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 **ASSIGNMENT**

Write an essay of not less than 1000 words on the military industrial complex and its impact on military technologies and warfare since the end of WWII.

 **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. The military industrial complex can also be referred as the relationship between the government, the military, and the businesses that make things for the military. 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. 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 contractor 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. A retired five-star general in the U.S. Army, Dwight D. Eisenhower had served as commander of Allied forces during World War II, and directed the D-Day invasion of France in 1944. Eisenhower’s two terms as U.S. president (1953-61) coincided with an era of military expansion unlike any other in the nation’s history. Rather than draw down its troops, as it had after World War II, the U.S. military kept a large standing army after the Korean War ended in 1953, and maintained a high level of military preparedness due to the ongoing Cold War between the United States and the Soviet Union. 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.

On Jan. 17, 1961, President Dwight Eisenhower gave the nation a dire warning about what he described as a threat to democratic government. Eisenhower served as a president for two full terms from January 1953 through January 1961, and was the first U.S. president to be term-limited from seeking re-election again. He had overseen a period of considerable economic expansion, even as the Cold War deepened. Three of his national budgets had been balanced, but spending pressures mounted. The recent presidential election had resulted in the election of John F. Kennedy, and the oldest American president in a century was about to hand the reins of power to the youngest elected president. He called it the military-industrial complex, a formidable union of defense contractors and the armed forces. Eisenhower was worried about the costs of an arms race with the Soviet Union, and the resources it would take from other areas such as building hospitals and schools. Another concern was the possibility that as the military and the arms industry gained power, they would be a threat to democracy, with civilians losing control of the military-industrial complex. 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. Eisenhower warned that the influence of the military-industrial complex was economic, political, and even spiritual and that it was “felt in every city, every statehouse, and every office of the federal government.” He exhorted Americans to break away from our reliance on military might as a guarantor of liberty and “use our power in the interests of world peace and human betterment.” On this score, Eisenhower may well have seen today’s America as losing the battle against the darker aspects of the military-industrial complex. He was no pacifist, but he was a lifelong opponent of what he called a “garrison state,” in which policy and rights are defined by the shadowy needs of an all-powerful military elite. The United States isn’t quite a garrison state today. But Eisenhower would likely have been deeply troubled, in the past decade, by the torture at Abu Ghraib, the use of martial authority to wiretap Americans without warrants and the multiyear detention of suspects at Guantánamo Bay without due process. Even if the economy can bear the immediate costs of the military, Eisenhower would be shocked at its mounting long-term costs. Most of the Iraq war expenses were paid for by borrowing, and Americans will shoulder those costs, plus interest, for many years to come. A strong believer in a balanced budget, Eisenhower in his farewell address also told Americans to “avoid the impulse to live only for today, plundering for our own ease and convenience the precious resources of tomorrow.” Too many of today’s so-called fiscal conservatives conveniently overlook the budgetary consequences of military spending. Eisenhower was perhaps best known for advocating that the nation guard against the potential influence of the military–industrial complex, a term he is credited with coining, the speech also expressed concerns about planning for the future and the dangers of massive spending, especially deficit spending, the prospect of the domination of science through Federal funding and, conversely, the domination of science-based public policy by what he called a "scientific-technological elite". This speech and Eisenhower's chance for Peace speech have been called the bookends of his administration.

Military budget of 10 countries over the last 5 years:

1. United States of America – $611bn(2016), $639bn(2017), $54bn(2018), $717bn(2019), $718bn(2020)

2. China – $146bn(2016), US$151bn(2017), $175bn(2018), $177bn(2019), $718bn(2020)

3. Nigeria -- $1.7bn(2016), US$1.4bn(2017), 2,043m USdollars(2018), n8.92 trillion(2019), USD 59.26m(2020)

4. Germany –$2.71bn(2016), $2.81bn(2017), $49.47(2018), $53bn(2019), $55.18bn(2020)

5. Saudi Arabia – $63.7bn(2016), $69.4bn(2017), $68bn(2018), $51bn(2019), $272bn(2020)

6. United Kingdom – 1.6bn euro(2016), 36.9bn euro(2017), 36.9bn euro, $49bn(2019), 41.4bn euro or $53bn(2020)

7. France –$55.7bn(2016), 60417 USDm(2017), $48bn(2019), US$53.9bn(2020)

8. Japan –$46.1bn(2016), $46bn(2017), $47bn(2018), $47bn(2019), $48.5bn(2020)

9. Russia – $69.2(2016), $61bn(2017), $1.8 trillion(2018), $46.4bn(2019),

10. South Korea – $36.8bn(2016), $39bn US(2017), $43.1bn(2018), $42bn(2019), USD42bn (2020)