



Jump to...



Fall 2009 ► [HST 195 F09 \(Escobar 21820\)](#) ► [Forums](#) ► [Episode 6 and 7 Forum](#) ► [Episode 6 and 7 Forum](#)



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

**Episode 6 and 7 Forum**by [Joe Escobar](#) - Saturday, 14 November 2009, 11:18 PM

How did the Tet Offensive and its aftermath affect American politics, society, and the military and diplomatic course of the war in Vietnam?

[Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum**by [Brian Hein](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 12:42 AM

I think the Tet offensive marked the beginning of the end for American involvement in Vietnam. There are many things that happened after Tet that affected the course of the war. A quote from *America's Longest War* tells of this change, the Tet Offensive was "probably unique in that the side that lost completely in the tactical sense came away with an overwhelming psychological and hence political victory. Tet had a tremendous impact in the United States and ushered in a new phase of a seemingly endless war."

The shock from the Tet offensive created a loss of faith in what the American people had been told with regards to the success of the war effort up until that point. If the North Vietnamese could mount a campaign that would lead them to the steps of the United States Embassy in South Vietnam the war would not be won quickly or easily. Walter Cronkite said "To say that we are mired in stalemate seems only reasonable." The Tet also led to an escalation of the anti-war movement and protests. "Campus unrest mounted significantly, some 200 demonstrations erupting at more than 100 colleges during the spring semester alone" with many of them turning violent. At this time an overwhelming number of Americans were certain that no progress was being made in Vietnam.

Initially the shock of the Tet Offensive led to the possibility of the expansion of the war. Believing the enemy had been hurt by their defeat Westmoreland believed this created an opportunity for him to obtain more troops. President Johnson did finally decided against this option sending only a minimal number of new troops and eventually a ceiling was placed of the number of ground troops. The Tet also led to the replacement of Westmoreland. Having told the progress of the war in the best of terms the Tet Offensive showed the public something different making "a mockery of Johnson's and Westmoreland's optimistic yearend reports, widening the credibility gap" he returned to Washington and was replaced by Abrams. While the peace negotiations were being held there was and escalation in the war with both American and South Vietnamese troops "in a frantic drive to gain control of the countryside, and made plans for a gradual shift of the military burden to the AVRN." This was a return to the policy from the beginning of our involvement, supporting the South Vietnamese allowing them to fight the war themselves. It was the beginning of the Vietnamization of the war.

Tet did lead Johnson to decide to have peace negotiations with Hanoi. The US believed they had "vastly strengthened position" due to significant losses incurred in the Tet Offensive by the North Vietnamese. Offering to stop bombing Johnson wanted to appear to be the peace maker. He could use this to show he was interested in peace, and if it failed, use it politically to show that the Hanoi government was to blame for its failure. Although Johnson was still unwilling to change his stance on what was negotiable, pretty much dooming the talks to failure.

Another impact of the Tet Offensive was its influence on the president. With approval ratings falling to an all time low for Johnson to 26 percent during Tet other factors came to weigh on the president. He was also concerned with the increasing domestic unrest, "tremendous erosion of support" from the business and legal

sector, and fiscal problems facing the nation, President Johnson exhausted both physically and emotionally decided to not seek another term for president.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Name Withheld-6450](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 02:03 PM

I agree completely with you Brian. The Tet offensive really shook America to it's core. Militarily, the largest and most successful nation in the world, was being pushed back by a enemy they considered inferior. The nation lost trust with the Military and Political leaders running the Vietnam war. Back at home, civil unrest against the war made people realize that Americans will no longer blindly support the nations armed forces. (Such as they did in World War 2, not to say the moral obligations in that war were not clearly apparent, but rarely did someone speak out loudly against our involvement in that war, especially after we were attacked) However, one thing that should receive more credit here is the media. Never in the history of any war in any country did the media effect the populace so much. In previous wars, Americans only got their information from movie reels and newspapers. Televisions were a rarity and Cable broadcasting was extremely new. In the Vietnam war, the news portrayed the war exactly as it was. There was hardly any editing of the reels on the news. The Tet offensive (unlike the Battle of the Bulge in World War 2, where allied forces were drastically pushed back for a month) was more or less well documented on TV, and people saw that we were failing.

This is slightly off subject, but we have a chance to really connect what happened in this country during Vietnam with what we are facing today. The saying that history repeats itself is not quite true, however history does rhyme from time to time. If we look at what is going now with the current war, people can draw from their own conclusions that we seem to be headed in a similar direction. The question is, will we address the situation differently?

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Paul Slaughterbeck](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 03:39 PM

I agree with you that the media coverage following the Tet offensive and the resulting reaction by the American public seemed to be of utmost importance to the North Vietnamese leadership. They were too well organized and aware of the realities of the situation to possibly think that they would achieve a military victory with this dangerous and costly maneuver. Instead they were using it as a sort of litmus test to gauge the resolve and, more importantly, the commitment of the American people. Even a cursory look at the numbers following this offensive proves clearly that America and The ARVN were the victors. If this were a well-supported and popular war, it would have been seen as a great sign and have given us hope and in fact strengthened our resolve to continue the war. Since the backlash was so severe, however, it proved the opposite to be true. This was clearly a war of attrition from the beginning, and if the American public had given up, it was over. What the North Vietnamese leadership wanted to prove, and did, with this offensive can be summed up in LBJ's famous, if not apocryphal words, "If I've lost Walter Cronkite, I've lost Middle America." (Appy, pg. 293)

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Matthew McIntosh](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 08:36 PM

I agree with what you and Brian are saying, but I do feel the most damage that tet did was to American politics. Before tet American would just spend money like there was no tomorrow on the war and on the programs that LBJ had put into place here in America. After the American people and politicians saw what was really happening I think they realized they could no longer blindly fund the war and American programs. If we are spending all this money on the war and not showing any progress is it really worth it? On the off the subject post, I think that we can learn alot from the war today, but I think the two wars are differnite.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Brian Hein](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 09:42 PM

I agree with you on how much of the Tet Offensive impact was felt politically. While writing this forum I found it difficult to separate any of the other topics distinctly from politics, they were all so intertwined. For me the biggest impact was the change in attitude by the American public toward the war, not for the amount on money spent but for the loss of lives fighting a war.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Paul Slaughterbeck](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 10:00 PM

Some people think that the media coverage of the Tet offensive started or heavily contributed to the American public souring to the Vietnam war. I wonder if media coverage changed in tone more in response to America's wearying of the war rather than being the cause of it? "The battles of Tet raised to a new level of public consciousness basic questions about the war that had long lurked beneath the surface." (ALW, pg. 233)

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Name Withheld-6450](#) - Saturday, 21 November 2009, 05:14 PM

Good point, though. Before the Tet offensive, there were still some clear (yet small) signs of American discontent. (Especially at Universities across the country, and before that there were already some people avoiding the draft) I think you're right in that the media simply added the "spark" to a very dry tinder box that was American opinion about the war.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Derek Abbott](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 08:49 PM

I feel since history does sometimes repeat it's self people can learn for the mistakes made in the past. After watching what did happen in Vietnam we cannot afford to make the same mistakes in Iraq. We haven't made the best decisions as a country in Iraq but I feel that now we are headed in the right direction.

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

Rate... 

**Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum**by [Paul Slaughterbeck](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 09:40 PM

What about Afghanistan? When I read about the requested troop build-up by the generals and how Obama is taking his time in deciding, I couldn't help but think about all of the requests for more troops LBJ had to consider. I hope that Obama is not pausing to consider political ramifications like LBJ seemed apt to do.

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

Rate...

**Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum**by [Brian Hein](#) - Thursday, 19 November 2009, 08:14 PM

Vietnam was the first televised war and it had an impact of the public image of the war especially after the Tet. I think it is likely that the reporting of the war and the exposure to the horrors of the war "contributed to public war-weariness" (herring pg.244). I like your point about the mood of many American's already shifting away from supporting the war before Tet. I was wondering if you thought there was any bias by the media toward the war. Was the media "hypercritical" toward the military or, as it seems to me to be reporting a story that needed to be told.

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

Rate...

**Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum**by [Paul Slaughterbeck](#) - Friday, 20 November 2009, 11:08 AM

I believe that there are inherent biases within the media that cause them to err on the side of ratings (\$). When public support was much higher and pro-war, they seemed to ignore the horror and focus on the good. "I remember reading a story in The New York Times about how the marines built a hospital in this area. Apparently the Hiroshima-like devastation that was around the hospital was not visible to the reporters of TNYT because they weren't telling about that." (Jonathon Schell 1966, Appy pg. 205). I don't so much think that the media is and was telling us what we wanted to hear, per se, but rather telling us what we might most strongly respond to, be it a warm public interest story or horrible mutilation. Saying the media had a critical role in shaping public opinion about the Vietnam war gives it too much credit, and the American people too little, in my opinion.

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

Rate...

**Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum**by [Brian Hein](#) - Friday, 20 November 2009, 08:50 PM

I agree with you, the media is a business that is driven by the ratings. The higher the ratings the higher they can charge for advertising. So to this extent the media must report what the public will be most interested in. It is at this point I wonder if you think there was a bias against the military or were they just reporting the facts they saw? There were hints that the military thought the media only showed them in the worst of light. I also liked what you wrote about giving the media too much credit and the public not enough, makes me wonder if this still holds true today.

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

Rate...

**Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum**by [Paul Slaughterbeck](#) - Saturday, 21 November 2009, 08:19 PM

Since we can safely assume that the media was more liberal in their view of the world and the war than, certainly, the military, it stands to reason that there had to be some bias involved. That being said the media was actually pro-military in much of it's coverage in the earlier years of the war. I don't think the bias was pervasive and I think largely that they were just reporting on what they saw. Of course I am biased as well!

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Mikco Stiner](#) - Saturday, 21 November 2009, 08:36 PM

I think that you did a wonderful job on this discussion. I really struggled. I believe you said it well when you stated that it created a loss of faith in the American people. I also think that Johnson caused the failure of the negotiations because of his unwillingness to change, I just couldn't find the words for any of this, great job.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Evan Looock](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 03:52 PM

Although the Tet was a failure for the North Vietnamese and (VC) it did have a very sobering affect on society back in the U.S. whom all believed that the communists were incapable of such coordinated attacks. The government made it clear that they were not able of attacking the U.S and allies with much precision and so when they did it discredited much trust that was involved between citizens and the government's politicians. People all over the states were already losing trust in the government's effort to bring a positive end to the war and after the Tet offensive it caused many more to protest against it.

The U.S had once again not had the right understanding of the enemy's resolve and determination to continue its fighting. The North Vietnamese were further aided in their belief that they could prevail by the Americans media sensationalism and numerous anti-war protests all across the country. LBJ stopped the bombing of Vietnam within a week from the Presidential elections as well as announced that he declines in running for another term as President of the U.S after a very hard and draining time in service during the Vietnam conflicts.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Jennifer Mosier](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 08:14 PM

The Tet offensive also opened the eyes of Johnson and I believe the movie mentioned that Johnson started paying more attention to the protesters and the American public for the first time.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Matthew McIntosh](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 08:40 PM

I agree, after Tet Johnson started paying attention to what the American people thought of the war.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Matthew McIntosh](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 08:49 PM

Evan I don't think Tet was a failure for the North Vietnamese. What else could you want from an attack, you showed the enemy, the America military, that you can strike from anywhere at any time, you caused American politicians to question what we were doing there and the money it was costing the tax payers, and you got the American people to start to questioning there government. With all that I think Tet was a great success even though they lost lots of men.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Jennifer Mosier](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 11:45 PM

It was said that Tet was a failure in the eyes of the VC because they weren't able to hold their ground for an uprising. To the US Tet was seen as a success for the Vietnamese.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Evan Look](#) - Thursday, 19 November 2009, 08:29 AM

The Tet was not a failure overall because it did displayed the weakness that the U.S had during the Vietnam conflict which was the non-supporting by its people back home. As well it showed that the North could coordinate the attacks on numerous fronts which was not believed to be possible.

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

Rate... 

Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Scott Burgess](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 05:05 PM

I think the that the Tet Offensive was the start of the end for us in Vietnam. I don't think that anybody here in the US thought that the North Vietnamese could ever pull off what they did. Even though US/ARVN forces fairly quickly took back what the North had done the damage had been done. If the US/ARVN forces would have gone on an all out offensive things might have been different in the end. (A limited war should never be fought; not then and not now.) The Tet showed US leaders the resolve of the VC/NVA and how effective they could be. Even though it was considered to be a loss, the north still had a major victory. With the effectiveness of the VC strikes and the amount of press coverage that was brought into the American living rooms gave us a look at defeat; even though we won. We should have struck hard and taken the war to them. (To bad that we where so afraid of the big bad Chinesse riding to North's rescue.)

The fact that the American people watched Tet in all of its "glory" really change public view about the war. From Tet on I think we just wanted the war to be over. The North Vietnamese relized in thier loss was a victory. The Americans didn't like what they saw and wanted out of this war. They used anti war protests as propaganda for thier war efforts. I think that they knew they had us at that point, it was a waiting game for them. They came to the peace just to buy themselves more time. They had issues that they weren't going to budge on and so did Pres. Johnson.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Brian Hein](#) - Thursday, 19 November 2009, 08:18 PM

The battle of Tet was a loss for North Vietnam militarily, but a victory politically. I was wondering what you meant, and why you think the war was a limited war. For me this was limited by political motivations of the administration, and it seems the North Vietnamese may have been better at it. It appears they outmaneuvered them, shown by the fallout in America after Tet.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Paul Slaughterbeck](#) - Friday, 20 November 2009, 11:24 AM

I think according to some we could have won the war if we would have sent more troops. Ronald Reagan years later during a speech said, basically, that we would never again send our boys to fight a war that we would not let them win. I believe he is referring to this, in my opinion, erroneous belief.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Brian Hein](#) - Friday, 20 November 2009, 09:05 PM

Even Clifford saw the increase of the troops after Tet as an erroneous belief when he reevaluated the US policy. His civilian advisors "questioned whether it would shorten the war. North Vietnam had already demonstrated that it could match American increases" (Herring pg. 236). I think Clifford was very influential in changing Johnson's views of the war.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Scott Burgess](#) - Saturday, 21 November 2009, 11:01 AM

The Tet was a very big loss for the North militarily if you looked back at all that happened. Everything that they did was recovered fairly quickly by the ARVN and US troops. It was a victory in the sense that it was devastating to the morale of the American people and alot of the political leaders of this country. I think that you are on the same page with me when I say a limited war. The troop actions were limited by our polictial leaders. You can not go over there, don't bomb that place, don't do this don't do that. They tied our military leaders proverbial hands. Thats what I am talking about when I say a limited war.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Evan Looock](#) - Saturday, 21 November 2009, 08:04 PM

Exactly. I agree it was militarily a defeat the Tet offensive for the North Vietnamese but by destroying most of the support of the war from the citizens here in the states it was a victory for them.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [William Wymer](#) - Friday, 20 November 2009, 05:08 AM

I would have to agree with you even though the American forces had better training and weapons, and thought that we were the big dog, they were surprised by how a little country could put up the fight that they did. I also think that our military was shocked by the devastation that the Vietnamese were able to do and with what heart that they fought. I think that it made the U.S. take another look at itself and how they should handle this and future operations or conflicts. I also think that it made us as a nation not to underestimate our adversaries.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Jennifer Mosier](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 08:09 PM

The Tet Offensive was a huge wake up call to the American public and diplomats splitting the white house on who was for or against the war. To the communists the this offense was a failure because they were unable to hold their positions for a general uprising.

The American public realized that everything Johnson had been telling them was a lie about the US "winning" the war and support from the general public rapidly decreased. White house officials started a group to change Johnson's mind on the war, in hopes to pull out.

Before Tet, Westmoreland wanted to send more troops to Vietnam which would have had to come from reserve units. After the offense Clifford, the secretary of defense, was against sending more troops over and wanted to slowly pull troops out.

To Johnson, the Tet offensive was career ending. An election year was coming up and even though he won to be a presidential candidate, he was fighting a losing battle in more than one way. Johnson announced that he would not run for re-election and over the next five years troops were slowly pulled from Vietnam.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Derek Abbott](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 08:45 PM

All of the above posts are very thought provoking and constructive. Everyone seems to be dancing around the same ideas and themes of the U.S. falling to a less powerful North Vietnam. The Tet offensive was very shocking to most people back in the states. It was mind boggling for them to actually seeing the American troops being shot down and losing in battle. Since the U.S. had spent so much money and sent so many men to Vietnam, this outraged protester and congressmen alike. To add to the fire the president wanted to implement 200,000 more troops in Vietnam. The U.S. citizens were not about to let more young men die for a war that had been at a stalemate for the last three or four years. It was just illogical.

Another great topic is the decision of how the media effected the U.S. population's view on the war and eventually led to America pulling troops out of Vietnam. The American civilians saw that the U.S. troops weren't making any leeway to win the war. However many men we sent over there, the North Vietnam and (VC) would not back down or give in. As President Johnson kept sending more troops over seas the U.S. public could see that it wasn't helping any and we wold eventually have to extract our troops out of Vietnam or risk losing even more men. This news was especially hard for President Johnson to take because he didn't want to be one of the first presidents to lose a war; especially to an enemy who was financially, far less superior. In his mind the war was suppose to be an easy in and out job. With pressure building from inside congress and the U.S. populace to withdraw from the war, President Johnson had no other choice. He made his announcement not to

run for another term and vetoing the idea of sending more troops to Vietnam on March 31, 1968. I feel this was a smart move on Johnson's behalf because he had already endured so much throughout this war that he was both physically and mentally drained. To worsen his situation he had candidates like Robert Kennedy running for election, and it seemed like all hope was lost for him in the eyes of the public.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Paul Slaughterbeck](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 09:54 PM

I agree with you about this being a smart move on Johnson's behalf. He spent his entire presidency up to this point making decisions based mainly on politics; what could he do (or not do) to get reelected. As Derek said, he also was obsessed with the idea of not being that president who lost our first war. These are not the values we needed in a president at this point in history. Only when he began to give up his aspirations of rerunning did he make his best decisions in not sending those 200,000 troops nor mobilizing the reserves.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [William Wymer](#) - Friday, 20 November 2009, 02:54 AM

I too seen the media as a big part. I think the media had a big part in Johnson not running for another term. I also seen how it played a big part in getting us out of Vietnam. For the first time the media brought the war into the homes of Americans and let them see what was going on their televisions. The media made it hard for the government to only let the public hear and see what they wanted. The media also made it so Americans could make their own decisions. I think that the media played a big part in people showing distaste for the war in Vietnam, and made the American public more vocal about it. I also think that this had a big part in Johnson's decision not to run again. the media made it where he would have to confront issues that he would not have had to if they were not there and showing it to the American public.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Chad Schultz](#) - Friday, 20 November 2009, 12:30 PM

When the war was brought into America's Homes this is when the war started to decline. People saw how horrid it was and they started to protest while we already had a following of protesters. LBJ saw that this was not going to go well if he had desided to run another term, and it would equate out to failure. Especially if he actually won. The draft would not succeed because we actually are visually seeing what was happening in the war.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Evan Looch](#) - Friday, 20 November 2009, 01:21 PM

America first being capable to experience a military conflict and its horrible aftermaths did influence much of the public that this is a terrible thing. This still occurs in Iraq/Afganistan nowadays. I was in Iraq and everybody back home just watched us getting attacked or shot at but in actuality it was like that at only certain times and places. They did not interview the people that I talked with in Baghdad that said they were happy to be relieved of their former tyrant of a leader that told them to not worry about fixing a broken t.v and just put his picture on it. All the people that watch the news saw blood and carnage everyday this would make most dislike any conflict past or

present.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Mikko Stiner](#) - Saturday, 21 November 2009, 08:46 PM

I feel that is part of the reason we have anti war rallies and such things instead of people being proud of the men and women that fight for our Country and the people in it. Our military fights for Americans who are against what the troops do for them as Americans. It's sad. It's not like you say hey lets go over seas and start shooting some people there are reasons for it, it isn't just enie meenie minie moe and that's who we attack today.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Mikko Stiner](#) - Wednesday, 18 November 2009, 08:59 PM

I believe T'et truly opened the eyes of our Nation. We had never believed that our inferior adversaries were capable of such an attack. It was the wars "bloodiest most wide spread fighting". After this we were even more ready for the war to end. Nobody wanted to look weak or seem defeated on either ends, especially ours. Negotiations were tried to be reached but failed. This was a hard time for the president, even more than that of times before. American officials had to think seriously about changes in Vietnam, "they needed to find a way to deescalate their war in Vietnam".

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Brian Hein](#) - Thursday, 19 November 2009, 08:12 PM

I agree that Johnson did not want to look weak, and I think this was one of the biggest problems to cause the failure in the peace negotiations. But, it doesn't look like Johnson was real serious when "the terms they were prepared to hold out for virtually ensured that nothing would be accomplished" (Herring pg.255). It was as if we had backed into a corner with no way out and the Tet offensive forced the administration to realize they needed to take a new path.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Chad Schultz](#) - Friday, 20 November 2009, 12:24 PM

I also agree that LBJ did not want to look weak by calling of the War. I think a Win meant many things and that he would settle for no less. He was hiding things from America and was trying to keep America oblivious to what was going on.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Paul Slaughterbeck](#) - Friday, 20 November 2009, 01:54 PM

I agree completely. In fact I think the Tet offensive and the subsequent media coverage and public reaction had no affect on the diplomatic process as it was a joke to even think that there was anything to affect. The two sides had fundamental gaps that, I think, both knew would never be bridged, regardless of what happened throughout the course of the war. "Neither side could afford to appear

indifferent to such efforts, but neither was willing to make the concessions necessary to bring about negotiations." (ALW, pg. 201) Although Herring is referring to the efforts a year earlier, nothing was significantly different during this process post Tet. Both sides wanted to look eager to compromise only to the extent that it would help their images, mainly in regards to the American public.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [William Wymer](#) - Thursday, 19 November 2009, 12:19 AM

I believe that the Tet Offensive brought about allot of realization that the U.S. even as strong and well trained as we were, there were smaller countries that could defend themselves and cause great damage to the United States. I also think that the media played a great part in putting an end to the war, as it let the public see what was really happening and brought the war to life as well as played a part in the U.S. to pull out as they could see that they had been lied to as well as the damage that was being done to the United States.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Chad Schultz](#) - Friday, 20 November 2009, 12:22 PM

The media exposed the gray area, and than America felt they couldn't fund the war. This I think greatly depreciated the following stats when we talk about the draft. I think the honor and representation was falsely advertised until the media started covering the war and actually representing what really was happening.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Paul Slaughterbeck](#) - Friday, 20 November 2009, 01:38 PM

One thing to remember is that this wasn't the first time that the American public saw brutal images of the war, just the first time they saw the horror directed at their boys while at their back door (urban areas, US embassy, etc.). If the public truly thought that we had something to gain from being in this conflict then they may have been able to come to terms with this, but they didn't, and so this was the beginning of the end for us in Vietnam.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Jennifer Mosier](#) - Friday, 20 November 2009, 07:59 PM

I agree that this wasn't the first time the American public saw nasty images of the war, but the image of the man being shot in the head at point blank was a first. That image I believe really hit a lot of Americans hard and they finally began realizing that this war was out of control. The support from the "hicks" decreased rapidly after this.

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

Rate... 



Re: Episode 6 and 7 Forum

by [Mikko Stiner](#) - Saturday, 21 November 2009, 08:40 PM

I think so too. I is terrible that it was misrepresented in the first place, it never should have been that way. How different would or could things have been or how would it change the outcome if the media was to show the whole truth from start to finish?

[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 F09 (Escobar 21820)