

HST 203: History of the United States Sp14 (Escobar Meta 41237 41238)

Home ► My courses ► Spring 2014 ► HST 203 Sp14 (Escobar Meta 41237 41238) ► May 26 - June 1 ► Forum 4 ► Military Industrial Complex


 Search forums

Forum 4

 Display replies in nested form

 Move this discussion to ...

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



Military Industrial Complex

by Joe Escobar - Thursday, May 22, 2014, 8:43 AM

This forum thread is for the Military Industrial Complex discussion.

After studying the required materials, address the questions in your 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.

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



This Topic, These Thoughts:

by Zachary Ogborn - Monday, May 26, 2014, 9:09 PM

First off, I'd like to address the questions presented to us in the Forum Materials. Many times fellow students stray away from these questions when in fact, they actually help evolve the Forum discussions into wonderfully resourceful academic entities.

I **DO** agree with the commentators statement about the vocabulary President Eisenhower choose to use (**Complex vs. Lobby**). If Eisenhower had chosen to use the phrase **Military Industrial Lobby**, I feel like it would have shaped our modern understanding into a much more comprehensive and logical mentality. When I first heard the phrase **Military Industrial Complex**, I must admit I absolutely **DID** have a ping of 'fear', more so 'concern', about what that implied or what that **Complex** would do or create.

As for Eisenhower building up our military in a time of '**Peace**', we were exposed to material during in-class lecture that shows that the Allies and the Post WWII United States were essentially in a stale-mate with the Soviet Union. That situation is anything but a '**Time of Peace**'. Sure it was no WWII or Korean War, but I'd argue that it wasn't a completely Peaceful decade. Numerous covert operations began 'popping-up' across the globe during this time, not to mention the fear of a Soviet Invasion, or massive Communist Uprising without a doubt caused some unrest.

I don't know for certain why President Eisenhower commented on this issue, or perhaps warned us as a Nation, all I have are hypotheses. Perhaps he wished to legitimize his actions early, just in case of a future War with The Soviets. Maybe he was just trying to lighten his conscience. I'll think about this and relay it back later throughout the week.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



War on Peace



by Ren Rasmussen - Monday, May 26, 2014, 9:37 PM

I agree with the commentator with the use of the vocabulary of complex vs lobby because he was trying to get the view of Eisenhower. The commentator states that it would make more sense to have it be lobby instead of complex due to the connections of the Pentagon lobbying and businesses wanted to increase profit over time, but that's how he saw it not President Eisenhower. Eisenhower knew the bigger picture and said it how he saw it, complex. The build up during a time of peace verse war times doesn't really affect my understanding of the situation. Eisenhower states that he didn't want to have an unnecessary attack due the lack of weapons. He also says that being with other generals that they always wanted more than they could ever get and I see this as good and bad. The bad is if a nation continually makes weapons on a massive scale other countries are going to try to match you and if war does come it could out compete all wars we have been in combined. The good is that I would like to have our troops over supplied to hopefully overwhelm the enemy and win faster and fewer deaths. I think Eisenhower took up this contrary position because war after war was happening and with a military build up, war or no war, would benefit the world because after all like he states we are the peacekeepers of the world.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



If it makes money, there's probably a Lobby for that.



by Zachary Ogborn - Wednesday, May 28, 2014, 10:54 PM

The second part of this Forums Materials/Questions are a very good discussion topic in my opinion. I have my own opinions about a Peace-time weapons/military build up, or rather practicality of the such. I've mentioned this before in other forum posts, but I've only ever been exposed to War in the **21st Century**. I haven't had an opportunity to witness the

transition from WW1, WW2, Korea, Vietnam, Numerous African/South American Conflicts, The Gulf War, to the modern Afghanistan/Iraq Wars; If I had, I would have a much more unbiased opinion/reflection.

At the surface, Yes, all wars can be compared. Especially when you chronologically look at each Wars effects, starting points, Reasons, entities involved, etc. Its obvious. Our Text book points out the WW1 effects that led to WW2, thus WW1 and WW2 had it's effects on Korea/Southeast Asia and an Anticommunist approach, That in turn led to the multitude of Wars/Conflicts in the Middle East and South America, and finally that led to our modern situation with Anti-Terror/Anti-Dictator Campaigns (*all of which were funded by the United States to quell Communism originally*). It's my opinion that the U.S is currently (*and WAS in terms of Vietnam*) trying to 'mop-up' the repercussions and unseen consequences of its previous engagements.

As for our *Presidential Leadership*, collectively *Republican* or *Democratic* ideologies aren't a huge factor in the face of a National Adversary in my opinion (*except for the Civil War, but that's not 20th Century material*). I validate this by simply purposing the question: "*If your Nation no longer exists, what does it matter if you're a Republican or Democrat?*"

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



I love your subject line, Zach  

by Blake Taylor - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 3:25 PM

...and nothing makes more money than war. Or rather, the fear of the need to go to war. The commentator's assertion that Eisenhower could have more accurately used the word "lobby" instead of "complex" is true, and it definitely would have sounded less threatening. Frankly, though, I think that people do need to be threatened by an entire industry whose sole purpose is to sell fear and anxiety. The chain of lobbying that Eisenhower describes is still seen today (remember last year when the Army finally said "Hey, we don't need 3,000 more tanks." and the congressman from the district where they were produced [in Ohio?] was like, "Uh, yeah, you do because I need to keep those manufacturing jobs in my district.") and it's one that reeks of corruption. The entire concept of a "war on terror" is utterly manufactured. Obviously, traditional forces can't fight an untraditional foe in a traditional way, but we've basically been throwing good money after bad, trying to do just that. I'm sorry, I should correct myself: we've been throwing good money into the coffers of Lockheed Martin, KBR, Boeing, etc, and they've been quite happy to take it and convince us to throw more. I think it's very interesting that the last military budget that Obama announced was considerably smaller than previous years; it infers a move to more drone use and less troop activity, which may actually make the Military Industrial Complex more money in the long run. And you're absolutely right, Zach: Republican or Democratic ideologies are irrelevant, because both parties like money equally.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The Cold War

by Andrew Betz - Friday, May 30, 2014, 3:21 PM

Yes i do agree with the commentator. I feel if he did not use the word complex, it would have not have sounded as heavy or intimidating. However in the time period that Eisenhower lived that wouldn't have mattered. The fact that Eisenhower oversaw a military buildup did not affect my understanding of the issue. The reason he would take this position I believe is in the video he said he did not ever want to appear weak enough to provoke attack. Since we were in a heavy competition with Russia we definitely weren't in a typical time of peace. So Eisenhower was increasing our military size to prevent us from looking weak.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The Cold War

by Ren Rasmussen - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 9:58 PM

I agree with you that Eisenhower did not want us to appear weak just like TR and his White Fleet. If we show strength with military power other countries will think twice before attacking. Peace will never be gained with words or agreements but with military power. I wish it wasn't that way but that it reality.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



complex vs lobby

by Edwin Westlund - Saturday, May 31, 2014, 10:51 PM

I agree with the commentator about President Eisenhower's use of the word complex versus the word lobby. I feel that he purposely used this word because he was warning the American people not to let the Military spending get out of control and go completely overboard like I feel it sort of has in modern times. Whenever someone is making money off of something, like producing more military equipment, then there will be a push to keep producing more and more equipment no matter what. I believe he saw that it was important to have an industry especially for producing military equipment but that it should also be controlled so it did not grow out of control and become something more than it was meant to be.

I feel that Obama's claims to bring the troops out of Afghanistan so soon were just campaign promises to get himself the vote. Before his first election he may have very well had intentions of bringing the troops out when he said but then he was elected and found out the war he thought he knew was a completely different creature than

he originally thought. I do not think that all of these different wars can be fairly compared to each other without an extremely deep analysis of everything surrounding the country and all countries involved in the wars. The all have different circumstances and took place at different stages in the development of the world as we know it.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

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

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

[i](#) Moodle Docs for this page

