

Eisenhower Warned of ‘Scientific-Technological Elite’ Coup in Farewell Speech

By [Ben Bartee](#)

Global Research, April 18, 2022

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [History](#)

All Global Research articles can be read in 51 languages by activating the “Translate Website” drop down menu on the top banner of our home page (Desktop version).

To receive Global Research’s Daily Newsletter (selected articles), [click here](#).

Visit and follow us on [Instagram](#), [Twitter](#) and [Facebook](#). Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

Once-overlooked prescient warnings, conveyed through black-and-white grainy footage, reach through history like that dead girl in Carrie. They haunt all the more forcefully given the foresight it took to make them.

We’ve all heard of the military-industrial complex (MIC) – the escalating intertwining of the national security apparatus and the private weapons industry. It produces an irresistible economic/political incentive for reckless, endless war.

Its characteristics are unique in many ways, but in others, the MIC is merely another iteration of the essential problem of intersecting corporate and state interests — their chief mutual interest being the accumulation of greater and greater concentrations of power for themselves.

Mussolini described the phenomenon like this in the early 20th century:

“Fascism should more appropriately be called Corporatism because it is a merger of state and corporate power.”

-Benito Mussolini

The gears of private industry are lavishly oiled with public money. In turn, the public decision-makers (bureaucrats), who are theoretically tasked with acting in the public’s interests, receive innumerable benefits — both while in office and especially after leaving, including appointments to lucrative board positions, gifted stock options, etc.

Interests across the two domains (state and private sector) – which theoretically remain separate in liberal ideology — become so intertwined that distinguishing one from the other is impossible.

To set the context of the MIC’s inaugural insertion into public consciousness, in 1961, the United States had just recently risen over the ashes of war-ravaged Europe to claim the

throne as the global hegemon.

The industrial-scale arms industry remained a relatively new advent, and so the MIC was largely a new phenomenon in human history. If all of its elements weren't entirely new, the MIC was at least a *new incarnation* of the inherent and ancient issue of state usurpation of power by private interests for personal and in-group gain.

Eisenhower introduced the MIC into the American psyche, coining the term in his farewell address from the Oval Office:

Via the president's [January 17, 1961 farewell speech](#):

"This conjunction of an immense military establishment and a large arms industry is new in the American experience. . . . Yet we must not fail to comprehend its grave implications. . . . 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've previously covered the most recent glaring example of the MIC in action](#) - US generals dutifully crying on television about the Afghanistan pullout. Their defense industry sponsors/owners directed them to fear-monger about ending a 20-year losing war - to keep the gravy train rolling, for at least another year - and they complied.

The Afghanistan war, incidentally, produced no tangible outcome of value for any American except the defense contractors who paid Jack Keane to promote it on cable news. Defense contractors, in addition to buying spokesmen like Keane, also purchase advertising on said corporate media channel in exchange for war propaganda that favors healthy stock prices.

It's all very incestuous, and, at the core, it's all funded at the public's expense via the US treasury.

As we will see — as Eisenhower explains himself in the portion of the speech that often goes overlooked in favor of the famous line about the MIC — the same types of public-private mechanisms are currently playing out in the biomedical context:

"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.**

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.

The prospect of domination of the nation's scholars by Federal employment, project allocations, and the power of money is ever present—and is gravely to be regarded.

Yet, in holding scientific research and 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.**"

If you've been paying attention to the last two years' events, that excerpt should send shivers down your spine.

The MIC and the biomedical state - administered by the "scientific-technological elite" — are a single entity. They're one and the same, different feathers of the same bird. They each conduct the business of technocratic social management in their own way. One produces kinetic and chemical weaponry; the other, biological weaponry.

Their methods differ, but their interests are the same.

Here's a case study:

EcoHealth Alliance tried to entice DARPA - the scientific arm of the Pentagon — to join in on the same Wuhan coronavirus gain-of-function that the organization illicitly conducted in China in partnership with the CCP. (EcoHealth Alliance being the organization Fauci funneled government money to for gain-of-function research in that same Chinese WIV government-run lab.)

Via [DRASTIC Research](#):

"EcoHealth Alliance (EHA) in concert with the Wuhan Institute of Virology (WIV) attempted to carry out advanced and dangerous human pathogenicity Bat Coronavirus research that would clearly qualify as Gain of Function (GoF), in a grant proposal submitted to the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) in 2018."

What we're looking at is a transnational, public-private grant proposal involving multiple state and private actors collaborating to engineer deadly new viruses.

The application actually proposed spraying aerosolized viruses into wild bat caves - *just to see what happened*:

"The grant proposal includes some elements of research that are already public via scientific papers, as well as other elements that have never been made public, including **vaccinating wild bats using aerosolized viruses** and further work on published and unpublished strains that could have directly produced SARS-CoV-2."

The Pentagon apparently, according to the leaked documents, shot down the proposal - not on the grounds that this was a ludicrous and dangerous project, and, in practice, would constitute an act of war against China, but on a technicality.

Two years later, by mere coincidence, if you believe the official narrative, a deadly bat

coronavirus naturally emerged from a Wuhan wet market – the exact type of virus that EcoHealth Alliance proposed spraying into the wild in the exact geographical area.

Whether DARPA was involved or not in the eventual release of SARS-CoV-2 into the wild is largely irrelevant for this point. The mere fact that Peter Daszak, Fauci and Co. knew this kind of activity to be in DARPA's wheelhouse demonstrates the deep ties between the various arms of the now-transnational biomedical technocratic complex.

Eisenhower's warning from six decades ago begs the question: what are the prescient warnings offered today that coming generations will look back on in awe?

*

Note to readers: Please click the share buttons above or below. Follow us on Instagram, Twitter and Facebook. Feel free to repost and share widely Global Research articles.

This article was originally published on [The Daily Bell](#).

Ben Bartee is a Bangkok-based American journalist with opposable thumbs. Follow his stuff via [Armageddon Prose](#), [Substack](#), [Patreon](#), [Gab](#), and [Twitter](#). Please support his independent operations however you can.

Featured image: President Dwight D. Eisenhower (National Archives)

The original source of this article is Global Research
Copyright © [Ben Bartee](#), Global Research, 2022

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Ben Bartee](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca
www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca