



Dwight D. Eisenhower Farewell Address – ‘Military Industrial Complex’

Description

Medhurst, M. J.. (1994). Reconceptualizing rhetorical history: Eisenhower’s farewell address. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*

Plain numerical DOI: 10.1080/00335639409384067

[DOI URL](#)

[directSciHub download](#)

Show/hide publication abstract

“Medhurst argues that rhetorical critique of Eisenhower’s farewell address has focused on ‘military industrial complex’ relegating it to ‘footnote status.’ full understanding of the text requires looking at Eisenhower’s previous statements, previous argumentative form, and the situational exigency. medhurst outlines three themes made by e: to restate the themes of his public life, to link himself to Washington, and to imply a critique of JFK through the ‘rubric’ of the mic. Eisenhower worried that Kennedy did not understand the negative implications an arms race would have on the economy. his attachment to Washington was more personal, he wanted to be seen as a public servant of democracy. balance is used as an overarching theme throughout the speech. Eisenhower sought to construct a ‘rhetorical constraint’ that Kennedy would have to work against.”

Eisenhower, D. D.. (1961). Text of Eisenhower’s Farewell Address. *New York Times*

Show/hide publication abstract

“ In this farewell address, president Eisenhower warned about the rise of a military-industrial complex. ‘in the council of government, we must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military-industrial complex. the potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced exists and will persist,’ the out-going president said. ‘we must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. we take nothing for granted. only an alert and knowledgeable citizenry can compel the proper meshing of the huge industrial and military of defense with our peaceful methods and goals, so that security and liberty may prosper together.’”

Reppy, J.. (2008). A biomedical military-industrial complex?. Technovation

Plain numerical DOI: 10.1016/j.technovation.2008.09.004

[DOI URL](#)

[directSciHub download](#)

Show/hide publication abstract

“Since the terrorist attacks and anthrax letters in 2001, the us government has multiplied the number of government programs and agencies concerned with biosecurity and greatly increased its spending on related projects, including a 20-fold increase in spending for biodefense research. this paper considers whether the surge in spending and the responses from industry, universities, and individual scientists have created a network of interlocking interests that constitute a new ‘Biomedical military-industrial complex’ (bmic), similar to the military-industrial complex that eisenhower warned against in his farewell address. despite the emergence of many practices associated with the military-industrial complex, the tentative conclusion is that the new institutions and practices in the area of biosecurity do not merit the bmic label, at least not yet. in particular, the concern that knowledge production in the life sciences might be seriously distorted by the increase in biodefense funding is discounted because, since the rise of molecular biology in the 1970s, the biological sciences have steadily evolved toward a model in which university research is already heavily influenced by outside patrons and commercial interests. © 2008 elsevier ltd. all rights reserved.”

Gholz, E.. (2011). Eisenhower versus the spin-off story: Did the rise of the military-industrial complex hurt or help America’s commercial aircraft industry?. In Enterprise and Society

Plain numerical DOI: 10.1093/es/khq134

[DOI URL](#)

[directSciHub download](#)

Show/hide publication abstract

“In his farewell address, president eisenhower warned that the military-industrial complex (mic) threatened to dominate american research, crowding out commercial innovation. ironically, a number of analysts point to spin-off benefits of the 1950s’ military effort as a crucial source of american high-tech competitiveness, often citing the key example of the relationship between military jet aircraft and the boeing’s 707. but the huge military investment in jet aviation had both benefits and costs for the commercial industry. this article compares the development of the boeing 707 and its relationship to military projects like the kc-135 tanker to the contemporary development of commercial jet aircraft by other companies that were also integral parts of the military-industrial complex (mic), including douglas aircraft and its commercial dc-8 and convair and its commercial 880 and 990. using evidence from archives, interviews with retired company executives, contemporary trade press, and academic studies, the article concludes that membership in the mic did not offer firms a leg up in commercial markets. president eisenhower was generally right about the costs of the military effort, but military spending remained low enough to allow commercial industry to thrive in parallel to the defense industry.”

Hooks, G.. (2010). Military-Industrial Complex, Organization And History. In Encyclopedia of Violence,

Peace, and Conflict

Plain numerical DOI: 10.1016/B978-012373985-8.00109-4

[DOI URL](#)

[directSciHub download](#)

Show/hide publication abstract

“The military-industrial complex (mic) has never been a neutral term. dwight eisenhower coined the term mic in 1961 during his farewell address to warn the nation of a looming danger. the threat to democracy has been a recurrent theme in many studies of the mic since eisenhower’s warning, including works by gordon adams, sydney lens, ann markusen and joel yudken, and seymour melman. at a descriptive level, the mic refers to military agencies and firms that produce military goods. in addition a number of political and economic actors are also dependent on the defense program and are included in the mic including legislators, workers, and businesses that serve and depend upon the military market. although the term was coined with specific reference to the united states it has been extended to identify industrialized military establishments in other times and places. this article will describe the firms, agencies, and institutions that comprise the mic and will consider the dangers posed by this concentration of economic and military power. © 2008 elsevier inc. all rights reserved.” Stevens, C. W., & Glatstein, E.. (1996). Beware the Medical-Industrial Complex.. Oncologist

Show/hide publication abstract

“... We must guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence, whether sought or unsought, by the military industrial complex.’ dwight d. eisenhower, 34th president of the united states (1953-1961). farewell address, january 17, 1961. if ike were with us today, he might well expand his views on power and influence to include modern american medicine. the corporatization of health care in the united states has moved rapidly in recent years. physicians are now in a position that requires us to adapt to an increasingly darwinian existence. years of training to be ‘rugged individualists’ pushing the frontiers of medical knowledge have not equipped us to fight corporate battles, nor to justify our treatment decisions to bean counters. when the most important consideration becomes the bottom line, then innovation, creativity, and research diminish in importance. they will, in fact, be selected against because they cost money. up to now, these have been the hallmarks of american medicine, and we must strive to maintain our position of american leadership in biotechnology. new developments in cancer treatment include expensive technological ‘bells and whistles’ which physicians must ultimately evaluate objectively, despite lush advertisements from companies with obvious vested interests, and authoritative testimonials from biased investigators who presumably believe in their own work to the point of straining credulity and denying common sense. the 3-d image that was created by a computer may look beautiful (and cost accordingly), but it is hard to believe that it can fundamentally change the outcome of patients when it does not add any new data that bear on basic issues. for example, where is the exact edge of the tumor? if one pays through the nose for increasing precision where there is no new accuracy, the purchase appears less attractive, perhaps, than the hype of the salesman or the enthusiasm of a neurosurgeon or a ‘stereotactic’ radiation oncologist (showing biased data, if any at all). for radiation therapy, the 20th century has largely represented progress by creating larger, higher energy machines for treatment. now, with the 21st century on the horizon, x-ray treatment parameters have probably been optimized over the past 10 years or so. we see no obvious advantage in an x-ray beam beyond about 18 mev, and none for electrons beyond 20-25 mev. exotic particles such as

protons, neutrons, and negative pions, though expensive and difficult to delive..."

Ritter, D. P., & McLauchlan, G.. (2010). Military-Industrial Complex, Contemporary Significance. In Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict

Plain numerical DOI: 10.1016/B978-012373985-8.00104-5

[DOI URL](#)

[directSciHub download](#)

Show/hide publication abstract

"The term 'military-industrial complex' (mic) was famously introduced to the american public in 1961 by president dwight eisenhower in his farewell address. the former general, who was well aware of the growing military industry, warned his fellow countrymen of the tremendous influence such an institution could have in a highly militarized society. during the cold war the mic constituted a significant locus of power and today its might is perhaps even greater. this article examines the contemporary significance of the military-industrial complex by tracing its development over the past few decades. © 2008 elsevier inc. all rights reserved."

Category

1. General

Tags

1. Dwight D. Eisenhower
2. Military industrail complex

Date Created

16. November 2018

Author

web45