Question: discuss the fear of Dwight Eisenhower and the reality of his fear in the industrialization of warfare in the 20th and 21st centuries.
The military industrial complex (MIC) is an informal alliance between a nation's military and the defense industry that supplies it, seen together as a vested interest which influences public policy. The term is most often used in reference to the system behind the military of the United States, where it is most prevalent due to close links between defense contractors, the Pentagon and politicians and gained popularity after a warning on its detrimental effects in the farewell address of President Dwight D. Eisenhower on January 17, 1961. Despite his military background and being the only general to be elected president in the 20th century, he warned the nation regarding the corrupting influence of what he describes as the "military-industrial complex". Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. He also expressed his concomitant concern for corruption of the scientific process as part of this centralization of funding in the Federal government, and vice-versa: His remarks, issued during a televised farewell address to the American people, were particularly significant since Ike had famously served the nation as military commander of the Allied forces during WWII. Eisenhower urged his successors to strike a balance between a strong national defense and diplomacy in dealing with the Soviet Union. He did not suggest arms reduction and in fact acknowledged that the bomb was an effective deterrent to nuclear war. However, KNOWING THAT that America’s peacetime defense policy had changed drastically since his military career, Eisenhower expressed concerns about the growing influence of what he termed the military-industrial complex. Before and during the Second World War, American industries had successfully converted to defense production as the crisis demanded, but out of the war, what Eisenhower called a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions emerged. This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience Eisenhower warned, "[while] we recognize the imperative need for this development...We must not fail to comprehend its grave implications we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence…The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist." Eisenhower cautioned that the federal government’s collaboration with an alliance of military and industrial leaders, though necessary, was vulnerable to abuse of power. Ike then counseled American citizens to be vigilant in monitoring the military-industrial complex. Ike also recommended restraint in consumer habits, particularly with regard to the environment. "As we peer into society’s future, we–you and I, and our government–must avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering, for our own ease and convenience, the precious resources of tomorrow," he said. "We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without asking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage."

Question: Data on the defence spending of at least ten (10) countries over five (5) years and graphically show the rate of increase or decrease in defence spending.

AMERICA: 2016- $611BILLION

 2017-$639BILLION

 2018-$649BILLION

 2019-$686BILLION

 2020-$718BILLION

CHINA: 2016-$146BILLION

 2017-$151BILLION

 2018-$175BILLION

 2019-$177.61BILLION

 2020-$300000.00MILLION

SAUDI: 2016-$65.2BILLION

 2017- $69.4BILLION

 2018- $57BILLION

 2019-$60.9BILLION

 2020- $99731.84MILLION

INDIA: 2016- $40.4BILLION

 2017- $53.5BILLION

 2018- $57BILLION

 2019- $60.9BILLION

 2020- $65.86BILLION

FRANCE: 2016- $57.36BILLION

 2017- $60417MILLION

 2018- $42BILLION

 2019- $48BILLION

 2020- $53.9BILLION

RUSSIA: 2016- $69.2BILLION

 2017- $34.5BILLION

 2018- $47.7BILLION

 2019- $46.4BILLION

 2020- $70000.00MILLION

U, K: 2016- £35.1BILLION

 2017- £35.28BILLION

 2018- £36.6BILLION

 2019- €38.03BILLION

 2020- $53BILLION

GERMANY: 2016- €42.92BILLION

 2017- €45.38BILLION

 2018- €41.54BILLION

 2019- $49BILLION

 2020- €45.1BILLION

JAPAN: 2016- $41.90BILLION

 2017- $46BILLION

 2018- $47BILLION

 2019- $48BILLION

 2020- $48.5BILLION

NIGERIA: 2016- $1.72BILLION

 2017- $1.4BILLION

 2018- $2,043MILLION

 2019-N1.03TRILLION

 2020- $2.41BILLION

Question: Describe Military Industrial Complex (MIC)

The Military Industrial Complex (MIC) is any informal alliance between a nation’s military and the defence industry that supplies it, seen together as vested interest which influences public policy. A driving factor behind this relationship between the government and defence-minded corporations is that both sides benefit one side from obtaining war weapons and the other from being paid to supply them. The term is most often used in reference to the system behind the military of the United States, where it is most often prevalent due to close links between defence contractors the pentagon and the politicians and gained popularity after a warning on its detrimental effects in the farewell address of President Dwight D. Eisenhower on January 17, 1961.

Question: Highlight the growing influence of the military industrial complex globally, from advanced countries to less develop ones.

**Military-industrial complex**, network of individuals and institutions involved in the production of weapons and military technologies. The military-industrial complex in a country typically attempts to marshal political support for continued or increased military spending by the national government. The term military-industrial complex was first used by U.S. Pres. Dwight D. Eisenhower in his Farewell Address on January 17, 1961. Eisenhower warned that the United States must “guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence…by the military-industrial complex,” which included members of Congress from districts dependent on military industries, the Department of Defense (along with the military services), and privately owned military contractors—e.g., Boeing, Lockheed Martin, and Northrop Grumman. Eisenhower believed that the military-industrial complex tended to promote policies that might not be in the country’s best interest (such as participation in the nuclear arms race), and he feared that its growing influence, if left unchecked, could undermine American [democracy](https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/democracy). Although Eisenhower is credited with the phrase and many scholars regarded the phenomenon as new, elements of the domestic and international military-industrial complex predate his landmark address. Military forces have been funded overwhelmingly by national governments, which historically have been the target of lobbying efforts by bureaucrats in military-related ministries, by legislators from districts containing military bases or major military manufacturing plants, and by representatives of private firms involved in the production of weapons and munitions. Because the goals and interests of these various actors broadly coincide, they tend to support each other’s activities and to form mutually beneficial relationships—what some critics have called an “iron triangle” between government officials, legislators, and military-industrial firms. For example, legislators who receive campaign contributions from military firms may vote to award funding to projects in which the firms are involved, and military firms may hire former defense-ministry officials as lobbyists. Some features of the military-industrial complex vary depending on whether a country’s economy is more or less market-oriented. In the United States, for example, weapons production shifted from publicly owned companies to private firms during the first half of the 20th century. In France, however, the national government continues to own and manage most military-related enterprises. Although in most cases the military-industrial complex operates within a single country, in some cases, such as that of the European Union, it is international in scope, producing weapons systems that involve the military firms of several different countries. Despite such differences, the military-industrial complex in most economically advanced countries tends to have several characteristic features: a high-tech industrial sector that operates according to its own legal, organizational, and financial rules; skilled personnel who move between administration and production; and centrally planned controls on the quantity and quality of output. Because of the technological complexity of modern weapons and the preference in most countries for domestic suppliers, there is little competition in most military markets. The military services must ensure that their suppliers remain financially viable (in the United States and the United Kingdom this has entailed guaranteeing the profits of private firms), and suppliers attempt to ensure that public spending for their products does not decline. Because of the lack of competition and because the budgeting process is often highly politicized, the weapons systems purchased by national governments are sometimes inordinately expensive and of questionable value to the country’s security. In addition, the pressure for large military budgets exerted by the military-industrial complex can result in the depletion of the country’s nonmilitary industrial base, because, for example, skilled workers are attracted to high-paying employment with military firms. The term military-industrial complex can also refer to the physical location of military production. Military spending creates spatial concentrations of prime contractors, subcontractors, consultants, universities, skilled workers, and government installations, all of which are devoted to research and development on, or the manufacture of, military systems and technologies. Examples include the aerospace complex in southern California, the shipbuilding complex on the southern coast of South Korea, and the isolated military research complex of Akademgorodok in Siberia. National governments often created such complexes in locations without a history of industrial production by underwriting massive migrations of skilled labour, and the areas came to resemble company towns that provided not only jobs but also housing, health care, and schools to workers and their families. The need to preserve this infrastructure can contribute to political pressure to maintain or increase military spending. Indeed, sometimes governments have chosen to continue funding weapons systems that branches of the military have deemed obsolete, in order to preserve the communities that are economically dependent on their production—e.g., the B-2 bomber and the Seawolf submarine in the United States. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War in 1991 reduced, at least momentarily, the influence of the military-industrial complex in many countries, particularly the United States and Russia. However, in part because of rising military involvement in the Middle East and concerns about terrorism, it remains a potent political force in both the United States and Russia, as well as throughout the world.

Question: Show the implications of the growing influence of the Military Industrial Complex on warfare in the 21st century.

**The First Era**

From 1797 to 1941 the government only relied on civilian industries while the country was actually at war. The government owned their own shipyards and weapons manufacturing facilities which they relied on through World War I. With World War II came a massive shift in the way that the American government armed the military.

With the onset of World War II President Franklin D. Roosevelt established the War Production Board to coordinate civilian industries and shift them into wartime production. Throughout World War II arms production in the United States went from around one percent of the annual GDP to 40 percent of the GDP. Various American companies, such as Boeing and General Motors, maintained and expanded their defence divisions. These companies have gone on to develop various technologies that have improved civilian life as well, such as night-vision goggles and GPS.

**The Second Era**

The start of the second era of the Military Industrial Complex is said to start with the coining of the term by President Dwight D. Eisenhower. This era continued through the Cold War period and finally saw the end of the Warsaw Pact and the collapse of the Soviet Union. In 1993 the Pentagon urged defence contractors to consolidate due to the collapse of communism and shrinking defence budget

**The Third (Current) Era**

The third era of the Military Industrial Complex has seen the most change as defence contractors either consolidated or shifted their focus to civilian innovation. From 1992 to 1997 there was a total of US$55 billion worth of mergers in the defence industry. Major defence companies purchased smaller defence companies and became the major companies that we know today. In the current era, the Military Industrial Complex is seenas a core part of American policy-making. The American domestic economy is now tied directly to the success of the MIC which has led to concerns of repression as Cold War era attitudes are still prevalent among the American public. Shifts in values and the collapse of communism have ushered in a new era for the Military Industrial Complex. The Department of Defence works in coordination with traditional military industrial complex aligned companies such as Lockheed Martin and Northrop Grumman. Many former defence contractors have shifted operations to the civilian market and sold off their defence departments.