenue from the federal government, and has annual revenues close to 3 billion. This very same company wasted millions of NASA's money because they didn't use metric units on the Mars climate orbiter. So I would say that the government is very pro big business. Just as long as it's a business that the a majority of government officials have stakes in.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**War for Profit**by [Jie Lai](#) - Saturday, May 30, 2015, 5:57 PM

"War for profit" is not the only approach for modern times as it drove the best and worst of old Europe as many decades -

perhaps best exemplified by the naval arms race seen between France, Spain and Britain. The driving force behind the establishment of a large standing military force to counter the moves of the potential enemy. The modern interpretation of this, as it relates to the military-industrial complex, is only slightly altered in that the established military force is now utilized to further global interests - the enemy is no longer another nation per se but any organization not in line with presented ideals.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Waging Peace**by [Woodrow Elsasser](#) - Saturday, May 30, 2015, 8:58 PM

When looking at U.S. involvement in wars throughout history, it is clear that we are a dominating military force. For the past decade or so, the U.S. has involved itself in several major wars, all of which our main goal was to maintain global peace. The fear of threats from all over the world (communism, fascism, terrorism, etc.) have forced the U.S. to wage wars as a means of creating a form of global peace and safety for the citizens of the world. That has become the job of the United States as we know it. As the most powerful military force on the planet, it is our job to deal with threats that endanger this peace and safety. We see that democrats and republicans alike have agreed to take control of this responsibility when leading this nation, and we have seen time and time again that we have prevailed. "The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist." Because of this fact, we will continue to wage for peace across the globe for the fear of what happens if we were to fail in upholding said peace.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Where is the silver lining?**by [Jaalen Johnson](#) - Saturday, May 30, 2015, 11:22 PM

Listening to Bruce Carlson was very interesting it made several thoughts come to mind. First thing that got me thinking is when he talks about general motors and ford both would convert to military manufacturing during war times. Which makes sense but then we may be on the tail end of being prepared. So the resolution to it is having company's that are continually there for war effort. Yet, the next question that arises is, How prepared is to prepared? To constantly have war effort even during times of no war cost's money. The money typically comes from one place as well. The pockets of all the citizens through personal income tax increases. That's the problem people don't like to give out of their pay. So we need to find a balance. How much of the war efforts need to be precautionary rather than reactionary.

Carlson quotes Ike "unjustified military spending is a waste of national resources and as a free society we should be directing that" which I believe to be true its a huge problem that would arise. Yet, Ike also says "I never wanted to be weak enough to provoke attack" so where can we find the balance of the two?

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)[Moodle Docs for this page](#)[HST 203 Sp15 \(Escobar Meta\)](#)