base housing, medical and dental care, maternity leave, commissary and PX privileges, and travel to new stations in the United States and overseas. In the early twenty-first century, the Department of Defense announced intentions to improve families’ access to child care facilities and employment for civilian spouses. Many families appreciated opportunities to travel and live in a variety of locations in the United States and abroad. Despite concerns that children in military families would suffer scholastically from the relocations that are a part of military life, comparisons between students who attended civilian schools and those who attended Department of Defense schools for dependents revealed that pupils who attended the latter fared well on assessment examinations, testing above national averages. Sociological studies have asserted that the experience of living abroad improved children’s self-confidence and their acquisition of new languages.

Military life offered challenges to families as well as benefits. In the latter part of the twentieth century, advocates for military families became more vocal in their demands that the military provide services to help families cope with the hardships of military life. Such difficulties included lower earnings for military families, as compared to the civilian sector; long waiting periods for on-base housing and inadequate allowances for civilian housing; the strains caused by the absences of spouses on military missions, and the difficulties of readjustment upon return; and the secrecy surrounding the whereabouts and activities of deployed service members. Many spouses, especially those married to enlisted personnel, complained of feelings of isolation, exacerbated by separation from birth families and frequent relocations. Because homosexuality was considered grounds for discharge, gay and lesbian personnel were forced to hide their same-sex relationships. Some observers contended that domestic violence was more likely to occur in military families than in the civilian population, although it was not clear that this was the case. Although the military has increased its efforts to make services available to assist families, family members and their advocates complained that they continued to receive inadequate attention from military officials, and from the public at large.
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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” (Eisenhower, “Farewell Address”). Eisenhower feared that the military-industrial complex would promote an arm’s race for its own profit, and that this race would weaken U.S. society by diverting funds to military use and lead to war, as arms races in the past had done.

The American military-industrial complex was a post-World War II phenomenon. The temporary centralization and conversion of civilian industries to war-making purposes had occurred during the World Wars I and II. In both instances, companies retooled to meet military needs, but with demobilization they eventually returned to peacetime production. The advent of the Cold War, particularly the drafting of National Security Council Paper Number 68 (NSC #68) in 1950, reversed this process. NSC #68 created a permanent defense establishment with a vastly expanded military budget that at its peak accounted for nearly one-tenth of the gross domestic product (GDP). With billions of federal dollars being pumped into weapons programs, the aerospace, computer, and communications industries turned out products for military purposes that only later found civilian applications. Cellular phones and e-mail, for instance, are military technologies that filtered into civilian society.

National security largesse subsidized numerous corporations, particularly in the aerospace industry, which produced warplanes and missiles; these corporations included Lockheed, Convair, Grumman, General Dynamics, McDonnell, Pratt and Whitney, and North American Aviation. Other corporations benefiting from government contracts included munitions juggernaut DuPont, computer titan IBM, and jet engine-maker General Electric. During the four-decades-long Cold War, as defense contracts were repeatedly awarded to major companies with the ability to fill them efficiently, industrial capacity was centralized. By 1968, the top 100 American companies held nearly half of all manufacturing assets (Hooks, 212). The military-industrial complex even penetrated leading U.S. universities, funding academic research and scientific projects with military applications. By the 1980s, an estimated 6 million Americans worked for the nation’s defense establishment.

The Pentagon became a large landlord to defense firms and an insatiable consumer of their products. For instance, between 1952 and 1956 the Department of Defense owned more than 60 percent of all aeronautics plants and equipment. Between 1960 and 1973, the period spanning U.S. intervention in Vietnam, the Pentagon consumed 77 percent of all U.S. ordnance output; 72 percent of aeronautics production; 39 percent of radio, television, and communications equipment; 34 percent of all electronics components; and 26 percent of transportation equipment (Hooks, 257). Defense spending spurred the development of what came to be called the “gun belt” of armaments-related industries, which stretched from Connecticut and the Atlantic Coast through the Southwest. California and Texas, where large military bases, weapons testing facilities, and major defense contractors were located, developed enhanced political power. Politicians from these states sought key posts on congressional committees that set defense expenditures. An iron triangle linked congressional panels with the armed services and defense firms.

Several themes animated the debate about the military-industrial complex. Some observers described the phenomenon as military Keynesianism, in which steady spending on defense stabilized the American economy. Critics charged that although this softened dips in the business cycle it also led to massive deficits, which threatened the nation’s long-term economic health. Others argued that unchecked defense spending neglected vital facets of American society, including education, health care, and urban renewal. When the Vietnam War began to suck dollars out of President Lyndon Johnson’s Great Society reforms, Americans debated whether they really could have both guns and butter. Profiteering and cost overruns stoked public ire in the 1970s and 1980s when it was revealed that the cost of basic items such as hammers and screws procured through defense contracts exceeded by a hundredfold the price of similar items at the local hardware store.

By the early 1990s, after the fall of the Soviet Union, the military-industrial complex receded from popular consciousness. By 1999, in the absence of the Soviet threat, American defense expenditures shrank to 3 percent of the GDP. But with the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, and two successive wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, defense spending rose beyond $400 billion in the 2004 budget. The headlong pursuit of homeland security renewed concerns that the influence of a reinvigorated military-industrial-national security complex would be an enduring facet of American life well into the twenty-first century.
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MULTICULTURALISM AND THE COLD WAR

America’s role in the Cold War led the nation to pursue policies that eventually resulted in the rise of multiculturalism. This trend has had an increasing impact on American society.

“Multiculturalism” has several meanings. At the minimum it means acceptance of people from different backgrounds. As used by scholars it has been associated with liberals and progressives on college campuses, to whom it means inclusion of people who have been “disempowered” through the control of public discussion by those who have had power. In general, multiculturalism supports diversity and the principle that no particular group should be privileged. Multiculturalists favor the metaphor of “mosaic” or “tossed salad” over “melting pot” as a means of conceptualizing their ideal of American society and culture. A mosaic is an art form in which various elements blend while maintaining their identities, whereas in a melting pot blended elements lose their identities.

During the Cold War America built upon its tradition of sheltering refugees, many of whom were victims of communism. Winston Churchill proclaimed the start of the Cold War in a speech in 1946 in Missouri, drawing eloquently on the American ideological self-image. His image of an iron curtain concisely encapsulated a picture of a world divided into two clear sides by a type of war—a “cold” war because there was no shooting. He echoed the American frontier experience in which a line between good and evil was clear.

In the Cold War era, due to increasing disapproval of racism in America, ethnicity became a dominant basis for identifying difference, replacing race and class as an explanation for dysfunctionality. European immigrants, the thinking went, were assimilated. African Americans had not yet been assimilated. The new Cold War immigrants such as Cubans and Asians, however, tended to be more difficult to assimilate. To combat the assimilationist model an ideal of America as a pluralist and multi-ethnic society came to the fore, reinforcing political views that emphasized identity and self-affirmation. Ethnic groups became political action groups, exemplified by African Americans, Hispanics and Asian-Americans. Culture wars erupted, pitting these groups against proponents of a “common culture.”

Multiculturalism reacts against both positions. While not disavowing ethnicity, it seeks to separate politics from ethnic group formation; and it opposes the political oppression of minorities fostered by a common culture. Multiculturalism calls on people to transcend differences and to glory in diversity.

Cold War policy-makers and multiculturalists both played a part in promoting multiculturalism. For example, because of Castro’s ties to the Soviet Union, 1.5 million Cubans fled to the United States after 1959. These Cuban-Americans gained an influence on American foreign policy, especially in regard to Latin America. They simultaneously became deeply involved in arguments about diversity and multiculturalism, as the Spanish language and Cuban culture came to predominate in parts of southern Florida. Similarly, Vietnamese, Chinese, Laotians, Hmong, and others who sought refuge from Communist regimes have fought to maintain their language and culture, aided both by multiculturalists and by the legacy of the Cold War.
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MUSIC, MUSICIANS, AND THE WAR ON TERRORISM

The Bush Administration’s vaguely defined war on terrorism, stemming from the devastating attacks on Septem-