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The use and abuse of Eisenhower’s Farewell Address, with its warning about the ‘military-industrial complex’

 *Editor’s Note: This piece is an expanded version of a piece that appears in the current issue of National Review.*

Suggest that the defense budget be increased, and you may well hear about Eisenhower’s Farewell Address. Tsk tsk, people will say: the military-industrial complex. We must not forget Eisenhower’s warning about that complex. A reminder of the 34th president is supposed to put a conservative Republican, in particular, in his place. People who otherwise have no use for Eisenhower or his brand of Republicanism — liberals, leftists, “paleocons,” and libertarians — suddenly like Ike, when it comes to this military-industrial complex.

Recently, a video of a speech made by Rand Paul surfaced. The speech was given in 2009, the year before Paul was elected to the Senate. He was speaking to students at Western Kentucky University. He said, “Even Eisenhower, back in the ’50s, said, you know, ‘Beware of the military-industrial complex.’ ” The Farewell Address was given in January 1961, but that is immaterial. Paul continued, “We need to be fearful of companies that get so big that they can actually be directing policy.” He then spoke of Halliburton — and Dick Cheney and the Iraq War. In the 1990s, Paul explained to the students, Cheney had opposed going into Iraq. But then he “goes to work for Halliburton. Makes hundreds of millions of dollars, their CEO. Next thing you know, he’s back in government and it’s a good idea to go into Iraq.”

There have always been Americans who say that we went to war because big companies or financiers or their lackeys manipulated us into it. In World War I, J. P. Morgan was the villain. In the Vietnam War, it was Dow Chemical. In the Iraq War, Halliburton played the role of Dow Chemical. Last year, a columnist defended Rand Paul and his mindset, making the inevitable comparison: “In his farewell address, Eisenhower sounded a lot like Rand Paul.”

Eisenhower had a long, distinguished career in war and peace, and just about the only thing people know about him is “military-industrial complex” — that and his generalship in World War II. And maybe his fondness for golf. Jimmy Carter did not have as long or distinguished a career, but he certainly rose to the presidency, meteorically. Today, he is remembered for two or three things — including a “malaise” speech in which he never uttered the word “malaise.” He is also remembered for an interview he gave to Playboy when he was running for president: “I’ve looked on many women with lust. I’ve committed adultery in my heart many times. God knows I will do this and forgives me.”

The other week, I reviewed a production of La cenerentola, the Rossini opera. At the end, the prince, with his bride, mounted a giant wedding cake. Looking at the (diminutive) tenor, I thought of Thomas E. Dewey — whom Alice Roosevelt Longworth indelibly labeled “the little man on the wedding cake.” Dewey was governor of New York, in addition to a two-time presidential nominee. But all people know is the wedding-cake crack — and maybe the false headline “Dewey Defeats Truman.”

“Military-industrial complex” is universally known, but the speech from which it comes is scarcely known at all. It is a “noble speech,” as the historian Ted R. Bromund wrote three years ago, “and the mature reflection of a great national servant.” In May 1959 — a year and eight months before the end of the Eisenhower presidency — Malcolm “Mac” Moos, the chief speechwriter, wrote a memo for the record. The president was hoping that “the Congress might invite him to address them before he left office, at which time he would like to make a 10 minute farewell address to the Congress and the American people.” Moos added, “I think this is a brilliant idea if it can be carried off with a minimum of fanfare and emotionalism.” Those words, so foreign to our own times, are typical of the Eisenhower presidency.

A few days later, Eisenhower wrote to his brother Milton, the president of Johns Hopkins University. He said the purpose of a farewell address would be “to emphasize a few homely truths that apply to the responsibilities and duties of a government that must be responsive to the will of majorities, even when the decisions of those majorities create apparent paradoxes. A collateral purpose would be, of course, merely to say an official ‘goodbye.’”

In April 1960, one Eisenhower aide, Frederic Fox, wrote a memo to another, Moos. He recommended the re-reading of Washington’s Farewell Address. “It is a beautifully wise and modest piece by a faithful public servant who loved his country.” Moreover, “I was struck by its relevance to our day: the call for Constitutional obedience; . . . the dangers of ‘overgrown military establishments’ but the necessity of maintaining ‘a respectable defensive posture’; . . . the ungenerous habit of one generation to spend beyond its means and to throw ‘upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear.’” Everyone involved in Eisenhower’s Farewell Address had Washington’s in mind.

In the end, Eisenhower did not go before Congress. He gave his address on television, on January 17, 1961, three days before his successor, John F. Kennedy, would be inaugurated. It is somewhat startling to watch a video of the speech now: Eisenhower is unpolished, and touchingly so, I think. He fumbles with papers, stumbles over words, mispronounces other words, and so on. No major politician could get away with such a performance today. Saturday Night Live might pronounce it beyond mockery. The speech itself, in any case, is “beautifully wise and modest,” as Fox said about Washington’s. It is also a minor classic of conservatism.

“Throughout America’s adventure in free government,” said Eisenhower, “our basic purposes have been to keep the peace; to foster progress in human achievement; and to enhance liberty, dignity, and integrity among peoples and among nations. To strive for less would be unworthy of a free and religious people.”

He then spoke of “the conflict now engulfing the world,” i.e., the Cold War. “It commands our whole attention, absorbs our very beings. We face a hostile ideology — global in scope, atheistic in character, ruthless in purpose, and insidious in method. Unhappily, the danger it poses promises to be of indefinite duration. To meet it successfully, there is called for, not so much the emotional and transitory sacrifices of crisis, but rather those which enable us to carry forward steadily, surely, and without complaint the burdens of a prolonged and complex struggle — with liberty the stake.”

In this speech, Eisenhower laid stress on “balance”: “the need to maintain balance in and among national programs.” Five years later, in 1966, he wrote a letter about the speech. “Our struggle against world Communism,” he said, “involves military, economic and spiritual factors. Each is equally important and it is up to us to see that we maintain the necessary strength in each and the proper balance among the three.”

Here is a line from the speech that is never quoted: “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.” Goldwater and Reagan would have an encapsulating slogan, “Peace through strength.” Eisenhower said, “Until the latest of our world conflicts, the United States had no armaments industry. American makers of plowshares could, with time and as required, make swords as well. But now we can no longer risk emergency improvisation of national defense; we have been compelled to create a permanent armaments industry of vast proportions.” Note the word “compelled.”

Said Eisenhower, “This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience.” And here is another line that is never quoted: “We recognize the imperative need for this development.” And here comes the “but,” or the “yet”: “Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications.” Finally, we get to the hallowed line: “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.”

Eisenhower also warned against a “scientific-technological elite”: “Today, the solitary inventor, tinkering in his shop, has been overshadowed by task forces of scientists in laboratories and testing fields. In the same fashion, the free university, historically the fountainhead of free ideas and scientific discovery, has experienced a revolution in the conduct of research. Partly because of the huge costs involved, a government contract becomes virtually a substitute for intellectual curiosity. For every old blackboard there are now hundreds of new electronic computers.” What must the ratio be now? Public policy, said Eisenhower, must not “become the captive of a scientific-technological elite.”

Just as Washington counseled the payment of debt, and not “ungenerously throwing upon posterity the burden which we ourselves ought to bear,” Eisenhower said, “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. 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.” Given our $17.5 trillion debt, people today might quote this line, as well as “military-industrial complex.”

Fast-forward to 1985, the middle of the Reagan years. An old Eisenhower hand, Ralph E. Williams, is asked by the Eisenhower Library in Kansas about the Farewell Address, and in particular its one famous line. He says, “I have always been astonished at the attention that has been given to the ‘military-industrial complex’ portion of President Eisenhower’s last speech, and agree with Pete Aurand [another Eisenhower hand] that its true significance has been distorted beyond recognition. I am sure that had it been uttered by anyone except a President who had also been the Army’s five-star Chief of Staff it would long since have been forgotten. But as things were, it became red meat for the media, who have gleefully gnawed on it for twenty-five years.”

Williams is sorry that “scientific-technological elite” did not catch. It “is now about as well-remembered as Edward Everett’s Gettysburg Address. (It no doubt would have fared better if Ike had been a Nobel Laureate in physics.)” Everett, recall, was the scholar and statesman who spoke for two hours at Gettysburg, before Lincoln gave his brief speech.

Ted Bromund gives a neat summation of what Eisenhower was doing in his warning about the military-industrial complex: “He was arguing that undemocratic direction from above, especially if directed by big and bureaucratic government, is dangerous. It was top-down control — not the possession and funding of armed forces that reflect the needs and threats of the day — that Eisenhower found threatening.” Eisenhower’s actions speak at least as loudly as his words (as men’s actions usually do): When he handed over to Kennedy, we were spending about 10 percent of GDP on defense, and over 50 percent of the federal budget. For 2015, we are prepared to spend 3.4 percent of GDP and about 13 percent of the budget. It’s always a tricky business to try to speak for the dead, or to claim to do so, but, given everything we know about Eisenhower, I believe he would be in the camp of those of us who say our defenses are dangerously low, inviting of aggression. National security is undoubtedly a federal responsibility, one that requires adequate funding. Our proper debate is over “adequate.”

Anti-military types, or anti-hawks, love to quote Eisenhower on the “military-industrial complex” more than they love to quote, say, George McGovern: because Eisenhower was a general, war hero, and Republican, and that is supposed to put us in our place. “Military-industrial complex” is the one thing that liberals and others can bless Ike for. Remember what Rand Paul said: “Even Eisenhower...” — “even”! I am reminded of obits and commentary about the founder of National Review, William F. Buckley Jr., in 2008. You would think that all he had ever done, in his long, consequential, and conservative life, was advocate the legalization of marijuana. It was the one thing that the whole world, or much of the world, could bless him for.

WFB liked to quote a comment attributed to Talleyrand: “Surtout pas trop de zèle.” Above all, not too much zeal. This was part of Eisenhower’s speech and mind, and it is a major part of the conservative mind.

VIEW COMMENTS

[An attempt to “View Comments” using the click just above failed to reveal any comments. Instead I could only get an initially out-of-chronological but clearly related pieces, which are below. Note, for example, that the first comment one encounters was written early in the morning the article itself is dated. –Ed.]

**Remember the Pheromones! (Or Don’t)**

On the homepage today, we publish an expanded version of a piece that appears in the current issue: “Ike as Weapon: The use and abuse of Eisenhower’s Farewell Address, with its warning about the ‘military-industrial complex.’” It begins this way: Suggest that the defense budget be increased, and you may well hear about Eisenhower’s Farewell Address. Tsk tsk, people will say: the military-industrial complex. We must not forget Eisenhower’s warning about that complex. A reminder of the 34th president is supposed to put a conservative Republican, in particular, in his place. People who otherwise have no use for Eisenhower or his brand of Republicanism — liberals, leftists, “paleocons,” and libertarians — suddenly like Ike, when it comes to this military-industrial complex. Recently, a video of Rand Paul made the rounds. He was speaking to students at Western Kentucky University. He explained to them why Vice President Cheney supported the Iraq War. At the time of the Gulf War, when he was defense secretary, he opposed a march on Baghdad. But then he “goes to work for Halliburton. Makes hundreds of millions of dollars, their CEO. Next thing you know, he’s back in government and it’s a good idea to go into Iraq.” Simple as that. Paul said, “Even Eisenhower, back in the ’50s, said, you know, ‘Beware of the military-industrial complex.’” That word “even” is full of meaning. Eisenhower was the winning general in a world war, which is why people such as Paul use him as a weapon. It is done ignorantly. We tend to know just one phrase from Eisenhower’s Farewell Address — “military-industrial complex” — but the context of the phrase is important, and so is the speech as a whole. The speech, as I say in my piece, is a “minor classic of conservatism.” It deserves to be known (as well as heeded). NR’s Fred Schwarz, whose knowledge is exceptionally wide-ranging, sent me a note: “In the mid-1980s a folk-comedy duo called the Pheromones did a (non-comic) song called ‘Eisenhower’ that was pretty much what you’d expect, blaming him for everything bad that people mistakenly associate with the 1950s: stultifying conformity, mind-numbing television, prudery, McCarthyism, etc. At one point they said that Ike had ‘warned us about men like himself in the end,’ which is of course the exact opposite of what he was doing.” I don’t remember the Pheromones, but it sounds like they would have been perfect for my Ann Arbor.

Read more at: <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/378938/ike-weapon-jay-nordlinger>

**Complexes**

Read more at: <http://www.nationalreview.com/article/378938/ike-weapon-jay-nordlinger>

by JAY NORDLINGER February 28, 2014 2:26 PM @JAYNORDLINGER

Whenever you write in favor of defense spending, or against defense cuts, someone tells you about Eisenhower and the “military-industrial complex,” as though you never heard that phrase before. I discuss this in Impromptus today (and a passel of other subjects as well). I’d like to mention something else, here on the Corner. Ike spoke of the “military-industrial complex” in his farewell address as president — January 1961. The world was a lot different in 1961, certainly where defense spending was concerned. In New York, Michael Bloomberg, our recent mayor, gave a farewell address too. It was on December 18 at the Economic Club of New York. There, he introduced a phrase: the “labor-electoral complex.” This “complex,” he said — this tight relationship between public-sector labor unions and politicians — had “traditionally stymied reform.” Here is a longer chunk of Bloomberg’s speech: . . . let’s face it: The future that most elected officials worry about most is their own. Winning election or reelection is the goal around which everything else revolves. But we cannot afford for our elected officials to put their own futures ahead of the next generation’s and to continue perpetuating a labor-electoral complex that is undermining our collective future. We need them to look ahead and to address the needs of tomorrow instead of being prisoners to the labor contracts of yesterday. Simply put, our pension and health-care system must be modernized to be sustained. I was discussing Bloomberg with a smart conservative friend the other day. He was listing some ways in which the former mayor is underappreciated, by all. He is essentially friendless now. The Left hates him — portraying him as a heartless plutocrat who made a Dickensian New York and takes special delight in “stopping and frisking” innocent black youth. (The “heartless” bit is especially galling seeing as Bloomberg poured so much of his own money into trying to improve the lives of the poor.) The Right hates him because he is the nanny whose career is defined by an attempt to limit the size of “sugary drinks.” Bloomberg can’t be judged properly now. It’s too early, and passions are too strong. But history, when she gets around to it, will rate him highly, I think. She may go so far as to call him a great public servant. With Rudy Giuliani, Bloomberg presided over a 20-year golden age. We in New York enjoyed a time of tremendous — and surprising — peace and prosperity. It is, among other things, ungrateful to think otherwise. Not that these words will play in the Iowa caucus or early primaries, so to speak . . . P.S. A reader writes, “What I find interesting about Eisenhower’s farewell speech is that everyone seems to remember the lamentation about the military-industrial complex, but no one seems to remember the part about how all this was unfortunately necessary.” I will have more to say about Ike’s speech in a subsequent post. (Sounds like a warning, I know!)

Read more at: <http://www.nationalreview.com/corner/372262/complexes-jay-nordlinger>

**The Forgotten Part of Ike’s Speech**

by GEORGE LEEF February 18, 2014 10:55 AM

Just before leaving office, President Eisenhower delivered his famous “military-industrial complex” speech. But there was more to it than just the warning about the dangers of that complex — he also cautioned against the rise of universities as power centers. Brooklyn College professor Mitchell Langbert quotes from and contemplates Ike’s speech in this blog post. Langbert observes, “Universities are crucial to the new power complex, just as they were to the military-industrial complex, not because universities’ research is of crucial importance to technological progress — most important technological innovation comes from for-profit sources — but because university professors, who benefit from university endowments that special interests fund, lend an illusive patina of legitimacy and impartiality to federal policy.” I think that Langbert is right. One of the methods the state uses to build legitimacy is to point to supposedly objective, academic research (e.g. on global warming or climate change or whatever the new preferred term is) and say, “See, we’re just doing what the experts say we should do.”

Read more at: <http://www.nationalreview.com/phi-beta-cons/371355/forgotten-part-ikes-speech-george-leef>

[And ” here is the article by Ted Bromund, referenced within “Ike as a Weapon”. –Ed.]
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**Like Washington, Eisenhower’s Farewell Address Counseled Balance**

[Ted Bromund](http://dailysignal.com/author/tbromund/) / [@Bromund](http://twitter.com/Bromund) / January 17, 2011 / [4 comments](http://dailysignal.com/2011/01/17/like-washington-eisenhower%E2%80%99s-farewell-address-counseled-balance/#comments)

Fifty years ago, on January 17, 1961, President Dwight D. Eisenhower delivered his famous Farewell Address. The speech ranks, as Eisenhower intended it to, with Washington’s Farewell Address as a masterpiece of American rhetoric, of balance, and of prudent, far-seeing counsel. It is the fate of such masterpieces to be much quoted but seldom read. On this anniversary, therefore, before you read further, we encourage you to [read the speech](http://www.americanrhetoric.com/speeches/dwightdeisenhowerfarewell.html).

Nothing could be further from the truth than the popular myth, which still lingers, of Ike as casual president, more interest in the golf course than affairs of state. Like Reagan – it is curious how this myth is applied only to conservative presidents – Eisenhower had prepared long and well for the Oval Office. Like Reagan – and Washington – Ike was supported by great speechwriters but the words he spoke expressed his own thoughts.

Eisenhower’s guiding vision in his Address, indeed in his presidency, was the need for balance. Deeply aware of the threat posed by Communism, and the Soviet Union, he wanted not only to meet the danger, but to ensure that the victory did not come at the cost of American liberty. He was concerned that the trend of the modern age – not simply because of the demands of the Cold War – was for the federal state to expand ceaselessly, and he regarded this as a danger to America’s ideals, as much as to its chances of victory in the Cold War.

It was easy, Eisenhower warned, to fall prey to “the recurring temptation to feel that some spectacular and costly action could become the miraculous solution to all current difficulties.” That was true in the realms of both foreign and domestic policy. But, he reminded us, “each proposal must be weighed in the light of a broader consideration: the need to maintain balance in and among national programs.”

There were many potential sources of imbalance. Not all of them related directly to the dangers of big government, though most did. Rather, Eisenhower’s guiding theme was the threats posed by top-down direction to freedom and self-government. One such danger was becoming “the captive of a scientific-technological elite.” Another was “mortgaging the materials assets of our grandchildren” and thus “risking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage” to “insolvent phantoms[s].”[[1]](#footnote-1) Yet another was the domination of scientific scholarship by government contracts. It was in this context of examining the many potential dangers that Eisenhower referred to another possible imbalance: the “acquisition of unwarranted influence . . . by the military-industrial complex.”

Rarely has a sober warning of a possible danger been so quoted out of context. Having spent most of his life serving his nation, and the world, in the Army, and having just stated that the U.S. armed forces were “a vital element in keeping the peace . . . [which reflected an] imperative need,” Eisenhower was clearly not making a despairing confession of the power of sinister forces against which he had struggled in vain. He was reflecting that, in the face of threats and stress, the government needed to respond in balanced ways. As he noted, “the record of many decades stands as proof that our people and their Government have, in the main, understood these truths.”

This was a noble speech, and the mature reflection of a great national servant. It harkened back, deliberately, to [Washington’s Address](http://avalon.law.yale.edu/18th_century/washing.asp), not just as a final words of a general who served in the Oval Office, but to Washington’s thought. Washington, too, called on Americans to recognize that “the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing.”

What Washington called prudence, Eisenhower described as balance, but the spirit behind the thought was the same. Washington’s policy, like Eisenhower’s, rested on a firm commitment to American liberties and sovereignty, and a mature recognition that the federal government itself was at once the means to preserve these liberties, and a possible threat to them. As Marion Smith [states](http://www.heritage.org/Research/Reports/2010/11/What-Is-America-s-Role-in-the-World) in his essay on American leadership in Heritage’s Understanding America series:

*Washington recognized that there are no easy answers to the hard questions of foreign policy. A policy based only on interests would do violence to America’s ideals, while a policy based only on ideals would ignore the realities of the world. Therefore, the Founders sought to apply America’s principles, which define its sense of justice, to the circumstances of the day. This prudent approach is essential to securing the blessings of liberty for the American people in a complex and sometimes hostile world.*

As my colleague James Carafano [points out](http://washingtonexaminer.com/opinion/columnists/2011/01/james-jay-carafano-ikes-dilemma-obamas-disaster), Eisenhower was both right and wrong. The U.S. today spends far less, either as a share of GDP or as a proportion of the federal budget, on defense than it did in 1961. The largest corporation that is primarily a defense contractor checks in at number 44 on the Fortune list. In 1961, Eisenhower noted that the U.S. had 3.5 million men and women (in a nation of 189 million) under arms; today, it has about 1.5 million, in a nation of over 300 million. The U.S. now has many fewer bases, at home and abroad, than it did in 1961, and many of the large countries that the U.S. was responsible for garrisoning – including all of Western Europe – in Eisenhower’s day now have few U.S. troops and are far down the list of U.S. security concerns. By any measure, the “military-industrial complex” is vastly smaller today than it was in 1961.

This is mostly because of the one development Eisenhower did not anticipate. He believed that “Unhappily, the danger [Communism] poses promises to be of indefinite duration.” It would have astonished Ike to have been told that the Soviet Union would collapse only thirty years after his speech. That victory had many results, but one of them was the “military-industrial complex,” already much diminished from 1961, shrunk radically in the 1990s.

That, of course, does not stop the Left from banging on about its dangers. Too bad they don’t read the speech. For the case Eisenhower was making was not that defense spending is dangerous. Indeed, he said it was vitally necessary – and today, he would point out that cuts in defense spending are unbalanced, and pose dangers of their own. He was arguing that undemocratic direction from above, especially if directed by big and bureaucratic government, is dangerous. It was top-down control – not the possession and funding of armed forces that reflect the needs and threats of the day – that Eisenhower found threatening. He was concerned partly it poses the danger of national insolvency – a danger that is all too real today – but fundamentally because it threatened the “the supreme goals of our free society.” And that is a risk that the Left is absolutely uninterested in acknowledging.

Amidst other similarities, both Eisenhower and Washington spoke of the need to avoid “the baneful effects of the spirit of party.” Taking inspiration from that thought, perhaps liberals and conservatives can find agreement in Eisenhower’s Farewell Speech.[[2]](#footnote-2) Conservatives can recognize, as they already do, that “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.” For their part, liberals can acknowledge that, as a “free and religious people,” Americans must seek “balance between the clearly necessary and the comfortably desirable, balance between our essential national requirements as a nation and the duties imposed by the nation on the individual.”

In an era when the Federal Government is vastly larger and more intrusive than it was in Eisenhower’s day, such an acknowledgement would move us far towards the conservative vision for American leadership, strength, and liberty that Eisenhower’s Address embodied.

# [Ted Bromund](http://dailysignal.com/author/tbromund/)

Ted R. Bromund, Ph.D., is the Margaret Thatcher senior research fellow at The Heritage Foundation. [Read his research.](http://www.heritage.org/about/staff/b/theodore-bromund)

**Another Academic Field that’s Become a One Party State**

by GEORGE LEEF March 4, 2015 10:20 AM George Mason University economics professor Daniel Klein has written about the phenomenon of groupthink in higher education. That is to say, the tendency for disciplines to get “captured” by a certain outlook and become hostile to scholars who are, as the Maoists would have said, “deviationists.” One of the fields where that has occurred is industrial relations (IR). In today’s Pope Center Clarion Call, Brooklyn College professor Mitchell Langbert discusses the way that discipline, once open to a wide array of perspectives, has over the decades turned into a one party state. The departments, journals, and scholarly societies are now only interested in people who favor unionism and government intervention. Those who argue that free markets would be better are persona non grata. “The ideological litmus tests in the Labor and Employment Relations Association and in the two leading journals,” he writes, “have direct practical effects because most leading business schools and other academic departments that sponsor IR programs will refuse to hire anyone who does not publish in those venues.” The way IR has become closed to non-leftist thinking is quite similar to the field of social psychology and Langbert draws the parallel between the two, citing our recent piece on social psychology by Professor Richard Redding. Just as social psychology hurts itself by shunning scholars who don’t toe the leftist line, so also with IR. Langbert observes, “IR is the logical venue for academic discussions of public policy and business strategy concerning the organization of employment systems. These might include the adoption of enterprise unions, the innovation of new forms of unionism not linked to the employment relationship, and the development of new forms of employment relationship.” Unfortunately, teaching and scholarship along such non-interventionist lines is very hard to find due to the groupthink that dominates in IR. Langbert closes on a somewhat optimistic note: He has managed to get the LERA to include a panel discussion about its one-sidedness in its next annual meeting in May. Will anything good come of that? The Pope Center will let you know.

Read more at: <http://www.nationalreview.com/phi-beta-cons/414832/another-academic-field-thats-become-one-party-state-george-leef>

1. “ not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow” [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. [Despite substantial Right Wing <-> Left Wing bias leaking through (e.g., "Too bad they don't read the speech."), Bromund’s essay is actually a pretty creditable effort to report what Eisenhower actually appears, from his words and text, to have been saying in his farewell address. –Ed] [↑](#footnote-ref-2)