

1: What Is the Military-Industrial Complex? | History News Network

The Military Industrial Complex was a phrase used by outgoing President Dwight Eisenhower when warning of a close relationship between the government and its defense industry. Military-Industrial Complex is an unofficial phrase used to signify the "comfortable" relationship that can develop between government entities (namely defense) and.

In one sense, the delivery of S batteries to Syria is cause for concern more for Washington than for Tel Aviv. With the S systems deployed in an updated version and incorporated into the Russian command, control and communications C3 system, there is a serious risk for Washington that Israel, now incapable of changing the course of events in Syria, could attempt a desperate maneuver. At this point, it is necessary to add some additional information and clarify some points. Such modern and complex systems as the Ss and Ss require maintenance, upgrades, and often replacement of parts to improve hardware. All this is missing from the Greek batteries. Secondly, it is the operator who uses the system using radar, targeting, aiming, locking and so forth that often makes the difference in terms of overall effectiveness. Furthermore, the system is fully integrated into the Russian C3 system, something that renders useless any previous experience gleaned from wargaming the Greek Ss. No Western country knows the real capabilities and capacity of Syrian air defense when augmented and integrated with Russian systems. This is a secret that Damascus and Moscow will continue to keep well guarded. The following are the words of Russian defense minister Sergei Shoigu concerning the deployment of the S to Syria and its integration with other Russian systems: We are convinced that the implementation of these measures will cool hotheads and prevent ill-considered actions threatening our servicemen. Otherwise, we will respond in line with the current situation. Syrian troops and military air defense units will be equipped with automatic control systems, which have been supplied to the Russian Armed Forces. This will ensure the centralized management of the Syrian air defense forces and facilities, monitoring the situation in the airspace and prompt target designation. Most importantly, it will be used to identify the Russian aircraft by the Syrian air defense forces. The US military-industrial complex would suffer irreparable damage. This would also explain why Israel and probably the US has for more than five years put enormous pressure on Moscow not to deliver the S to Syria and Iran. For the United States, there are two scenarios to avoid. The first is a direct involvement in the conflict with Russia in Syria, which is now unthinkable and impractical. An illuminating example of how the United States operates its most advanced aircraft in the region was given in eastern Syria around Deir ez-Zor. In this part of Syria, there is no threat from any advanced air-defense systems, so the US is often free to employ its F in certain circumstances. The US simply does not even consider using the F in Syria, nor would it risk its use against Russian air defenses. It has already been sold to dozens of countries bound by decades-long agreements. Its development began more than 10 years ago and, despite the countless problems that still exist, it is already airborne and combat-ready, as the Israelis insist. From the US point of view, its employment in operations is played down and otherwise concealed. The less data available to opponents, the better; though the real reason may lie in a strong fear of any revelation of potential weaknesses of the aircraft damaging future sales. Obviously, both Lockheed Martin and the US Air Force have no interest in revealing any weaknesses or shortcomings, especially publicly. Washington finds itself in the unenviable position of probably having no leverage with Israel over the matter ever since losing any ability to steer events in Syria.

2: Big money behind war: the military-industrial complex | | Al Jazeera

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.

Get the latest updates straight to your inbox. The potential for the disastrous rise of misplaced power exists and will persist. The vast economic and administrative apparatus for the creation and deployment of weapons took its enduring shape during the two years preceding the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor. It grew to gargantuan proportions during the war, then survived and flourished during the four decades of the Cold War. By the s, members of Congress had insinuated themselves into positions of power in the complex, so that one is well justified in calling it the military-industrial-congressional complex MICC during the past 40 years. The powerful role played by the MICC in the second half of the twentieth century testifies to a fact that has seldom been faced squarely: World War II did not end in a victory for the forces of freedom; to an equal or greater extent, the defeat of Nazi Germany and its allies represented a victory for the forces of totalitarian oppression in the Soviet Union and, later, its surrogates around the world. Hence, in , we merely traded one set of aggressive enemies for another. In reality, the war did not end until the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the degeneration of its armed forces in the early s. Its antecedents hardly suggested how quickly and hugely the MICC would grow. Prewar military budgets were very small: In those days, military purchases were transacted according to rigidly specified legal procedures. Normally, the military purchaser publicly advertised its demand for a definite quantity of a specific item, accepted sealed bids, and automatically awarded the contract to the lowest bidder. Moreover, few businessmen wanted military business or any dealings with the New Deal government. With congressional authorization, the War and Navy departments switched from using mainly sealed-bid contracts to mainly negotiated contracts, often providing that the contractor be paid his full costs, however much they might be, plus a fixed fee. In these and other ways, military contracting was rendered less risky and more rewarding. Large manufacturing firms enjoyed the bulk of the business. The top prime contractors received about two-thirds of the awards by value; the top 10 got about 30 percent; the leading contractor, General Motors, accounted for nearly eight percent. The military research and development contracts with private corporations were even more concentrated. Besides bankrolling ammunition plants, the government built shipyards, steel and aluminum mills, chemical plants, and many other industrial facilities. Most of the government-financed plants were operated not directly by the government but by a relatively small group of contractors. Just 26 firms enjoyed the use of half the value of all governmentally financed industrial facilities leased to private contractors as of June 30, . The top contractors using such plants enjoyed the use of more than 83 percent of all such facilities by value. This concentration had important implications for the character of the postwar industrial structure because the operator of a government-owned, contractor-operated facility usually held an option to buy it after the war, and many contractors did exercise their options. The arrangements created in and refined during the next five years completely transformed the relations between the government and its military contractors. During the Cold War these relationships became institutionalized. Transactions were not so much firm deals as ongoing joint enterprises among colleagues and friends in which military officials and businessmen cooperated to achieve a common goal not incompatible with, but rather highly facilitative of, the pursuit of their separate interests. It was easy to forget who worked for whom. As General James P. This is a family affair among terribly interdependent parties. When Ruben Trevino and I made a study of the profitability of defense contracting published in *Defence Economics*, , pages , we found that during the period , the profit rates of the top 50 defense contractors substantially exceeded those of comparable non-defense companies. We also found that investing in defense contractors was not significantly riskier than investing in comparable non-defense companies. In short, this business has been very good to those involved in it. Even when companies got into trouble, they could expect to be bailed out. Congress, as usual, went where the money was. Defense-related jobs served as a major determinant of congressional defense decisions for both liberals and conservatives. Members of Congress strove to steer contracts and subcontracts to favored constituents, who rewarded them in turn with lavish

campaign contributions, votes, and other payoffs. Congressional micro-management of the defense program grew ever more elaborate as lawmakers grasped new opportunities to control the disposition of defense resources. Resistance to base closures, in particular, prompted the most exquisite legislative maneuvers. For more than a decade after , the Pentagon found it impossible to close any large defense facility, no matter how obsolete or otherwise unwarranted. Weapons systems no longer desired by the military, such as A-7 and A aircraft in the early s, got extended funding, thanks to the efforts of friendly legislators. This waste of money had many other pernicious consequences. With great corporations, powerful military authorities, and members of Congress all linked in a mutually self-serving complex, there was little incentive to end the Cold War. But wealth, position, power, and perquisites all rode on the shoulders of the MICC. The best of all worlds, then, was massive, ongoing preparation for war that would never occur. But with the nation well-prepared for war, national leaders launched more readily into military adventures like those in Korea and Vietnam, not to mention a variety of smaller projections of force abroad. For the period , national defense spending consumed, on average, 7.

3: What is the Military-Industrial Complex?

Roughly 10 percent of the \$ trillion in factory output in the United States goes into the production of weapons sold mainly to the Defense Department for use by the armed forces. And the.

Compton, Bush became the first dean of engineering. It was a position he used as a bully pulpit to shape the role of the engineer in society. For both Bush andâ€¦ The term military-industrial complex was first used by U. Eisenhower in his Farewell Address on January 17, 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. 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. 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: 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. 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. The collapse of the Soviet Union and the end of the Cold War in 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.

4: Military's "industrial complex" - Wikipedia

It is what Eisenhower described as the "misplaced power" of the military-industrial complex - power that makes public opposition and even thousands of dead soldiers immaterial.

Big money behind war: Eisenhower warned that "an immense military establishment and a large arms industry" had emerged as a hidden force in US politics and that Americans "must not fail to comprehend its grave implications". Fifty years and some later, Americans find themselves in what seems like perpetual war. No sooner do we draw down on operations in Iraq than leaders demand an intervention in Libya or Syria or Iran. While perpetual war constitutes perpetual losses for families, and ever expanding budgets, it also represents perpetual profits for a new and larger complex of business and government interests. The new military-industrial complex is fuelled by a conveniently ambiguous and unseen enemy: Former President George W Bush and his aides insisted on calling counter-terrorism efforts a "war". This concerted effort by leaders like former Vice President Dick Cheney himself the former CEO of defence-contractor Halliburton was not some empty rhetorical exercise. Not only would a war maximise the inherent powers of the president, but it would maximise the budgets for military and homeland agencies. This new coalition of companies, agencies, and lobbyists dwarfs the system known by Eisenhower when he warned Americans to "guard against the acquisition of unwarranted influence" by the military-industrial complex". Ironically, it has had some of its best days under President Barack Obama who has radically expanded drone attacks and claimed that he alone determines what a war is for the purposes of consulting Congress. Investment in homeland security companies is expected to yield a 12 percent annual growth through - an astronomical return when compared to other parts of the tanking economy. A study showed that roughly 75 percent of the fallen in these wars come from working class families. They do not need war. They pay the cost of the war. Eisenhower would likely be appalled by the size of the industrial and governmental workforce committed to war or counter-terrorism activities. Military and homeland budgets now support millions of people in an otherwise declining economy. Hundreds of billions of dollars flow each year from the public coffers to agencies and contractors who have an incentive to keep the country on a war-footing - and footing the bill for war. That is only the secret programmes, not the much larger intelligence and counterintelligence budgets. We now have 16 spy agencies that employ , employees. This is separate from the over one million people employed by the military and national security law enforcement agencies. The core of this expanding complex is an axis of influence of corporations, lobbyists, and agencies that have created a massive, self-sustaining terror-based industry. The contractors In the last eight years, trillions of dollars have flowed to military and homeland security companies. When the administration starts a war like Libya, it is a windfall for companies who are given generous contracts to produce everything from replacement missiles to ready-to-eat meals. According to Morgan Keegan, a wealth management and capital firm, investment in homeland security companies is expected to yield a 12 percent annual growth through - an astronomical return when compared to other parts of the tanking economy. The lobbyists There are thousands of lobbyists in Washington to guarantee the ever-expanding budgets for war and homeland security. One such example is former DHS Secretary Michael Chertoff who pushed the purchase of the heavily criticised and little tested full-body scanners used in airports. When Chertoff was giving dozens of interviews to convince the public that the machines were needed to hold back the terror threat, many people were unaware that the manufacturer of the machine is a client of the Chertoff Group, his highly profitable security consulting agency. Those hugely expensive machines were later scrapped after Rapiscan, the manufacturer, received the windfall. Lobbyists maintain pressure on politicians by framing every budget in "tough on terror" versus "soft on terror" terms. The agencies It is not just revolving doors that tie federal agencies to these lobbyists and companies. The war-based economy allows for military and homeland departments to be virtually untouchable. Environmental and social programmes are eliminated or curtailed by billions as war-related budgets continue to expand to meet "new threats". A massive counterterrorism system has been created employing tens of thousands of personnel with billions of dollars to search for domestic terrorists. With the support of an army of lobbyists and companies, cabinet members like

former DHS Secretary Janet Napolitano, are invincible in Washington. When citizens complained of watching their children groped by the TSA, Napolitano defiantly retorted that if people did not want their children groped, they should yield and use the unpopular full-body machines - the machines being sold by her predecessor, Chertoff. It is not just the Defense and DHS departments that enjoy the war windfall. The problem has been a comparative shortage of actual terrorists to justify the size of this internal security system. Accordingly, the DOJ has counted everything from simple immigration cases to credit card fraud as terror cases in a body count approach not seen since the Vietnam War. For example, the DOJ claimed to have busted a major terror-network as part of "Operation Cedar Sweep", where Lebanese citizens were accused of sending money to terrorists. They were later forced to drop all charges against all 27 defendants as unsupportable. It turned out to be a bunch of simple head shops. Nevertheless, the new internal security system continues to grind on with expanding powers and budgets. A few years ago, the DOJ even changed the definition of terrorism to allow for an ever-widening number of cases to be considered "terror-related". Symbiotic relationship Our economic war-dependence is matched by political war-dependence. Many members represent districts with contractors that supply homeland security needs and our on-going wars. Even with polls showing that the majority of Americans are opposed to continuing the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, the new military-industrial complex continues to easily muster the necessary support from both Democrats and Republicans in Congress. It is a testament to the influence of this alliance that hundreds of billions are being spent in Afghanistan and Iraq while Congress is planning to cut billions from core social programmes, including a possible rollback on Medicare due to lack of money. None of that matters. Even the documented billions stolen by government officials in Iraq and Afghanistan are treated as a mere cost of doing business. It is what Eisenhower described as the "misplaced power" of the military-industrial complex - power that makes public opposition and even thousands of dead soldiers immaterial. War may be hell for some but it is heaven for others in a war-dependent economy.

5: Military-industrial complex | www.enganchecubano.com

The hallmark of the months leading to today's EU referendum has been horrifying censorship. One can but hope that Noam Chomsky's dictum that censorship is a "brand on the imagination" and.

The term military-industrial complex is used at 8: Eisenhower used the term in his Farewell Address to the Nation on January 17, A vital element in keeping the peace is our military establishment. Our arms must be mighty, ready for instant action, so that no potential aggressor may be tempted to risk his own destruction This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influence—economic, political, even spiritual—is felt in every city, every statehouse, every office of the federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources and livelihood are all involved; so is the very structure of our society. In the councils 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 power exists, and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. 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. Williams and Malcolm Moos. Ledbetter finds the precise term used in in close to its later meaning in an article in Foreign Affairs by Winfield W. Wright Mills had claimed in his book *The Power Elite* that a class of military, business, and political leaders, driven by mutual interests, were the real leaders of the state, and were effectively beyond democratic control. Friedrich Hayek mentions in his book *The Road to Serfdom* the danger of a support of monopolistic organization of industry from World War II political remnants: Another element which after this war is likely to strengthen the tendencies in this direction will be some of the men who during the war have tasted the powers of coercive control and will find it difficult to reconcile themselves with the humbler roles they will then have to play [in peaceful times]. Anything else would be an unacceptable shock to the American economy. As of [update] , the United States still had many bases and troops stationed globally. In the late s James Kurth asserted, "By the mids The term is also used to describe comparable collusion in other political entities such as the German Empire prior to and through the first world war , Britain, France, and post-Soviet Russia. Pentagon contractor-funded American think tanks such as the Lexington Institute and the Atlantic Council have also demanded increased spending in view of the perceived Russian threat. The government owned their own shipyards and weapons manufacturing facilities which they relied on through World War I. Roosevelt established the War Production Board to coordinate civilian industries and shift them into wartime production. After the end of the war the American government did not dismantle the war machine that they had built. Various American companies, such as Boeing and General Motors , maintained and expanded their defense divisions [30]. These companies have gone on to develop various technologies that have improved civilian life as well such as night-vision goggles , GPS , and the Internet. This era marked the end of the Warsaw Pact and the collapse of the Soviet Union. In the Pentagon urged defense contractors to consolidate due to the collapse of communism and shrinking defense budget. Major defense companies purchased smaller defense companies and became the major companies that know today. The lack of a large budget from the Pentagon has made defense contractors anxious to invest their own profits into research and development as it is unclear whether or not the Pentagon will be able to match their contributions to create intuitive new products.

6: Eisenhower warns of the "military-industrial complex" - HISTORY

After World War II, the United States military gradually came into a position of overwhelming dominance in the world. Military spending in the United States far outpaces that of other countries, with their world share of military expenditures at 41% in , followed by Russia and China with only.

Ready to fight back? Sign up for Take Action Now and get three actions in your inbox every week. You can read our Privacy Policy here. Thank you for signing up. For more from The Nation, check out our latest issue. Support Progressive Journalism The Nation is reader supported: Travel With The Nation Be the first to hear about Nation Travels destinations, and explore the world with kindred spirits. Sign up for our Wine Club today. Did you know you can support The Nation by drinking wine? Donald Trump used his first Joint Address to the Congress of the United States to engage in an unprecedented flight of fiscal fantasy. Specifically, the president imagined that the United States could cut taxes for wealthy Americans and corporations, rip tens of billions of dollars out of domestic programs and diplomacy , hand that money over to the military-industrial complex, and somehow remain a functional and genuinely strong nation. Ad Policy Trump did not articulate this agenda quite so bluntly. His hour-long speech was far more traditional and temperate in character than his ballistic inaugural address. The themes were, for the most part, predictable: But the specifics were few. But even Ronald Reagan and George W. This is not an accidental turn. This is by design. But it is not a grand design; rather, it is an approach that Trump has adopted as he has moved from the capricious politics of his initial candidacy to the reality of a ever more rigidly right-wing presidency. He made big promises about jobs and infrastructure, delivering more and better health care, protecting Social Security and Medicare. We can do it for a lot less. Even with that fact in mind, however, it must have surprised at least a few Trump backers to learn from Mulvaney that bloating up the Pentagon budget was such a high priority of the Trump campaign. This is a winning argument for my friends in the House and a winning argument for a lot of folks all over the country. That does not protect America"at least not in the sense that Democratic and Republican presidents have historically understood the preservation of the republic. Budgeting is always a matter of striking balances. And when there is an imbalance, the American experiment is threatened. Dwight Eisenhower explained this when he appeared barely two months into his presidency before the American Society of Newspaper Editors. The speech was much anticipated. He chose as his topic the proper balancing of budget priorities. Eisenhower recognized the threats that existed. He spoke, at length, about difficult relations between the United States and the Soviet Union and he addressed the threat of annihilation posed by the spread of atomic weaponry. But the career military man"the supreme commander of the Allied Expeditionary Forces in Europe during World War II, the chief of staff of the Army during the postwar era when tensions with Moscow rose"did not come to suggest that increased defense spending was a singular priority. In fact, his purpose was the opposite. It is spending the sweat of its laborers, the genius of its scientists, the hopes of its children. The cost of one modern heavy bomber is this: It is two electric power plants, each serving a town of 60, population. It is two fine, fully equipped hospitals. It is some 50 miles of concrete highway. We pay for a single fighter with a half million bushels of wheat. We pay for a single destroyer with new homes that could have housed more than 8, people. This, I repeat, is the best way of life to be found on the road the world has been taking. This is not a way of life at all, in any true sense. Under the cloud of threatening war, it is humanity hanging from a cross of iron. Eisenhower did not propose surrender or immediate disarmament. This would be a declared total war, not upon any human enemy but upon the brute forces of poverty and need. The world has changed, and so has the United States. But what has changed the most is the understanding that providing for the common defense does not preclude the promotion of the general welfare. That is a problematic imbalance in itself. 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. For Reprints and Permissions, click here.

7: Military-Industrial Complex - Tracking American Defense Spending since

Military-industrial complex, network of individuals and institutions involved in the production of weapons and military
www.enganchecubano.com military-industrial complex in a country typically attempts to marshal political support for
continued or increased military spending by the national government.

Presidency of Dwight D. Eisenhower On January 20, , Eisenhower served as a president for two full terms, making a total of eight years, and was the first U. 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 [4] was about to hand the reins of power to the youngest elected president. Wikisource has original text related to this article: It went through at least 21 drafts. We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow. Despite being a politician with a military background and the only general to be elected president in the 20th century, he famously warned the nation with regards to the corrupting influence of what he describes as the " military-industrial complex ". American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense. We have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions. Added to this, three and a half million men and women are directly engaged in the defense establishment. We annually spend on military security alone more than the net income of all United States corporations. Now this conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. The total influenceâ€”economic, political, even spiritualâ€”is felt in every city, every Statehouse, every office of the Federal government. We recognize the imperative need for this development. Yet, we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. Our toil, resources, and livelihood are all involved. So is the very structure of our society. In the councils 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 power exists and will persist. We must never let the weight of this combination endanger our liberties or democratic processes. We should take nothing for granted. 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. Akin to, and largely responsible for the sweeping changes in our industrial-military posture, has been the technological revolution during recent decades. In this revolution, research has become central, it also becomes more formalized, complex, and costly. A steadily increasing share is conducted for, by, or at the direction of, the Federal government. Yet in holding scientific discovery in respect, as we should, we must also be alert to the equal and opposite danger that public policy could itself become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.

8: Eisenhower warns of military-industrial complex - HISTORY

Dwight D. Eisenhower exit speech on Jan, Warning us of the military industrial complex.

September 30, Source: In one sense, the delivery of S batteries to Syria is cause for concern more for Washington than for Tel Aviv. With the S systems deployed in an updated version and incorporated into the Russian command, control and communications C3 system, there is a serious risk for Washington that Israel, now incapable of changing the course of events in Syria, could attempt a desperate maneuver. At this point, it is necessary to add some additional information and clarify some points. Such modern and complex systems as the Ss and Ss require maintenance, upgrades, and often replacement of parts to improve hardware. All this is missing from the Greek batteries. Secondly, it is the operator who uses the system using radar, targeting, aiming, locking and so forth that often makes the difference in terms of overall effectiveness. Furthermore, the system is fully integrated into the Russian C3 system, something that renders useless any previous experience gleaned from wargaming the Greek Ss. No Western country knows the real capabilities and capacity of Syrian air defense when augmented and integrated with Russian systems. This is a secret that Damascus and Moscow will continue to keep well guarded. The following are the words of Russian defense minister Sergei Shoigu concerning the deployment of the S to Syria and its integration with other Russian systems: We are convinced that the implementation of these measures will cool hotheads and prevent ill-considered actions threatening our servicemen. Otherwise, we will respond in line with the current situation. Syrian troops and military air defense units will be equipped with automatic control systems, which have been supplied to the Russian Armed Forces. This will ensure the centralized management of the Syrian air defense forces and facilities, monitoring the situation in the airspace and prompt target designation. Most importantly, it will be used to identify the Russian aircraft by the Syrian air defense forces. The US military-industrial complex would suffer irreparable damage. This would also explain why Israel and probably the US has for more than five years put enormous pressure on Moscow not to deliver the S to Syria and Iran. For the United States, there are two scenarios to avoid. The first is a direct involvement in the conflict with Russia in Syria, which is now unthinkable and impractical. An illuminating example of how the United States operates its most advanced aircraft in the region was given in eastern Syria around Deir ez-Zor. In this part of Syria, there is no threat from any advanced air-defense systems, so the US is often free to employ its F in certain circumstances. The US simply does not even consider using the F in Syria, nor would it risk its use against Russian air defenses. It has already been sold to dozens of countries bound by decades-long agreements. Its development began more than 10 years ago and, despite the countless problems that still exist, it is already airborne and combat-ready, as the Israelis insist. From the US point of view, its employment in operations is played down and otherwise concealed. The less data available to opponents, the better; though the real reason may lie in a strong fear of any revelation of potential weaknesses of the aircraft damaging future sales. Obviously, both Lockheed Martin and the US Air Force have no interest in revealing any weaknesses or shortcomings, especially publicly. Washington finds itself in the unenviable position of probably having no leverage with Israel over the matter ever since losing any ability to steer events in Syria.

9: The US Military-Industrial Complex's Worst Nightmare: The S May Destroy and Expose the F

The business of war is profitable. In , the largest contractors sold \$ billion in arms and military services. Just 10 of those companies sold over \$ billion. Based on a list of the.

As citizens of the world, we are filled with anger when we see men, women, and children slaughtered and displaced so that the few at the top can earn profits from blood and guns. We are sick and tired of wars ad nauseam, from our fathers who were killed in Viet Nam, our neighbors on , displaced war refugees around the world, not to mention the millions of starving children around the world who could use the money we spend on DARPA and their war tools for clean water, food, and education. Unlike many of our politicians, we know that naming our enemy is the first step towards identifying and disarming them. Many readers to this site will be quite familiar with the usual suspects: We also know that they work closely with government agencies to plan and implement continuing military, cyber, and economic wars. We have all read about how the Bilderberg Club, Illuminati, and the Knights of Malta coordinate these machinations with the Vatican. We know that the U. Federal Reserve is just a private corporation with a monopoly to print Federal Reserve notes that manipulates and plunders the U. S and global economy. So we decided to follow the money. Who are the war profiteers that are plundering American lives, wealth, and democracy? In this article, the Anonymous Patriots are back again. We are tired of becoming poorer, sicker, and more enslaved by these ruling sub-humans and ask you to arm yourselves with the knowledge we have gleaned from our research. Then, be a patriot. Send this article to as many people as you can, as quickly as you can, so that the truth will be preserved when TPTB think about taking down this website. Brief Background We apologize that our articles are so long, but much needs to be said. You might want to cut and paste the article into a Word document so that it is easier to navigate and read. To begin our journey, please review this list of the top ten or so military contractors, or Military Warlords. Rowe Price Group, Inc. What is worth noting about this list is that you can find some of the usual suspects: Rothchilds, Rockefellers, Morgans, Warburgs, and the rest of the Bankster Warlords behind some of these names. These Americans are in the business of war, every type of war or conflict that enables them to sell their war products. Like any for-profit business they have products to sell and to make good profits they need a vibrant, robust customer base. To make things even more complex so that we can never figure out who is in charge, every one of these corporations owns major shares in every other corporation. They are intertwined like a grape vine. If we look closer we find that every one of these corporations conducts international business and is invested in international military ventures. They are not governed by any one nation as they transcend nations. This type of Corporate Warfare is transnational. It is beyond being international or global. These companies work outside of the control of American as a nation. They work against Americans with their transnational economic warfare and make money from both sides of any military or corporate warfare. No matter who wins or loses, no matter how many of our children die in their war theaters, and no matter who the politicians are, they make money. And then they invest this money back into the same business because the business of war is extremely profitable. Essentially, they are war criminals just like Henry Schroder, who funded both Hitler and England. This type of banking warfare is common throughout history. No one knows who owns the Bank of England or who the shareholders are. This should raise some eyebrows and make the conspiracy theorists ecstatic, and for good reason. The Queen of England Makes Money from War Accordingly, all the unsubstantiated conspiracies about the Queen of England have some merit after following the money back to the bankster warlords who set up the U. But unlike most conspiracy theories suggest, the Federal Reserve regional banks are not the true culprits. The true culprits are the original investors in the corporations, listed above, who serve the military through all types of wars " physical conflict, information, and economics. It is the interwoven fabric of the investments of the war-supporting corporations that have created a system that is inbred and tied to England and then to Rome. Simply through the association of the royal families of the world who are members of the Knights of Malta you have an economic intelligence community that is insider trading at a transnational level. The Bilderberg Group, the Club of Rome, or DARPA are associations of powerful people with deep investments in military

concerns who must protect their financial interests and pass wealth onto their family members. If we wish to broaden the perspective, one can add that the Society of Jesus, the Jesuits, are involved at all levels and have worked tirelessly as the soldiers of the Pope to create the ultimate spy network. It is fair to say that the central banking ideas of Italy have been replicated in the central banking systems used throughout the world. Central banking comes from the Vatican and through the different agencies of the Vatican Knights of Malta the world economy is manipulated by insider trading information that is being shared with the Vatican via the vows of allegiance that every Knight of Malta makes. The Vatican profits by war because it takes in hundreds of billions a year through refugee placement services and humanitarian aid provided to war-torn areas. The more war the richer the Vatican becomes. That is why the Vatican supports unbridled migrations of people and the chaos that ensues from war. The Knights of Malta are one of the largest charities in the world. The Catholic Church has thousands of different tax-free, charitable organizations that receive money to help in humanitarian causes. No one knows how much money the Catholic Church receives each year. The Vatican Bank has been caught many times laundering money on a huge scale. Just like the almost unfathomable interwoven inbreeding of the bankster warlords, the double-speak of the Vatican is filled with lies. The Vatican says one thing and does the opposite. The Vatican itself gives no money away to any charity. America attorneys still take an oath to the Temple Bar in the City of London. The Templars were a Catholic order that more or less established banks from Europe to Jerusalem during the Crusades. Again, whether we look at the history of banking or law, all roads lead to Rome. Therefore, when we hear the theorists get all worked up about the conspiracies rampant in the military industrial complex, we should perhaps listen a little more carefully and do our own research to find that the simply version is supported by the detailed version. The Long War is Forever This question is actually quite simple to answer. DARPA is well known for funding multiple initial projects and then further funding the winner. And we hardly have to mention the cost over-runs on every military contract. These contracts, paid for by American tax payers, are for hundreds of billions of dollars and the corporation is allowed and encouraged to make a big profit so the interwoven Corporate Warlords get their cut of the pie. When Rumsfeld audited the 7 trillion dollar Pentagon budget, 2. Just read the web sites of any top military contractor where they proudly proclaim their international business in military devices. These transnational corporations are also using their influence to destabilize markets, economies, countries and currencies to create new business. These warlords know full well that the CIA manipulates currency as a continuing war. Destabilizing countries creates the need for international intervention. The pronouncement of the War on Terror was the declaration of the overthrowing of American Democracy by warlord oligarchy. Former presidents and prime ministers become Corporate Warlords and make a fortune. American Democracy is Doomed If the following corporations continue to exist, American Democracy will fall and become the military arm of the triangle of power between New York, the City of London and Vatican City. It is a system which has conscripted vast human and material resources into the building of a tightly knit, highly efficient machine that combines military, diplomatic, intelligence, economic, scientific and political operations. Its preparations are concealed, not published. Its mistakes are buried not headlined. Its dissenters are silenced, not praised. No expenditure is questioned, no rumor is printed, no secret is revealed. It was surely one of the causes of his assassination for in those days few knew of the treasonous behavior of Corporate and Banking Warlords. In our time, the greedy warlords are proud of what they do and the government supports them in full knowledge that transnationalism is destroying America. Donnelly, The Associated Press, This type of waste indicates the scale upon which the military industrial complex seemingly answers to no one. All military inventions, even if they advertise them as helpful, are weaponized. But there is a more secret group that directs the military in its future goals. One group, essentially one man, has been behind creating the direction of military and commercial warfare for decades. All Highland Forums are private, invitation only, have no written agenda and basically are secret and did not happen. Except for the fact that the Corporate Warlords who are invited become privy to the direction of research for the US military, which subsequently creates the directions of Corporate Warlords. Nothing is written down so that no one is held responsible. The description below is taken from their website: As such, control over its use, its protection, and its manipulation, are national and global security issues. This Research Program examines strategic and tactical

offensive and defensive aspects of information operations IO by state and non-state actors to achieve political, military, and economic goals through IO means, including computer network operations CNO , computer network attack CNA , computer network exploitation CNE , computer network defense CND , psychological operations PSYOPS , perception management, media manipulation, propaganda, strategic influence, and public diplomacy, among others. Over the past 18 years almost fifty major meetings and twenty enrichment sessions have been held around the country. The in-depth proceedings of those events are posted to the Secretary of Defense Highlands Forum website, along with interviews, original papers, and book reviews. The Forum is sponsored by the Office of the US Secretary of Defense to explore new ideas and emerging trends that will help support high-level Department of Defense DoD policy and strategy, especially as they relate to information and information technologies. Each meeting is centered on a specific topic. Around 25 experts from government, industry, academia, the arts and the professions are invited to discuss their ideas on the subject “ to be part a kind of strategic conversation. While our discussions were generally technology-based, you cannot ponder how IT, the Web and related technologies could impact DoD without also thinking hard about the global environment that DoD, and society in general will face over the next decade and beyond. The Long War is perhaps as much about winning the hearts and minds of people and nations, as it is about defeating, or at least containing an enemy that is often hard to find. While one absolutely needs the weapons and military training to win the classic, hot conflicts, the soft or cultural aspects of the conflict are at least as important that over time could undermine democratic principles, free markets and our standard of living. Perhaps DoD should once again take on a lead role, this time in supporting research and pilot programs that will accelerate the development of some of the most complex and critical applications and emerging technologies that are driving the evolution of the Web for the very different requirements of the 21st Century. I would justify the investments as part of our efforts to prepare for and fight the Long War, as well as to help our armed forces become even more highly skilled, collaborative, information-based organizations.

Mr. Russell on Bull Run. Electrical conductivity of materials The Kennedy years. 7. Transportation systems A legal framework for systemic bank restructuring Democracy and cultural inclusion Its Pub Time a Capp Facing turbulent times Working accounts for auctioneers and estate agents Uncle Wiggily and the pirates and other stories Saemtliche Schriften Und Briefe. Zweite Reihe Types of Maps (Rookie Read-About Geography) Hots questions for class 10 science ssc Faith in what (2:12) Anarchy in Our Schools Im back in court The racial imagination in the writings of (ex-)conversos Resentments virtue Joy for a Womans Soul Command area development in Mahi-Kadana Studies in the teaching of history Tomorrows Tourist How to Prune Trees (S. hrg) A rich and rushing stream Country statement, India Grandmother Elsie North Carolina teachers professional competencies handbook Musics of Belonging Marie Curie and radium The lady bark, or, New upstart-lady Clerical character in George Eliots fiction The brothers promise Last Victory in Russia A medieval mirror The Best Travel Writing 2005 Lord of the Congaree The Scandalous Schoolmistress Elementary applied electricity Probing the energy landscape of protein-binding reactions by dynamic force spectroscopy Andreas Ebner . [Dying to Look Good