







[Fall 2010](#) ► [HST 195 F10 \(Escobar META 21581 24392\)](#) ► [Forums](#) ► [Forum 3 Past Week's Discussions](#) ► [Vietnamization](#)



**Vietnamization**  
 by [Joe Escobar](#) - Tuesday, 23 November 2010, 01:40 PM

- What problems surfaced to hamper efforts to conclude the war?
- Was President Nixon right in de-coupling Vietnamization and American troop withdrawals from negotiations or were the two strategies essential complements to each other?
- Similar to the accounts you've read in the Appy book, what effect do the statements made by former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara (from the 2003 documentary film Fog of War) have on your understanding of the war?
- What if LBJ or Nixon were still alive and had been filmed in a documentary similar to Fog of War? Would they be able to add to our understanding of the war? **(Be very careful on this one... Did you really learn \*anything\* from McNamara in the video? Why would you expect to learn more from a former president after the fact? Think Clinton. Think Bush.)**

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

When addressing the questions, put something descriptive like "Problems", "Nixons Strategy", or "Robert McNamara" in the subject line of your post. DO NOT leave the subject line of your posts unchanged.

[Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



**"Robert McNamara"**  
 by [Spencer Smith](#) - Tuesday, 23 November 2010, 02:28 AM

The most intriguing thing that McNamara shared was how differently he and the Prime Minister of Vietnam viewed the war as a whole. They were two people looking at the same thing, but seeing it completely differently. He mentioned that the North Vietnamese believed we had replaced the French as a colonial power. He saw it as an element of the Cold War. He also revealed that the North Vietnamese were fighting for their independence, and believed that we were fighting to enslave them. This is a very important lesson. Leaders must communicate effectively to ensure that no unnecessary casualties occur.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



**Re: "Robert McNamara"**  
 by [Kristin Maurer](#) - Friday, 26 November 2010, 11:30 AM

Spencer,

Totally! maybe if the leaders of the countries communicated a little more, than maybe we wouldn't have has so much paranoia and confusion. Maybe there never would have been a war... who knows.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



**Re: "Robert McNamara"**  
 by [Jolene Powell](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 03:12 AM

I totally agree! This war was outright silly. The left foot knows nothing of the right foot. Its like interpreters did not exist.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

**Re: "Robert McNamara"**by [Jared Hall](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 05:35 PM

I agree that communication is key but it's difficult to accomplish. Even if you're able to communicate your ambitions, you still have to make them believe you. It's very difficult when you're contradicting, what is essentially, their fellow countryman.

Even today, with all the advancements in technology, the US is having difficulty communicating to the population in Afghanistan.

[http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE6AI2OX20101119?utm\\_source=feedburner&utm\\_medium=feed&utm\\_campaign=Feed%3A+reuters%2FtopNews+%28News+%2F+US+%2F+Top+News%29](http://www.reuters.com/article/idUSTRE6AI2OX20101119?utm_source=feedburner&utm_medium=feed&utm_campaign=Feed%3A+reuters%2FtopNews+%28News+%2F+US+%2F+Top+News%29)

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: "Robert McNamara"**by [Justin Powell](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 08:37 AM

I agree 100%, to be honest, our country and any country for that matter should be ran like a good realationship. Open and honest communication, without that you have nothing but confusion and arguments that could have been avoided. If all the leaders would have had that, i dont think we would have been in this war as long as we did or even at all.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: "Robert McNamara"**by [Jason Carlstrom](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 06:34 PM

thats what i thought was really strange how both were fighting each other for different reasons but didnt realize it. makes you think what could have been the Vietnam war if they understood each other.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: "Robert McNamara"**by [Shellea Montgomery](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 06:43 PM

Very true I feel the same way, I think these were excellent lessons only if leaders of today would revisit and try to learn from past mistakes!

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Robert McNamara**by [Kyle Hutton](#) - Tuesday, 23 November 2010, 01:41 PM

I agree with Spencer in that i think the most interesting thing for me from the McNamara interview was the different viewpoints of the war by the two different sides. Maybe if we had communicated better, most, if not all, of the bloodshed could have been avoided, a long with our time/resources/soldiers lost. When McNamara went on the topic of the laws for what chemicals we can use in combat,(in regards to agent orange), he had said "we don't have clear definitions of that kind". I hadn't realized that what didn't have set laws for what we can/cannot use in combat, and makes me think that a lot of times during war our enemies are just "test dummies" for our new chemicals/weapons. I mean sure we test them on other things, but i don't think they will know the true effect, until they are used on their intended target. As for when McNamara talks about how "you cant change human nature." I agree but also disagree with this. Human Nature response is fight or flight. As a Nation, for us to choose "flight" every time, would open us up, and show we are weak. But to choose "fight" each time is something we cannot do either, we need to choose our battles, And I think Nam was a battle we should not have resorted to fighting(War) in. I don't think Human Nature can change overnight, but we slowly need to start working towards changing how we approach things, because every time we are faced with a world problem, we cannot go into it all War happy to try and solve it. We need to slowly progress into negotiating more, and yes i know we negotiate now, but maybe we need to be a little more open and willing to compromise more to avoid going to war altogether?

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: Robert McNamara**by [Jolene Powell](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 01:47 PM

Very well put Kyle. I agree completely with the "fight or flight" theory you have. I think as a nation we have progressed a lot in the sense I do not think if Vietnam was at this moment, we would approach it nearly the same. Or I would like to think not.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Problems Concluding the War**by [Tony Francisco](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 01:48 AM

Near the end of the war there were multiple issues that hindered the actual ending of the war. Of all of the issues, some stand apart from the rest: Nixon's paranoia in office, Nixon's changing policy on the war, and the lack of ability for both sides to meet in the middle, rank, for me, prominently as the most important hinders.

Nixon entered his term in office optimistic about not repeating the mistakes of the presidents before him, but instead escalated a nonsensical war for peace. His growing paranoia of the communist threat and even his own government, created a sense of distrust, confusion, and strife in the majority of his political actions. Shrouded in secrecy, Nixon ordered heavy bombing attacks on North Vietnamese retreats in Cambodia that President Johnson had rejected during his term. This attack was meant to impress onto the Vietnamese the severity with which the United States would be acting. Information on the attacks was leaked to the New York Times and to this day the number of civilian deaths amongst the Cambodians will never be known. The Vietnamese were unwilling to give in to Nixon's military threats as his proposals differed only marginally from Johnsons with little to no improvement.

The U.S. and North Vietnam's inability to come to agreement was mutual on both sides. The president, facing growing opposition at home for the war, was under more pressure than ever to solve the Vietnam crisis; the north was unwilling to come to an agreement in the formal Paris talks, leaving both sides to meet in a series of secret meetings. Both sides were still unwilling to make the concessions necessary to end the war at that point. Unable to affect the north directly enough through increased bombing, this left Nixon scrambling for a new strategy.

Nixon entered into office with the idea that he would be able to end the war through honorable withdrawel, but when he was unable to force the concessions he required out of the north he turned again to Johnson's plan for Vietnamization. In the beginning the south was angered at the idea that only now the war was turning to "Vietnamization" when the south had been fighting for years and years before America became involved. The military in the south increased to over one million Vietnamese, and the United States donated millions of the newest weapons available to the cause. By early 1970 the ARVN had started to really get its act together presumably as it had realized that the U.S. was pulling out support units and that slack had to be taken up somewhere. On the other hand, actual progress being made during this time was hard to measure as corruption ran rampant throughout the South Vietnamese government.

The U.S. faced numerous obstacles in ending the war but I feel none more important the nailing down a strategy that would for sure work towards ending the war. Nixon's paranoia in office lead to his eventual downfall and confusing times during the war itself and lastly the lack of give-and-take from both sides on the negotiating table stretched out the war much longer than was necessary. Who is to say what would have happened if Nixon had went straight into Vietnamization instead of "withdrawing with honor"? Or if both sides were more willing to negotiate without the paranoia of cold war influences hanging over the table? I feel like these are key hindrances to the ending of the war.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: Problems Concluding the War**by [Molly Graham](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 04:17 PM

I think you picked out some of the key difficulties in coming to the conclusion of the war. It seems that Nixon's personal faults of being extremely paranoid really hindered a lot of progress in terms of the war and our policy toward it. Like you said, he didn't even trust his own men. It sounds like he had some serious personal issues he should have sought help for and perhaps should not have been entrusted with the fate of our country.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: Problems Concluding the War**by [Spencer Smith](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 04:33 PM

Nixon ended the war. He didn't escalate it. If you look at how many troops were being deployed throughout his presidency the number drastically decreased every year. The number of americans killed decreased. The war in general was slowly but surely ending throughout his time as president. I understand that this is an unpopular opinion for anyone to have, because Nixon was an unpopular president, but he did end the war.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### Robert McNamara

by [Jolene Powell](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 01:43 PM

The thing that does stand out the most was said best. The leaders and decision makers were on completely different pages. The real lack of communication caused way more harm then good.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### Re: Vietnamization

by [Jason Carlstrom](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 01:45 PM

I feel vietnamazation and US troop withdraws worked together. In Herring 283 it tells how much supplies was given to the South Vietnam in a frantic attempt to build up and modernize them. Also to build the moral they boosted the pay rate, promotions, and benefits. All this help that was like a "spoiling" tactic was paying off because the South was fighting well and was controlling most of the countryside. With all this happening the North couldn't recruit like they have been which made the South even stronger.

Fog of War was a good video to watch and I basically took from it that there was a huge misunderstanding between America, Russia, and Vietnam. Russia saw America as a replacement of French power and wanted to subject them to our ways. North Vietnam was after freedom and really didn't want anything to do with China and Russia, but we saw it as a Cold War with the threat of nuclear weapons. The views of each side were very different and that most likely led to why the Vietnam war is so confusing.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### Nixon and Vietnamizing

by [Kristin Maurer](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 03:12 PM

Vietnamization was long overdue in my opinion. With the past presidents, training of the South Vietnamese always seemed to be put on the back burner so to speak. The US troops were always stepping in to fight the battles because the South showed too much weakness to fight. It was kind of this ongoing circle of us having to step in. I think that Vietnamizing was hard at first, for them to break away from our tactics in fighting the war. On disk three- Vietnamizing the War, it shows that in a battle at Quang Tri (forgive the spelling,) the last enemy hold out, was one of the biggest, bloodiest battles yet. Over 5,000 Vietnamese died, but no American casualties. They fought their own battle. It made the South's morale go up and much more confident that they could do it with out the Americans. And for America, we did not have to step in, and we did not have to have any American casualties. With the south being confident enough to fight there own battles, they did not need as much assistance (as far as fighting goes,) so we could pull out some of our troops to be sent home.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### Re: Nixon and Vietnamizing

by [Spencer Smith](#) - Thursday, 25 November 2010, 06:24 AM

Vietnamization was very much overdue. One could learn a very valuable lesson with that one fact. The longer the U.S. fought their war for them, the harder it became to pull out. The responsibily of the war was on the shoulders of the U.S. from the very beginning.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... **Re: Nixon and Vietnamizing**by [Deanna Middlestetter](#) - Friday, 26 November 2010, 11:37 PM

I agree with this. As I understand it this war was based mostly on politics.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... **Re: Nixon and Vietnamizing**by [Jolene Powell](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 03:13 AM

Ya we fought a war that had nothing to do with us. We had no reason to interfere.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... **Re: Nixon and Vietnamizing**by [Tony Francisco](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 01:01 PM

I fully agree with all of the points that you are making and the points of all of the responses that you have gotten. Many people find it hard to draw the line at where political responsibility for one of the world's superpowers end and where it is imperialism. I feel like the South never should have had us step in to fight their battles for them. Material and money is acceptable to give but if we had started off by teaching the South what we ended up teaching them later, there is no knowing how different the war would have been for us. I personally gravitate towards isolationist points of view as I feel that we are not the kings of the world, so I definitely am a little biased in that area.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... **Re: Nixon and Vietnamizing**by [Jason Carlstrom](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 06:54 PM

i agree it was time for the South to take the lead and should have been from the start. its just from the beginning i read stories where the South didnt have the will to fight hard. The US gave them so much supplies and equipment and new benefits to modernize them and they took charge.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... **Problems**by [Kristin Maurer](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 03:33 PM

The South Vietnamese could not understand or comprehend that the Americans could just pull out after spending so much money, time, and all the lives lost. They began to retaliate in ways. The U.S government tried to issue a cease-fire agreement that did not go over very well in Saigon. President Thieu refused to sign and told his troops to keep fighting. On page 277, in Herring, it shows that the North refused any kind of agreement unless America would pull out all together and a new government would be established with out President Thieu. They thought that if they accepted, it would have been an abandonment of all their goals for which they have been fighting for nearly a quarter of a century. The Paris peace talks were making no movements forward. When this got back to America, the public approval of the president's handling of the war dropped significantly. More peace movements took place. With Nixon's paranoia, and anger, he thought that communists were driving the peace movements. He became obsessed with that and tried many means in stopping the peace movements. He also tried to threaten the North. He told them that if they did not accept agreements, than he would have no choice but to attack with full force. After long thought out debates, Nixon decided the only way to still look good and feel like we did not lose the war was by Vietnamizing the South to become strong enough to carry on the fight.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 

**Robert McNamara**by [Kristin Maurer](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 04:05 PM

The Fog of War- War is so complex. It's beyond the ability of the human mind to comprehend all the variables. This is what Robert states in the video. I am in total agreement. Throughout these weeks of learning about the war in Vietnam, I keep telling myself... I just cant fathom, or why did this happen, it makes no sense. There will always be questions as to why, and there might be answers, but I really don't think I will ever be able to fully understand. Mr. McNamara didn't answer if he felt guilty for the war, but he does state he feels guilty for things he may have authorized such as Agent Orange. He says that he never would have done that if he knew the consequences. He states that it's human nature, we all make mistakes.

When he went back to Vietnam and met with the former minister, there was still on both accounts misunderstandings and confusion. They were still arguing in a sense. It still has never been concluded and there are still two sides. I think that this will always be the case, we will never fully understand.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: Robert McNamara**by [Spencer Smith](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 04:18 PM

This complexity that McNamara talked about is why soldiers try to minimize war by saying things like, "its about the guys to the right and left of you" and why people say "support the troops." War is so complicated that people need something simple to latch on to so they can understand it and put it in perspective.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: Robert McNamara**by [Molly Graham](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 04:42 PM

I think the last part of what you said is very sad. Did we really fight an entire war, costly in both money and lives and perhaps credibility and respect, and yet decades later McNamara still cannot understand the most basic principals of why each side was fighting? I was hoping to hear in the interview that when they met up again they would be able to both approach the subject of war with a regret for immense loss. But, here we are, almost throwing punches (as McNamara said) because we were unable to take ourselves out of our own shoes and see the subject from those of someone from the other side. I thought that was ridiculous.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: Robert McNamara**by [Kyle Hutton](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 05:43 PM

I agree with you, the fact that this many years later, the two of them couldn't sit down and have a real talk about the war, and taking a look at both sides and both arguments for the war is just ridiculous. But it really shows the stubbornness of humans, and how stubborn we really can be. When we get it set in our minds that we are right, nothing is going to change that, not even time.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: Robert McNamara**by [Spencer Smith](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 07:00 PM

McNamara wasn't saying that he didn't understand the most basic principles of the war. In fact he's one of the few people that has actually met with leaders from the other side since the war, to talk about that fact. He was talking about the complexity of war, "the fog of war." He was talking about how there's so many factors that go into a war, that it's hard for any human being to really grasp. War isn't as simple as the Ducks vs. the Beavers. War is complex. That's why this class exists, because even if we studied Vietnam the rest of our lives we still wouldn't know everything.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... **Re: Robert McNamara**by [Shellea Montgomery](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 06:45 PM

I know we will never know why or really for what!? It is such a waste of life. If only we could turn back the hands of time and change all our bad decisions.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)Rate... **Re: Robert McNamara**by [Kristin Maurer](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 09:01 PM

Yes, although I understand about the Vietnam war now. I, and most of the world will still have unanswered questions.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)Rate... **Problems**by [Molly Graham](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 04:06 PM

Nixon and Kissinger would not end the war unless it was done so "honorably". It seems that this "honor" did not have anything to do with how we treated others, such as the South Vietnamese government, but instead with how we were viewed by China and Russia. Peace with honor meant not losing. The insistence to appear powerful at the war's conclusion definitely made it a bit trickier seeing as how we were fighting a losing battle.

The Paris peace talks between the United States and North Vietnam were slow in concluding the war. One of the reasons for this is that neither side was willing to back down. This mainly had to do with the United States' continued bombing of the North and their presence in Vietnam in general as well as the North Vietnamese's holding of American POWs. Another is that the United States was representing South Vietnam but really was not acting in their best interest. Because of the fact that the United States did not consult the South Vietnamese government about the issues they were discussing with the North, the South was very angry and would not sign various drafts of the agreements.

It was also argued, mainly by the administration, that the American public was hindering the conclusion of the war as their protests were giving hope to the North Vietnamese and preventing them from making steps in the Paris peace talks. Nixon would also blame his failings in regard to ending the war on Congress who were fighting against him and were even trying to revoke some of his privileges. However, this can hardly be a legitimate reason as Nixon worked secretly anyway and did not feel he needed approval from Congress to act.

What also did not help end the war was that Nixon escalated air attacks, expanding them to Cambodia and stepping them up in the North during such instances as the Christmas bombing of 1972. Nixon also decided to invade neighboring Laos in February of 1971. Instead of stepping back from the combat and seeking a peaceful conclusion, Nixon was in fact expanding the war against more countries.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)Rate... **Re: Problems**by [Tony Francisco](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 11:50 AM

I really like your final point and think that during a time when we are supposed to be withdrawing with honor it is incredibly ironic to be moving our attacks into other countries now.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)Rate... **Re: Problems**by [Spencer Smith](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 04:14 PM

The Vietnam War never had anything to do with how we treated other people. "Domino Theory" dictated our stance in south east asia. During the Cold War it was very important how we appeared to other countries. Nixon didn't have much of a choice to bomb the north in 72', they were not willing to negotiate anything and Nixon had to show that he would do what was needed to end the war with honor. The U.S. helped South Vietnam just about as much as it could. At some point countries need to take responsibility for themselves. Spending more and more money on South Vietnam was turning into a system of welfare, where they would never learn to do the job themselves as long as we were paying for everything.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



#### Re: Problems

by [Molly Graham](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 04:51 PM

We did not include the South in our negotiations with the North. We tried to force them into signing agreements that did not benefit them at all but only were beneficial to us. I thought that was treating them poorly and do not know how we can say that these actions were at all "honorable". I agree that we were spending way too much in South Vietnam. From the readings, I don't even know how much they even wanted us there. I mean, we made the decisions to invest so much on our own. We only deployed all of our ground troops after we had put our own ships into the enemy gulf and had most likely not been attacked at all during Tonkin. We kept diving deeper into this. In my opinion we further complicated a messy situation by increasingly getting ourselves involved.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



#### Re: Problems

by [Spencer Smith](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 07:05 PM

I'm not sure the South made it possible for us to include them in the negotiations. Both the North and the South made it difficult to reach any agreement. Sooner or later the U.S. had to do what was in its best interest or the war would have never ended.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



#### Re: Problems

by [Kyle Hutton](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 05:34 PM

What you didn't include about the bombing of Cambodia is that they asked for it! If i remember correctly, the Cambodia government asked for the bombing and it was in remote locations, meant to hit the Vietcong supply's, not the people of Cambodia. So could that really be considered an escalation when we were asked to do it? Let me see if i can find the page from the Appy book that they talk about that.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



#### If Nixon and LBJ were alive

by [Kristin Maurer](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 04:13 PM

If Nixon or LBJ were in a documentary explaining, I do not think I would truly get anything from it. My opinion is they would still stand behind what happened while they were presidents. They would not truly confess how they felt about the war, or the decisions they made. They would in my opinion defend any decision while being presidents of war. It would be too big of a statement for them to say, or to confess their feelings, or opinions. Just like McNamara, whatever they say, there would be controversy.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



#### Re: If Nixon and LBJ were alive

by [Jolene Powell](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 03:16 AM

Agreed. There is no way they would concede to any wrong doing. I think if this were present time we would make different decisions. I think we thought we were to mighty to be taken down by a little third world country.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### Robert McNamara

by [Molly Graham](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 07:01 PM

The excerpt from the documentary Fog of War of Robert McNamara has really not added to my knowledge of the Vietnam War. Most of what McNamara said was extremely vague. He made use of many quotes and expressions and one liners, but none of it was very revealing of the war or even very comprehensive. For example, he goes on in the last segment of the interview really not saying anything and being extremely elusive with statements such as "I'm not gonna say any more than I already have" or "I don't want to go into further discussion; it just opens up more controversy" or "I don't want to add anything to Vietnam; it is so complex and anything I say will require additions and qualifications." I was not really sure what he was getting at during a lot of the interview. The way in which he spoke, too, seemed to lack regret about his part in the war or just about the war in itself. He used a lot of hand expressions and raised his voice at times but he seemed incredibly disconnected from the situation.

I would say that the only thing he really seemed to shed any light on was the meeting between himself and Thieu in 1995. This showed the pain that still exists because of the war. It also sums up the central cause of the war; that the United States viewed Vietnam as "an element of the Cold War" while the Vietnamese viewed the United States' involvement as a wish to colonize.

I feel that the evasiveness of his interview and lack of regret that he showed was as apparent as it would have been if this interview had been conducted during the war itself. It was all very secretive. As far as if Johnson or Nixon were still alive and interviewed, I think it is hard to say if we would be able to gain any knowledge or perspective of the war or if it would have turned out like these excerpts with McNamara. Judging by what I know of the characters of the two men, I would think that we would have a better chance of learning about the war from Johnson as Nixon was extremely paranoid and seemed to be able to cover up anything in order to cover himself. However, Johnson was also extremely emotionally invested and haunted by the war and maybe this would have caused him to be closed mouth about it as well.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### Re: Robert McNamara

by [Kristin Maurer](#) - Friday, 26 November 2010, 11:22 AM

Molly, I agree with your statements. I especially agree with your last paragraph. I do believe Johnson would definately be more sensitive, but I think that he would never show it. He (just like McNamara) would just say he can't make any statements with out controversy. He would most likely defend the decisions he made, but by not giving us real evidence for his defense.... Classified.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### Problems that hampered the conclusion of the war.

by [Jared Hall](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 07:39 PM

The problems which hampered the efforts to conclude the war were: North Vietnam's determination to win, the United State's weak bargaining position and South Vietnam's refusal of key points in the peace agreement.

Northern Vietnam's determination to win caused the talks to break down whenever the tides of war were in their favor. During the North's invasion in 1972, the North stopped negotiating when it appeared like the offensive may win the war. After the offensive failed the secret negotiations between Le Duc Tho and Kissinger made significant progress.

America's unfavorable political environment along with the desire to exit the war hurt their bargaining position. This weak position gave the North hope to win the war by dragging it on. It wasn't until America's improved relationship with the North's allies held up to America's escalation that the North was more willing to make concessions. This is another

reason Le Duc Tho's and Kissinger's negotiation was making progress.

The South initially refused the peace agreement because of proposals like allowing the North's soldiers to remain in the South. It wasn't until added support for the South, the Christmas bombing and pressure from the United States that the South signed.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### Problems

by [Spencer Little](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 07:39 PM

One of the problems to end the war came from the Southern Vietnamese. The United States and North Vietnam agreed to terms in the fall of 1972, but the deal was killed by Southern Vietnamese president Nguyen Van Thieu. Van Thieu felt left out of negotiations and would not agree to letting Northern soldiers stay in South Vietnam after the war. It is ironic that Van Thieu was the one to hold up negotiations and keep the war going because the ARVN troops had not been competent the entire duration of the war. For example, in the attempt to give the ARVN a bigger role in the war, the US sent 15000 ARVN troops to invade Laos in 1971. They were supported by the US with armor, air support and equipment but were routed by Northern troops. They ran from the battle clinging to the rails of helicopters, leaving behind borrowed tanks and their pride.

After Van Thieu's objections, peace talks ceased. Nixon went on to deliver a massive ten day air strike on the cities of Hanoi and Haiphong, which seemed like punishment for North for failing to be able to come to terms.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### Re: Problems

by [Kristin Maurer](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 09:05 PM

So true. At the beginning of learning this, I thought it was the start of the war being stopped when in fact it got worse in a way. Nixon went crazy on Laos as well. Attacked different parts that shouldn't have been involved at all. More people suffering from this war.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### Nixon's Strategy

by [Molly Graham](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 07:49 PM

The policy of Vietnamization and the decision to withdraw American troops were very much connected. However, I think that at the time it was made to be believed that the decrease in American troops was a result of the policy of Vietnamization. It was as if to say that to give the war back to the South Vietnamese, we must also take out our men as they are making the ARVN feel inferior and worthless in comparison.

However, I believe Vietnamization as a policy was more a result of the fact that Nixon wanted to bring the troops home in order to get the protesters off his back. To be able to withdraw U.S. troops and not entirely fail the South Vietnamese, or more importantly our reputation of course, a policy such as Vietnamization had to be set in place. If we could no longer offer our fighting soldiers, we had to continue support for a while by supplying the South with the necessary tools to fight.

We also needed a policy such as Vietnamization to coincide with our pulling out of troops which Nixon used to negotiate with the North Vietnamese. It is true that we "lost" by having to pick up and go home but this is what Nixon had been pressured to do throughout his entire presidency by not only a majority of the citizens of the United States but also by Congress and many of his peers. Maybe it came to him as a relief. The people that were really hurt through the policy of Vietnamization and our decision to withdraw our troops were the South Vietnamese. Not only were they being forced to concede to the North on numerous other fronts but they were also losing a great deal of their fighting power, most notably the capability of airstrikes, which we know Nixon did not hesitate to employ heavily.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 

**Nixon's Strategy**by [Jared Hall](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 08:23 PM

The two strategies complemented each other because for the negotiations to succeed, South Vietnam would have to stand on its own. Until that time, America would still have to continue to support it. With the domestic turmoil, the only way to continue the support was to reduce American casualties.

If the withdrawals of the American troops were linked to the negotiations the peace treaty wouldn't hold. The North's perception of the South would be that it was helpless after the American troops were withdrawn. That perception was changed when the South was able to turn back the 1972 offensive with help from America's air support.

Without the strategies complementing each other, the North would have never made the concessions needed for a peace treaty to be signed.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**if LBJ or Nixon were still alive**by [Colin Gabrielson](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 08:42 PM

I think if LBJ or Nixon were still alive they would say something along the lines of what McNamara said. I don't think they would have added anything, they would have probably said something like "if you knew what i knew at the time you would have done something similar." The problem with McNamara's statements in the documentary Fog of War is that he doesn't really allow him to be responsible for anything. He says "You can't change human nature," well maybe you can't but you can always push for better. Using that as a scapegoat doesn't do that, instead it justifies the mistakes made. I don't think there was really much to be learnt to the extent where it allowed for the Vietnam War to be thought of any better from the McNamara documentary. He really just defended his position a lot. There is a lot of pride most politicians have and it seems to get the best of them. Even in more recent times dealing with Bush and his involvement in the Iraq War and Afghanistan Bush says one of his biggest Failures was not privatizing social security, which most people would think to be absurd from his administrations lies and failures. As for Clinton, he was and is too a politician that would hold the same type of pride or image saving tactics. He might mention something heart felt about how he regrets that he cheated on his wife, when really there were much worse things to regret for those with a conscience.

Watch: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=wZtPzOukjZA>

for more info on what i mentioned.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: if LBJ or Nixon were still alive**by [Spencer Smith](#) - Thursday, 25 November 2010, 06:41 AM

Politicians definatley have a lot of pride, especially presidents. I don't think one could hold that office without a lot of pride.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: if LBJ or Nixon were still alive**by [Colin Gabrielson](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 05:09 PM

Which is a huge problem. With an abundance of pride it is impossible to look at past decisions correctly. McNamara talked about him being proud, but i think the reason he was proud was not because he did what was best for his country. It was because he got to a high level and was basically famous and will have his name in history books for ever.

Politicians get all full of themselves so easily because it is human nature i guess. Winning votes and being elected is a huge achievement but it probably gets the best of some people and because this their focuses can shift from what is best for their country or state to what is best for their interest and the people around them.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: if LBJ or Nixon were still alive**by [Justin Powell](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 09:00 AM

I do understand that a lot of people don't agree with our leaders, like McNamara, when it seems like all he does is justify the mistakes he made. I think that people need to understand that if he doesn't have that pride and justify why he did what he did, the public would view him as weak and unsure on the decisions he made. Which in turn would make people not trust any decision he makes. The people need to believe that the leaders have the answer and reasoning for everything, otherwise they are not a leader.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: if LBJ or Nixon were still alive**by [Shellea Montgomery](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 06:48 PM

It truly is a double edged sword. Only if all the leaders had the RIGHT answers. I don't think that the public would see him as weak if he expressed remorse, or ownership. I think it would be easier to relate to the man, as being a human.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: if LBJ or Nixon were still alive**by [Molly Graham](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 05:09 PM

That was a very interesting video you posted. It goes to show that in the United States we usually are hardly aware of our huge "campaigns" in other countries. We hurt their citizens, then they hurt ours, and we wonder why because we just are not informed like other countries are. I do not think this is the fault of the citizens. Instead of real news about what is going on around the world, everyday on Good Morning America we hear about who was voted off Dancing With The Stars. I agree that leaders are people placed in charge who must make decisions and we must place a certain level of trust in them. However, I think that it is also true that many leaders have been found to be corrupt. Just because Nixon was our president does not mean that we should have followed him blindly. That man had some serious personal issues. We criticize the citizens of Germany for blindly following Hitler. It is important to try to stay informed. Unfortunately, the way that our media is set up today, this may only be possible by watching news from somewhere else such as watching BBC.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: if LBJ or Nixon were still alive**by [Kyle Hutton](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 05:53 PM

I agree with your point that the citizens care less about what is happening in the world, and more about their reality shows, and what is happening with "Celebrities". I think that this isn't just the news's fault though, the news has to show what people really care about, or they would not get any ratings, they are just showing what they have to to keep people interested in their show. It really has to do with us, if we were to try and change and care about other things than the stupid shows/made up celebrities we have created, the news would be broadcasting more of the issues around the world.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Robert McNamara**by [Jared Hall](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 08:56 PM

Robert McNamara's statements in "The Fog of War" had little effect on my understanding of the War. At most I was able to learn more about McNamara himself. It had little to do with the history, and his decisions. Most of what he says is vague and when he's asked specific questions in the epilogue he doesn't want to answer.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: Vietnamization**by [Jared Hall](#) - Wednesday, 24 November 2010, 09:00 PM

A documentary with LBJ or Nixon like "The Fog of War" wouldn't really add to my understanding of the war. If LBJ or Nixon went into specifics and why they chose to do certain things that I would learn a lot. It would help to learn more about the what kind of people they are but if it's as vague as the Fog of War than it wouldn't reveal anything new.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: Vietnamization**by [Justin Powell](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 09:06 AM

I agree, a documentary with any of them revealing more of their inner thoughts and feelings on what happened and why would help me out a lot as well.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: Vietnamization**by [Colin Gabrielson](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 03:17 PM

True it would need to be more in depth and would take countless hours. To get to the details events would need to be split up and looked from multiple angles, not just the war as a whole.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**McNamara**by [Tony Francisco](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 11:48 AM

I think that it was nice to be able to use the documentary film Fog of War as an aide to teach lessons on the war, however it is important to remember that even though we are learning McNamara's side of the story it is only his side of the story. I loved the scene where it had the audio reel of LBJ and McNamara talking on Feb 25, 1964. It is I think incredibly powerful and profound to hear, in their own words during their own time, the people who were shaping the events of the war. It was interesting to see how frustrated LBJ was over the events of the war and I particularly liked his quote, "You can have more war or more appeasement, but we don't want more of either." I feel that this quote, and whole conversation, really demonstrated the state of the war and how McNamara and LBJ really couldn't change anything even if it was what they desperately wanted.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Still Alive**by [Tony Francisco](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 01:17 PM

If Johnson or Nixon were still alive and filmed in a documentary like this I feel it would be interesting to see what Johnson had to say. I feel that Nixon wouldn't be open and if he did, it would be half truths and he would try to salvage and just protect what he had done. I feel like it was interesting seeing McNamara's view in FOW, but I feel like it's too biased because it is mainly based off of his opinion. Anything that you could squeeze out of Nixon would have to be corroborated by multiple other sources. Johnson I feel would be a little easier to trust, but I would still want to have his information corroborated as well. But maybe I'm wrong maybe Nixon would be open and able to talk about all of his mistakes through out the war, after all, hindsight is 20/20.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: Still Alive**by [Molly Graham](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 05:11 PM

I entirely agree with you on the validity of what Nixon or Johnson would have to say in an interview on Vietnam if they were still alive today. I think we possibly could have learned some from Johnson but basically feel that whatever Nixon would have to say would probably only be comical or offensive. We will never know though.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



#### Re: Still Alive

by [Spencer Little](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 06:48 PM

I think that Johnson would to deny mistakes and tell only half truths. During his tenure, he showed to be stubborn in his policies and decisions. The seemed like more of a sense of pride then anything and he wouldn't let that go. Besides, what would either of them have to gain by admitting to mistakes so long after the war.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



#### Complementing Strategies

by [Tony Francisco](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 01:38 PM

I feel that Vietnamization and U.S. troop withdrawals were essentially the same strategy. The only way that the United States was going to be able to leave was if the south would be able to sufficiently defend itself from the north after the U.S. pullout. Keeping that open on the negotiating table would have been suicide for the U.S. and the north. In order for the U.S. to leave they had to increase the south's forces and have them trained; without the training and support that came with Vietnamization the south would assuredly have fallen should the U.S. have withdrawn.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



#### Problems

by [Donald Ebel](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 03:57 PM

The main problem that plagued the Nixon administration was this idea of "ending the war with honor." While Nixon used the phrase as part of his campaign strategy, earning him the presidential office, defining exactly what that looked like became an issue, along with attaining that mysterious goal. "The Nixon-Kissinger strategy for ending the war was deeply flawed and based on a large dose of wishful thinking. Their concern for U.S. credibility was exaggerated and was based on dubious reasoning to begin with. In any even, as Walter Issacson has concluded, in their stubborn and ultimately futile pursuit of a settlement that would uphold the credibility of the United States, they 'squandered the true sources of its influence--and of its credibility--in the world: its moral authority, its sense of worthy purpose and its reputation as a reasonable and sensible player.'" (Herring, pg. 275) Herring goes on to say that it was presumptuous of Nixon and Kissinger to assume that they could do what Johnson had failed to do with even less military backing or public support. The goal of the war in Vietnam was still as obscured as ever.

Another issue were the peace talks. The communication between North Vietnam and the United States, and South Vietnam and the United States was always strained. At the beginning, neither the North nor the United States were willing to back down until the Christmas Bombing. And even after that, after a treaty was drawn up to which both the U.S. and North Vietnam and presented to South Vietnam, the South Vietnamese rejected the treaty because they felt cheated by the United States and pressured to agree to something they weren't comfortable with. Then they added a bunch of new conditions, and they talks had to be resumed. Thus began the vicious cycle of peace talks.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



#### Re: Problems

by [Kyle Hutton](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 05:47 PM

The communications between the US, and both the south and north Vietnam can be summed up with three different things, lack of trust, lack of communication, and stubbornness in regard to their ideas and beliefs. We really failed to communicate with the North Vietnamese on why we were there, and why they were there. If both sides hadn't been so set on the fact that "they were right", we may have been able to actually sit down and have a successful peace talk, with compromises from both sides in order to get everything wrapped up successfully.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Strategies**by [Donald Ebel](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 03:56 PM

I think that both Vietnamization and the troop withdrawals go hand-in-hand. It wouldn't make much sense if the United States tried to get South Vietnam to shoulder more of their own burden while intending to stay there. Plus, the only way that South Vietnam would be able to hold its own without the U.S. there was if they were taught how to run their own show first. So, the troop withdrawals needed Vietnamization.

It's a shame that the policy of Vietnamization wasn't tried out sooner under Johnson. At that point, Johnson would have been able to keep American troops there longer to defend and train the South Vietnamese to a greater degree, get American troops out of there sooner, and maybe even end the war with a more favorable turnout due to the trained efforts of the South Vietnamese themselves. But the way it turned out under Nixon was that American troops pulled out prematurely, without enough time to adequately train the South Vietnamese troops. Vietnamization should have existed for the good of the South Vietnamese much early in the war, not as a tool to get the United States out, too late in the game.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**If Nixon or LBJ was alive**by [Spencer Smith](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 03:59 PM

Just as many other have pointed out, I also am not inclined to think that LBJ or Nixon would contribute very much to my understanding of the Vietnam War. I've seen a lot of interviews with former presidents, and I'm not sure if its for security purposes or if they are just bull headed, but they rarely admit any wrong doing and have very strong convictions for what they did while in office. The nature of the president's job has a lot to do with making decisions and taking firm stances on issues, because of this the job naturally breeds ignorance. Imagine if a president was in a debate and they asked him what his stance on abortion was and he said, "It depends." In our society people think that indecisiveness is a weakness. People also view admitting failures as a weakness too. This is why Presidents are bred to be like this.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Re: If Nixon or LBJ was alive**by [Jason Carlstrom](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 07:24 PM

very true you said basically what i was thinking if Nixon shared his points on the war. He probably stands behind his actions 100% because being the president you have to take a firm stance like you said. It would be great to hear it from him and why he chose certain actions, but from all the other sources and interviews i learned a lot already.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**If LBJ/Nixon were still alive**by [Kyle Hutton](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 05:25 PM

I think if LBJ or Nixon were still alive and a filmed a documentary similar to "The Fog", it wouldn't necessarily help us better understand the war, but maybe it would give us insight as to what they were thinking during that time during the war, or why they made some of the choices they did, basically what was going on in their head at that time of the war.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate...

**Problems**by [Shellea Montgomery](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 06:11 PM

The problems with pulling out of Vietnam is a diverse list. One of the factors in the prolonging of the pull out of troops was the fact that we did not win; it was justifying to the people the loss of lives, time and money. Another problem was that all parties were not on the same page at the signing of agreement to just stop to cut losses and part ways. The lack of communication between the parties involved was obviously never there.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### Vietnamization

by [Shellea Montgomery](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 06:29 PM

Vietnamization and the American troop withdrawal were definitely meant to be coupled. Vietnamization was a way for us to beef up the south and prepare them to fight their own fights. It made sense to pull out American troops while in a way replacing them with their own. It came as less of a shock, it is like taking with the right and giving with the left hand.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### McNamara

by [Shellea Montgomery](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 06:34 PM

I agree with previous posts that the lack of communication was the real problem. It is not possible to do something a good job on something if you are not communicating with the other parties involved.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### What if?

by [Shellea Montgomery](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 06:38 PM

I think we would have a little different spin on the war if LBJ and or Nixon would have done a documentary. I'm not sure that it would be any more in lighting because what we did get in the video was just an opinion. It might have had more credibility for people and a different twist. But as we have seen with past presidents we only get the edited version that they want the people to have. Everyone likes to hear it from the horses' mouth.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 



### Re: What if?

by [Kristin Maurer](#) - Saturday, 27 November 2010, 09:06 PM

I think that we are all in agreement that we wouldn't have gotten much more from Nixon or LBJ. I do like how you pointed out that we could see it in a different twist because they are different people with different opinions.

[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Rate... 

[Send in my latest ratings](#)

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

You are logged in as [Joe Escobar](#) ([Logout](#))

HST 195 F10 (Escobar META 21581 24392)