

HST 203: U.S. History Sp18 (Escobar Meta 41002 43590)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 203 Sp18 \(Escobar Meta 41002 43590\)](#) / [Week 9](#) / [Forum 4](#)
/ [The Military-Industrial Complex](#)



Forum 4 The Military-Industrial Complex

[Subscribe](#)[◀ Rights, Rights, Rights](#)[The Military-Industrial Complex ▶](#)

The Military-Industrial Complex

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Friday, May 25, 2018, 7:13 AM

This thread is for discussions on The Military-Industrial Complex topic.

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, something that describes which one of the questions you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: The Military-Industrial Complex

Sum of ratings: -

[Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



Re: The Military-Industrial Complex: is it still relevant?



by [Sienna Grosse](#) - Saturday, May 26, 2018, 10:28 AM

The concerns of an industrial military complex are still very applicable today, and maybe even more so now than when Eisenhower first coined the term. Even Eisenhower in the speech implied fears of the future, "the potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists, and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes." (Video clip from forum). Obviously he felt that it could pose not just an immediate threat, but a threat for future generations. At the end of the speech Eisenhower says, Only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military machinery of defense with our peaceful methods and goals so that security and liberty may prosper together." In my opinion, Eisenhower's concern of being a part of an alert and knowledgeable system is a question that we could all ask ourselves, are we a part of an alert and knowledgeable system? If so, in what ways? And if not, how so? For me, I don't think it's so black or white, I think we probably exist in a gray area of that spectrum.

Sum of ratings: [2 \(1\)](#)

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



Re: The Military-Industrial Complex

by [Zachary Denton](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 10:48 AM

I somewhat agree with the commentator because I do believe it was a complex issue for Eisenhower when he was president. The country still looked towards companies like Ford and General Motors for wartime vehicle productions instead of separate companies that specialize in these productions. In todays time I would say it is more of a lobbyist issue because of these specific companies that are getting these massive defense contracts. I do think that because Eisenhower said this after he started a military buildup in peacetime is contradictory. It confuses me on his actual stance on the topic. Why would he begin a military buildup if he were to denounce it later in his presidency? In Eisenhower's farewell address video, he says that only 60 years into this century there has been 4 major wars and I believe he simply wants peace and that continuing to buildup our military resources would make that goal very hard to accomplish. He also recognizes that the country depended on it for economic growth and providing jobs to the American people. He seemed very torn about the issue it presented the country in its future. I think the concerns of the time being that if we don't spend a lot of money on defense and war the Russians will win are no longer that big of an issue. Considering we spend more on defense and war than all other counties combined, I think we can reduce some of that spending but we do need to continuing doing it. There are still many threats to the U.S. in the world today, but they most likely won't happen because of the power that we hold as a nation in the world.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Affects of Words**by [Kayla Hadden](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 3:35 PM

I do agree with the comentator that the use of the word “lobby” instead of “complex” could have yielded a different response from the public. The definition of the word “complex” is; a group of similar buildings or facilities on the same site (dictionary.com). The definition of the word “lobby” is; a room providing a space out of which one or more other rooms or corridors lead (dictionary.com). “Complex” makes it seem like the plan is already set in stone and that there is no room for citizens’ ideas. “Lobby” would have made it seem as if Eisenhower was presenting an idea to the public in which they could have a say in how the idea is carried out. I believe the word “lobby” also is just a more relaxed term that the public could understand. I think it makes sense that Eisenhower would present this idea during a time of peace so that way we would be prepared in case of another war. Like he says, we had just witnessed “four major wars” so it would make sense to expect another (Farewell Address 0:20). I think he took this position because it is logical. Why scramble to prepare for a war after it starts when we could have some stuff on hand so that way we aren’t so shocked by it.

This subject is still being talked about today because there are people who feel like we do not need to spend as much money as we do on our national defense and there are people who feel it is necessary. Obama says in his speech that money and resources are used to find out who terrorists are communicating with (Obama’s NSA Speech 1:45). Many people fear that the surveillance teams are using these resources to violate the average citizen’s privacy. I disagree with this idea though because I think there are real threats out there that they have to address. I think that when it comes down to spying on citizens or trying to track terrorist communications, they would choose to do what is most important; tracking terrorist communications.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: The Military-Industrial Complex in Past and Current Events**by [Carly Minow](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 4:39 PM

Eisenhower’s word choice is correct. While lobby is a clearer choice, complex is a word with more meaning. It sounds like a plan or idea with a vast reach and large effect. Eisenhower’s choice to build up strength during times of peace relates back to his word choice through power and effect. If the word complex were changed to lobby, the nature of the situation would sound optional. Complex stresses the sheer amount of power and communication involved rather than a softer word. In his farewell speech,

President Eisenhower explained that America lacked an armament creation process other than relying on manufacturers, like Ford, to stop production of normal goods during war time. (Speech 0:32, 0:40-47; Carlson 1:43-54) With a military-industrial complex, the nation could be ready to fight and stocked with weapons at any given moment without having to give up other manufacturing ventures. The concept of ready to defend relates back to today through our current defense system. Along with protecting the country from outside forces, today's defense also consists of modern surveillance methods, like the NSA's storage of all cellular communications. President Obama, in response to widespread outrage about the newly revealed spying in 2013, stated that reforms would be enacted to ensure transparency between government actions and the public. (Obama speech 1:25-1:30) The actions by the NSA, however, reflect the efforts of the military-industrial complex to use every form of defense available in the name of homeland security. The monitoring of communication, although to much controversy, is a small section of America's efforts to be ready to defend at any moment.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Complex vs. Lobby

by [Carley Kramer](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 4:49 PM

I agree with the commentator about the impact of vocabulary on this issue. The commentator from the podcast said that "the term could've been changed to military industrial lobby and it wouldn't seem so crazy a term now, because he used the term military industrial complex to reflect the complexity of it, that there were so many interlocking pieces that it was hard to fight." (3:28 Military Industrial Complex Podcast) I appreciate why Eisenhower would use "complex" instead of "lobby," however, I feel that using the term "Military Industrial Lobby" instead of "Military Industrial Complex" could make modern Americans understand the issue differently in a powerful way. I like this phrasing because it places responsibility somewhere, unlike just using "complex." Using the term "lobby" points to Lobbyists and the issue of lobbying in general, and recognizes that this issue is a financial one. To me, using the phrase "complex" makes it seem like the issue is somewhat intangible and out of our control. While it's important to address that this is a multifaceted dilemma, I like that using the term "lobby" actually helps us to know what the real issue is a bit more, and to know that is something that could be changed.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Complex vs. Lobby

by [Carly Minow](#) - Thursday, May 31, 2018, 9:20 PM

I disagree that the issue of the military-industrial complex is purely financial. While there is a financial element to the complex, it was also a way for America to improve defense and increase our capabilities in weapons and weapons manufacturing. As Eisenhower said in his farewell speech, the world had just seen four major wars, all of which the United States was never fully prepared for. As quoted in Carson's podcast, Eisenhower writes in his memoir, *Waging Peace*, "After Korea, I wanted to be sure that we were never so weak as to provoke attack" (1:19-1:24). We didn't have armaments stocked up and only produced during war time, causing companies to stop manufacturing their normal goods. Under the military industrial complex, American factories could continue to manufacture goods while new groups and businesses produced armaments. The country would always have supplies when needed and could be ready to fight at a moment's notice.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Complex vs. Lobby**by [Kayla Hadden](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 1:32 PM

I agree with you that the term "complex" makes it seem like the idea is out of our control. It makes it seem like the plan was already made and we, as citizens, had no choice but to accept it. Using the word "lobby" would have made the idea seem more open. In that we could be part of this huge decision for our country instead of a decision being made for everyone.

Sum of ratings:0 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**The complexes of complex, being a military power**by [Emily Hemmerle](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 10:01 PM

It's common nowadays for people to use the wrong terminology when describing something. If the correct terminology was used people will still not pay attention to the differences. As a country we only see one way or the other so explaining complex vs lobby they'll still believe they are similies. Eisenhower was a war general so he has military expertise and took advantage of the time of peace during the Cold War to built his artillery. It was smart of him to buildup during this time because it guaranteed as a country we'd be ready for anything. That's been our motto since day one is to be ready and fight hard. Even though were in the Middle East having a ever growing military is a positive thing because again we go back to always being ready. We're a economic and powerful superpower that needs to have a great military in order to be protected by anything. However, we spend way too much on this sector and barelv any of the

budget goes to other things. Currently, we have a government that still stands behind Eisenhower's huge military complex.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

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



Re: The complexes of complex, being a military power

by [Carly Minow](#) - Tuesday, May 29, 2018, 9:03 PM

I'd like to disagree with your notion that America is a "one way or the other" country. We as a society and country fall on many political, social, and economic spectrums. For example, Senator Bernie Sanders takes a doubtful stance on the reveal of the NSA's spying, stating that it is a very complicated issue that has damaged our credibility in foreign policy (Bernie video 2:15-2:20). Sanders is a left, democratic socialist politician. President Obama, however, somewhat defends the NSA's actions after holding some skepticism. He says that he "felt that they made us more secure" and that "nothing in that initial review and nothing that I have learned since indicated that our intelligence community has sought to violate the law or is cavalier about the civil liberties of their fellow citizens" (Obama speech 0:44-1:03). President Obama is also politically left, demonstrating the spectrum of views from two people who share a political ideology

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2

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



Re: The complexes of complex, being a military power

by [Emily Hemmerle](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 5:00 PM

Rereading and taking into account what you said. We are a spectrum but as a whole we are one way or another which is why we are polarized as a nation. As you mentioned a lot of politicians fall on both sides so I totally understand what you're saying. I was just talking about people who are the extreme left and right because that's what our nation is being controlled by. You see it on Facebook and you see it in the congressional chamber. It's either One or the other when it comes to decision making in current times in 2018.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1)

0

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



Military Industrial Lobbying

by [Kyle Shrope](#) - Sunday, May 27, 2018, 11:22 PM

I do agree with the commentator mentioning of the misuse of vocabulary. In the audio

clip he mentions that the word complex makes it seem more of an intense military action towards its enemies, but it really just meant lobbying for military build up. After reading the information provided I got a better understanding of the U.S. military spending. During the time of the cold war there was always a looming threat of an attack and it makes sense that Eisenhower would want the military to be ready for any type of attack on American soil and its citizens. While Eisenhower was president the idea of communism was very relevant in the world and many citizens of the country feared the idea of communism. The build up of the military created a sense of comfort for the potential attacks of communism. Some concerns seen in todays world is that the U.S. still spends too much on military expenses. Many people believe that the money going to the military could be better used to help the country domestically rather than building up a peacetime military.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Military Industrial Lobbying

by [Kayla Hadden](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 1:46 PM

I agree with everything you said, until the end. Not sure if it was just the way you worded it, but it seems like you agree with our government spending so much on defenses. I agree that it is important that we do have some sort of defense in case we need it, but I do not think we should be spending \$610 billion on it (pgpf.org). According to the article I found on pgpf.org, all other countries combined only spend \$578 billion. We could spend half the amount that we spend now, and still be ahead of the country in second place (China with \$228 billion). That's an extra \$305 billion that could go to other things such as education or health care.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Eisenhower's position during The Cold War

by [Sydney Plaza](#) - Tuesday, May 29, 2018, 6:41 PM

I think that Eisenhower had a unique perspective in explaining why militaristic values and protocols should not be a continual function outside of war. To quote Eisenhower during his speech he said it would "endanger our liberties or democratic processes." (1:57) Here he is stating that a strongly militaristic society is not so different than a communist society which I agree with. If the privatization of prisons, the increase of criminalization, and the influx of dollars into the military system creates a government run by the people in charge of the military, taking away true democratic idealism.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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


Re: Eisenhower's position during The Cold War

 by [Jacob Spriggs](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 12:37 AM

I agree with your analysis of Eisenhower's position. His statement warning about the Military-Industrial Complex was controversial because it was during a time of overall peace, but constant tension with the threat of Communism. However, Eisenhower recognized that the reason that Communism had taken over certain countries was because their military powers were so mighty. Ike realized how risky and wrong it was to fight fire with too much fire and he didn't want the future U.S. leaders to spend too much money on unnecessarily building up the military when that money could be put to better use.

 Sum of ratings: **1** (1)

1

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

Re: The Military-Industrial Complex / Complex or Lobby?

 by [Kevin Gable](#) - Tuesday, May 29, 2018, 10:55 PM

I can agree with the commentator when he said the use of the term "lobby" instead of "complex" during that time would have sounded less ominous. However, I agree with Eisenhower's use of the word complex. It was the complex nature of the defense system that he helped to create he was warning us about. No one knew better it's potential for misuse at the time. President Eisenhower had some pretty impressive credentials prior to his election. He was the supreme allied commander in WWII and directed the invasion of Normandy in 1944. (Textbook, pg 911) With that experience in mind I believe he understood the cost in lives an unchecked military complex could bring. But when considering the financial cost Ike warned us outright. "But Eisenhower said unjustified military spending is a waste of national resources." (2:48 into the commentator podcast) I believe Eisenhower was very careful in the word he chose to use. The complexity of the relationships involved in national defense is not necessarily evil. Rather, it must but monitored closely by the citizens as well as the government in order to ensure freedom as well as safety.

 Sum of ratings: **2** (1)

2

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

Re: The Military-Industrial Complex / Ike's Contribution and Cold War Exit

 by [Kevin Gable](#) - Tuesday, May 29, 2018, 10:56 PM

Eisenhower's contribution to starting the military complex in America definitely changes my understanding of his warning. This brings a level of honesty to what Ike was talking about. Eisenhower understood the necessity for a network of permanent defense for

the country. The ideologies of imperialism didn't go away with the creation of the UN. Those ideologies helped motivate the destruction of The League of Nations. Eisenhower served in WWII with the rank of General. This means he was in the service for years prior to this conflict and educated respectively for his field and position. When the textbook refers to the events of WWII it's interesting to note the attack on Pearl Harbor was 7 December, 1941. General Eisenhower led operation Overlord on 6 June 1944. The textbook spoke of the issues of that gap briefly, "The United States had been unprepared for war, but new bureaucracies and technologies quickly guided a crash program for mobilization." (pg 860) Could you imagine if we would have had that defense network in place before 7 December, 1941? Even if we could not have prevented the attack on Pearl Harbor the US response would have been much faster and more effective. When Eisenhower was elected he took over the Korean War from Truman in 1953. The textbook spoke of a similar readiness for war issue in the beginning of the war. When referring to North Korean movements and UN response, "Within three months, they captured Seoul, the capital of South Korea, and approached the southern tip of the Korean Peninsula. UN troops, most of them from the United States, seemed initially unprepared for war." (pg 894) Eisenhower wanted a system in place that would support and supply a military defense. As for his message of warning during the cold war, the textbook again gives some good clues. Eisenhower was able to use this new defense machine to stop the spread of communism through covert actions involving the CIA in the Philippines, Iran, and Guatemala. (pg 917) In that time he saw much clearer that almost all of us Americans ever will, the capabilities, dangers, and necessity of such a complex.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

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



Re: The Military-Industrial Complex / A Warning for Today's Generation

by [Kevin Gable](#) - Tuesday, May 29, 2018, 10:56 PM

I think one of the biggest concerns is not just the lobbying done in the name of defense. Some of that lobbying is necessary whether we like it or not. I don't get so angry when I hear about the US spending \$75 on a hammer that I can get at Lowes for \$7. I understand my government must finance defense technology without my direct knowledge. It would be naive to think we could keep defense secrets from countries that would do us harm if I am allowed to be briefed on these matters just because I am a tax paying citizen. The USSR developed their atomic bomb in 1949 directly from the spy efforts at the time. There is a level of concession we must make in the name of defense. As a parent I am okay having the unpopular opinion if it means my children will enjoy the ability to have one at all. However, the danger is said beautifully in the article written by Peter Philips. This quote sums up my fears best, "Major defense contractors were seriously involved in the 2008 elections. Lockheed Martin gave

\$2,612,219 in total political campaign donations, with 49% to Democrats (\$1,285,493) and 51% to Republicans (\$1,325,159). Boeing gave \$2,225,947 in 2008 with 58% going to Democrats, and General Dynamics provided \$1,682,595 to both parties. Northrop Grumman spent over \$20 million in 2008, hiring lobbyists to influence Congress, and Raytheon spent \$6 million on lobbyists in the same period.” It’s one thing for a company to have an agreement with our country through elected officials that we choose. This is closer to these companies financing candidates for us to elect in order to secure contracts with our country through our elected officials they financed. Remember class today and the discussion on how hand shakes go far in the White House? How far would a hand shake go with an official you financed into office? And by financing both sides of the election these companies ensure the best deal possible.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: The Military-Industrial Complex / A Warning for Today's Generation

by [Carly Minow](#) - Wednesday, May 30, 2018, 8:54 PM

As Carlson's podcast says, Eisenhower predicted that the side effect of the military industrial complex would be that companies always want a profit. "Companies would need constant business. They like more profit. They would lobby the Pentagon. The Pentagon, getting in equipment, being managers and the overseers of equipment, kind of helped them secure their jobs. The Pentagon would lobby Congress. Eisenhower also talked about how being a general and seeing other generals always felt that officers wanted more equipment than what's probably needed. The companies would lobby the Pentagon and Congress, the Pentagon would also lobby Congress, and Congress would lobby the administration. Everybody seeking for more industrial buildup from military spending" (Podcast 1:55-2:47). Companies like Boeing, Raytheon, and Lockheed Martin finance each side. Only one candidate is going to win, and they would like to make a profit either way. But, by spreading donations and lobbying money between parties, they guarantee bipartisan support. Every candidate needs donor money and even those we elect by ourselves have ties to companies. That is the way of the military-industrial complex.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Complex Lobbies

by [Daniel Zavala](#) - Wednesday, May 30, 2018, 4:04 PM

I would argue that regardless of what it was named, people would still have an issue

with it. I've heard plenty of people say that the Military Industrial Complex is bad because of how it has resulted in the proliferation of arms, resulting in an America so heavily entrenched in an unending state of war against ever more nebulous threats for the sole purpose of maintaining the massive black hole of spending (that could potentially ruin our economy if we ever run out of enemies to face) that the previously mentioned complex has become. I have heard far fewer people say that it is bad because it has a 'scary' name as the commentator (commentator sound clip) explains it.

You could make the claim that Eisenhower was being a little bit of a hypocrite considering that he was the one who started this mass proliferation (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Military_budget_of_the_United_States). But at the time, the Soviet Union was still a considerable threat. Also, at this point, the Military Industrial Complex was small enough that it could have been lowered. But at this point in time, doing so would be an incredibly difficult situation.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Complex Lobbies

by [Tanner Wiese](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 12:57 PM

I honestly don't think it resulting in the proliferation of arms is a bad thing. I understand why many people think it is bad. But, if protecting American citizens results in the proliferation of arms. Then I think its worth the risk. Having a powerful military and protecting our nation is much more important than anything else. So, I think this is the correct decision.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1)

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



Re: Complex Lobbies

by [Daniel Zavala](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 2:20 PM

I would have to agree with you. A nation needs to be able to protect its people and having a strong military is an important part of that. I am not saying that the armaments are the actual problem. Since our involvement in World War 2, America has been a war economy. This was what allowed us to pull ourselves out of the Great Depression the way we did. The problem however is that the spending required to get and maintain our vast military infrastructure has drained money away from other areas of the economy that may need more funding.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Is This What Eisenhower Warned Against?

by [Rachel Gragg](#) - Wednesday, May 30, 2018, 4:50 PM

This topic of the military industrial complex honestly didn't intrigue me much at first, but as learning more about it through the materials, it feels more relevant and interesting. As we learned through materials, when Dwight Eisenhower first introduced this idea, it evoked fear in many Americans. As Bruce Carlson said in the podcast, Eisenhower just didn't want America to be weak and he was trying to warn people that we needed to move people from the past system because there had been so many global-scale wars in such a short amount of time. From our textbook we learned that, "This term signified an informal relationship among military, political, and economic elites committed to expanding national security capabilities. This complex, the former general wanted, threatened to so accelerate the costs of cold war containment that the burden of military expenditures could eventually harm the U.S. domestic economy" (*Liberty, Equality, Power* 919). Military expansion was necessary, but he was also warning that it could be harmful to the economy and was warning against such happenings.

This absolutely is applicable today considering the expansive government spending on the arms industry. According to Wikipedia, Donald Trump has proposed an increase to the military budget for 2019 to \$681.1 billion. That is over \$100 billion since 2016. Also according to Wikipedia, the national budget for intelligence spending (NSA) exceeded the peak at Cold War times in 2013 with a total of \$52.6 billion. Obama said in his speech that the use of intelligence has helped secure American freedoms and that nothing indicated that the intelligence systems would violate protocol. The original intention of the NSA was not to spy on Americans, but instead to protect them. Listening to phone calls and other things that have been evoking fear was meant to map terrorist communication in order to protect. There is a lot of government spending going into this and it is hurting people because they feel as though their privacy has been violated. Is this what Eisenhower was warning against? Considering the new developments in technology since Dwight Eisenhower's presidency, could this be exactly what he meant by unjustified military spending being a waste of resources?

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: The Military-Industrial Complex

by [Maxam Robison](#) - Wednesday, May 30, 2018, 7:59 PM

When President Dwight D. Eisenhower spoke to the nation, he made it clear

When President Dwight D. Eisenhower spoke to the nation, he made it clear that industries and the Pentagon were in league to make the U.S. military the largest it could be and warned future generations to make it smaller. Having the most prominent military is very important for defending our country and its allies because if it wasn't then stronger nations would overrun us and other countries. On the other hand with a vast military, the amount of resources and material needed to supply them would limit the amount for everyone else.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Eisenhower's Contrary Position

by [Jacob Spriggs](#) - Thursday, May 31, 2018, 11:48 PM

I believe that the fact that Eisenhower was a general in WWII is the reason he built up the military during the peace time of his presidency. The commentator in the podcast for this forum discussion says that Eisenhower wrote in his 1965 memoir that "After Korea...I wanted to be sure that we were never so weak as to provoke attack" (1:19-1:24). It seems to me that Eisenhower was thinking back to the Attack on Pearl Harbor and remembering how unprepared the U.S. military was for that kind of an attack. Being a general and seeing the effect of the events of the war first hand would have made him desire to do everything in his power to try to prevent an attack on American soil from ever happening again. However, he also was aware that too much military spending would be a problem, and that is why he made his military-industrial complex warning in his farewell address.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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



Why I think Eisenhower took that position

by [Tanner Wiese](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 12:19 PM

In the beginning of his farewell address he says, "we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense" (45 seconds). So, at the beginning of the video its pretty clear what stance he is taking. Therefore, he decided to create a permanent armament industry (55 seconds). He also states, "the potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists, and, will persist" (1:50, Farewell address video). And, I agree with all those statements he made. So, why did Eisenhower take this stance? First of all, I think this is the correct stance. Like he said early in the video, he has witnessed 4 major wars among great nations. Which obviously resulted in many American casualties. And, I think the number one goal of the president is to keep the citizens of America safe. So, it makes complete sense to me why he took this position. He wants

America safe. So, it makes complete sense to me why he took this position. He wants to keep American people alive, and, he doesn't want to every be caught off guard. As the president of the United States, I would assume a catastrophe that takes American lives is their biggest nightmare. So, this is Eisenhower taking the Steps he believes are necessary to hopefully prevent that every happening.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

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



War on Terror and the MIC

by [Sydney Plaza](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 1:24 PM

I think that that "war on terror" is alike the cold war in it's effort to mobilize spending towards the military complex. The way I was told about the "war on terror" growing up in school is that we (the US) are the goodies and the terrorists are the baddies and that even a small existence of them will contaminate other countries leading to a mass uprising of terrorist activities. I think this is a dangerous perspective to give. I think that what the US is doing currently in countries in the Middle East is alike containment. For example, our presence and implementation of governments overseas is alike the behavior and actions taking place during the cold war and Vietnam ear. I think that the US views it's foreign presence and domination as detrimental to it's success. I personally disagree with our countries stance and presence in the middle east. In my opinion it is a neo-conservative effort to concentrate power both through force and through dollar into one area of the federal government.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

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



The Military-Industrial Complex/Lobby

by [Peyton Tooze](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 4:00 PM

I agree with the commentator about how Eisenhower could have used "Military-Industrial Lobby" instead of "Military-Industrial Complex." It makes sense that Eisenhower would use the word "complex" because of the fact that it was complicated with a lot of "interlocking pieces." If the "Lobby" terminology would have been used it wouldn't have made it seem like such a big deal at the time. Eisenhower wanted his farewell speech to have a challenging message which is probably why he decided to even talk about the Military-Industrial Complex at such a pivotal time in the cold war. I do understand what he meant when he talked about the importance of armaments in peacetime. He didn't want to give any other country, for many years, a reason to attack

the United States. The best way to prevent someone from attacking you is to have a good defense. When I look at the speech that Obama made about defense spending, I notice that this type of spending, though it is a lot of spending, is necessary in keeping the United States at the standard of military technology and protection of its people. Even if a anti-war president in Barack Obama is willing to keep the spending high on military it must be something that works well and has had a lasting effect from former presidents who put it in place.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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



Re: Presidency v. Phillips

by [Carly Minow](#) - Friday, June 1, 2018, 6:33 PM

According to Peter Phillips, a Professor of Sociology at Sonoma State University, President Obama's military and defense spending follows "the neo-conservative agenda of US military domination of the world...But perhaps more important is the belief that this global military machine is seen as necessary for the protection of US corporate interests and the American upper classes in an increasingly destabilized world. Given that belief, the Obama administration is unlikely to change the defense spending policies of the previous US administrations without significant disruptive pressure from anti-war activists and global empire resisters." However, the fact that the Obama Administration did not change spending tendencies is the exact reason why the military-industrial complex was established. Ever since the Eisenhower Administration, military spending has followed an upward trajectory throughout decades of party turnovers and policy changes. In his speech on the NSA, President Obama admits that "the readiness of some to assume the worst motives by our government can be frustrating" (Obama speech 2:31-2:35). His dedicated reviews of NSA policies reflect the same gravitas as Eisenhower when he described the purpose of the military-industrial complex. The complex has held its purpose no matter the party in power, the state of war, or the fight at hand; the protection of America is the paramount purpose.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

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

◀ [Rights, Rights, Rights](#)

[The Military-Industrial Complex](#) ▶

[Moodle Docs for this page](#)

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

[HST 203 Sp18 \(Escobar Meta 41002 43590\)](#)