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QUESTION: WRITE AN ESSAY OF NOT THAN 1000 WORDS ON MILITARY INDUSTRIAL COMPLEX AND ITS IMPACT ON MILITARY TECHNOLOGIES AND WARFARE SINCE THE END OF WWII. ESSAY SHOULD HIGHLIGHT THE FOLLOWING POINTS:

ANSWER:

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. A driving factor behind this relationship between the government and defense-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 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. Military industrial complex (MIC) has its roots in the United States during World War I, when the army and navy turned to private firms for design of aircraft, and not, as some analysts have proposed, in the latter part of the nineteenth century. Second, the MIC took on its current shape during the 1950s. President Dwight D. Eisenhower’s famous warning, in effect, expressed recognition of and perhaps something like dismay at his own creation. Finally, despite the broad shift in responsibility for design, development, and production of military systems from government to industry in the middle of the last century, the armed forces remain the dominant partner in the MIC by reason of their control over the technical requirements that shape and constrain weapons system design. This leaves the defense industry a junior partner.

On January 17, 1961, Dwight D. Eisenhower ends his presidential term by warning the nation about the increasing power of the military-industrial complex.

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, cognizant 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."

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.

Here are the defence records spent for ten (10) countries for over five (5) years

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| S/N | COUNTRIES | YEARS | AMOUNT ($) | REMARKS |
| 1 | USA | 2015 -  2016-  2017-  2018-  2019- | $495. 6 billion  $611 billion  $639 billion  $700 billion  $686.1 billion | An increase |
| 2 | RUSSIA | 2015-  2016-  2006-  2018-  2019- | $81 billion  $69.2 billion  $34.5 billion  $61.4 billion  $65.1 billion |  |
| 3 | CHINA | 2015  2016  2017  2018  2019 | $141 billion  $146 billion  $200 billion  $175 billion  $261 billion | An increase |
| 4 | UNITED KINGDOM | 2015  2016  2017  2018  2019 | $36.7 billion  $36.6 billion  $37.1 billion  $38.7 billion  $40.2 billion | An increase |
| 5 | SOUTH KOREA | 2014  2015  2016  2017  2018 | $37.55B  $36.57B  $36.89B  $39.17B  $43.07B | An increase |
| 6 | GERMANY | 2015  2016  2017  2018  2019 | $28.7 billion  $29.8 billion  $31.8 billion  $32.1 billion  $34.1 billion | An increase |
| 7 | FRANCE | 2015  2016  2017  2018  2019 | $55.34 billion  $57.35 billion  $60.42 billion  $63.80 billion  $42.2 billion | An increase |
| 8 | JAPAN | 2015  2016  2017  2018  2019 | $42 billion  $41.90 billion  $1.74 trillion  $46.6 billion  $47 billion | An increase |
| 9 | ISRAEL | 2015  2016  2017  2018  2014 | $16.97b  $14.78b  $15.58b  $15.95b  $18.49b |  |
| 10 | ITALY | 2014  2015  2016  2017  2018 | $27.70b  $22.18b  $25.03b  $26.46b  $27.81b | An increase |

In conclusion military industrial complex in my own understanding is an informal alliance between the nation’s military and the defence industries, it is means of trading weapons by the defence to the military, in order word, on the side the government gets the weapon while on the other the defence gets paid. Meanwhile on January 17, 1961, Dwight D. Eisenhower ends his presidential term by warning the nation about the increasing power of the military-industrial complex. He had doubt of the MIC falling in the wrong side, although it has its reality to be played. Looking at the battle for the arms race during the cold war between USA and Russia (Soviet Union). The development of the weapons led to a competition between the USA and The Soviet Union and the battle for arms became stronger for the invention of biological weapons. Researchers made their research on small pox as a weapon which is no longer in existence. In the 21century looking at the corona virus today. Research have been made about the covid-19, which started from the year 2019, this disease is said to be one of the newly invented biochemical weapon of a failed test, and it has spread drastically around the world killing thousands of life, especially the old, rumours have it to be a means for reducing the old people from the earth surface and it was declared as a pandemic.