



You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

[Home](#) ► [My courses](#) ► [HST 195 F12 \(Escobar 26516\)](#) ► [November 18 - November 24](#) ► [Forum 4](#) **CLOSED** ► [Forum 4](#)

 [Search forums](#)

**Forum 4**

by Joe Escobar - Monday, November 19, 2012, 12:34 PM

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post.

To reply to someone else in your group, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

When addressing the topic and questions, BE SURE to put something descriptive, such as "Nixon's Vietnamization", "Robert McNamara's confession", or "Fog of War recollections" in the subject line of your post. It will help keep the discussion organized and let others easily know what specific parts of the materials you are talking about.

DO NOT leave the subject line Re: Forum 4

Sum of ratings: -

[Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Presidents Would Defend the War**

by Jacob Pusey - Tuesday, November 20, 2012, 08:06 PM

If Johnson and Nixon had been asked to explain their decisions regarding the war, I think they would both be very defensive about their actions. McNamara being Secretary of State, still is in a position to say that he did the best that he could, while former Presidents do not have the luxury to say that the tough decisions did not fall on them. Of course whatever they say would add to how we understand how the conflict played out, they probably would be extreme cases of biased opinion. Sure historians would love to hear them try to justify or rightfully defend executive decisions that either prolonged or shortened the war. I know I would. I'm sure that they both would probably have countless examples of intelligence that they had at the time that would give validity to historically right or wrong moves that the United States made in Vietnam. But, as we have seen in the Appy book, they would still just be individual perspectives on a topic with so many different viewpoints that they would only be adding to the historical context, not necessarily explaining anything better than modern experts on the war.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)
[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: Presidents Would Defend the War**

by Emerald Jones - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 09:32 AM

I really like the phrase "historical context". I think that you are quite correct in that Nixon and Johnson would feel very defensive. We could have a thousand perspectives on Vietnam and it would not add any extra factual information. The many decisions that affected this war, whether it was withdrawing troops, sending more or giving aid, fell to many presidents. Maybe the reason so many would be defensive is because this war went through so many hands as it states in the Appy book, presidents who came into office after this war was underway were just reinforcing whatever was done before them. Everyone seemed afraid to really do anything, afraid of far reaching consequences of making hard decisions.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)
[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: Presidents Would Defend the War**

by Evelyn Deutscher - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 07:12 PM

Jacob -

I agree with your post overall. I think the president's would have stood by their decisions for your reasons and other reasons. I think if the presidents were alive they would feel obligated to stand by their opinions because if they didn't it would make their decisions they made during the Vietnam war more tragic. I don't think they have an easy way out in defending their

actions like McNamara does, because it is ultimately their decision that caused the events whether it be right or wrong and they have to stand those decisions. I think they would leave it up to historical facts as you said or they would just say they did what they thought was right at the time. I think that your last sentence aptly sums up that their stories if they existed would be just another "individual perspective."

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Presidents Would Defend the War

by Justin Wease - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 08:47 PM

I believe that you are correct in suggesting that Nixon and Johnson would be very defensive about their actions. I think that it takes extraordinary responsibility to take on the roll of President and get blamed/praised for the descisions that you make. Even though those descisions go through whichever appropriate channels before landing squarely on the president's shoulders...it is still the president, the man, that will be remembered for the events that transpired during his/her office. Johnson inherited the war from Kennedy and even if he was the right man for the job, he had gigantic shoes to fill to shepard America into the thick of Vietnam.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Presidents Would Defend the War

by Natasha Haynes - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 11:33 PM

Isn't that the sort of beautiful nightmare of history. No matter who is to retell or recall a memory, it is in fact just a personal recollection. The elements that add to why a persons perspective is the way it is, is an interesting thing to look at and examine. Yes, we could understand why they would be defensive, due to the positions that they played. We can also understand that because of the roles that they played, their recollections would most likely be seen more credible from the majority than perhaps a very knowledgable veteran that has nothing to loose.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Ending the War on Nixon's Terms.

by Jacob Pusey - Wednesday, November 21, 2012, 10:44 AM

According to Nixon's speech, the United States could not simply withdraw from the war for a number of reasons. He says that it would humiliate us, undermine our ability to conduct foreign policy and alienate our allies as well as produce more casualties. He said that complete withdrawal would "cost more lives" and "not bring peace; it would bring more violence." Nixon did a great job blaming North Vietnam for extending the war by saying that he had done everything possible for peace and that it was Hanoi that had been unwilling to negotiate any sort of terms. According to Herring, it was just as much Nixon who was unwilling to negotiate any sort of concessions. (Herring, p.281) It is hard to say whether or not their would have cataclysmic consequences for America if we would have simply pulled out. Their most certainly would have been for the people of South Vietnam and once we did withdraw, there were. What could have happened was we withdraw combat soldiers and tried to leave advisers in place. However, because of the full escalation that the North had already put into the war effort, it most likely would have been futile for any kind of peace treaty to develop between between the North and South. What history does show us is that when we did finally get the last American soldiers out, the South did fall but, the domino theory never came into play. Communism was not an epidemic that swept the world and the U.S. Did take a hit, but the loss in Vietnam was never the crippling blow that the American citizens were warned would be so disastrous if we did not succeed.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Ending the War on Nixon's Terms.

by Michael Sitterley - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 05:15 PM

Referring to ending the war, I agree with your point on Nixon blaming the North. The one thing that was evident was the amount of blame placed on every one else. The blame for the lack of a peacefull resolution fell solely on the North Vietnamese and the Nixon administration was painted as saints just trying to peacefully end the war. Yes, communism never turned out to be the great evil that would take over the world, but hindsight is 50-50 and the communism in the Soviet Union and China were a very big concern at the time.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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


Re: Ending the War on Nixon's Terms.

by Evelyn Deutscher - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 07:20 PM

As you said the "blame" for lack of peaceful negotiations does rest on Nixon for his unwillingness to withdraw or make concessions, but it also the blame of the North, for they wouldn't make any concessions. I think the blame for the lack of negotiations was equal on both sides. The Nixon administration just made North Vietnam a scapegoat for why America was still in the war. I don't think it was possible for a peaceful agreement to happen between North and South Vietnam because they were essentially in a civil war. I do think that if America had immediately withdrew South Vietnam would have instantly collapsed, for our involvement seemed to only prolong the inevitable.

 Sum of ratings:2 (1)
[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Nixon's Vietnamization A Slow Surrender

by Sierra Lavoie - Wednesday, November 21, 2012, 11:39 AM

Some of the problems that surfaced to hamper efforts to conclude the war were the Paris peace talks, the U.S. needed to find a way to withdraw while still obtain credibility between them and communists, and obtaining the release of all American POWs. The Paris peace talks had been going back and forth for many years but both sides were unable to make concessions. America was tired of the war and Nixon had promised to end it. Nixon began to get serious about the peace talks realizing it was the best way to end the war. He hoped to end the war leaving with "peace with honor". "Nixon never abandoned his quest for "Peace with Honor". " (Herring 313) "Both Washington and Hanoi saw the Paris Peace Talks as the best route to exit the stalemate. "From mid-1972, the talks became more serious and both sides made concessions. Even at the time it was known that the Agreement would probably not ensure the future of South Vietnam and give the U.S. "Peace with Honor" but it was a way out." (http://olive-drab.com/od_history_vietnam_nixon.php) The Paris peace talks led to the freeing of the American POWs and America's withdrawing from Vietnam. America lost the war in Vietnam so it is debatable if we obtained credibility in the communist's eyes.

Vietnamization and the withdraw of American troops were essential complements to each other because the two went hand in hand according to Nixon. By making the South Vietnam Army stronger and provided them with the materials they needed America could withdraw. This would leave the South Vietnam Army strong enough to fight on its own. "Most military experts agreed that without full American assistance, the South Vietnamese could not stand up against the combined threat of the NVA and NLF forces."(Herring 283) After all Nixon had promised in his November 3 speech to end the war and bring our troops home. To do this Nixon promoted this in his November 3 speech," In the previous administration, we Americanized the war in Vietnam. In this administration, we are Vietnamizing the search for peace. "The best way to leave the situation as peacefully as possible was through Vietnamization. "Most saw it "Vietnamization as a fig leaf to cover U.S. Abandonment." (Herring 284) Vietnamization was probably a cover for the U.S. being able to leave the war quickly and get their troops back home. General Abrams criticized Vietnamization as a "slow surrender". (Herring 283) The Vietnamization policy seemed to be a policy that would quickly get the troops back home and that would leave Vietnam to stand alone and fight their own war. This policy was like General Abram's said America's surrender.


 Sum of ratings:3 (1)
[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

Re: Nixon's Vietnamization A Slow Surrender

by Justin Wease - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 09:05 PM

Sierra, your post brings to mind the issue of occupation. It is tough to view the occupation of another country as a successful stride towards liberty for that country. Not only do you have a foreign nation running things for you (because you cannot yourself) But you also are fighting your bretheren, your people all the while wondering which nation is telling you the truth...which is lying...which is a false friend. Regarding "A slow surrender", I believe it would be impossible to pull out of a country completely and it still be regarded as victory. See: Iraq. What does this say for occupation? Is it our human duty to fight for those who cannot fight for themselves?

p.s awesome picture of Nixon.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Vietnamization of the War.... When did the REAL war start????

by Natasha Haynes - Wednesday, November 21, 2012, 04:30 PM

The first immediate thing that I found to be ill informed in Nixon's speech is within the first minute of reading it. He states, "Now, let me begin by describing the situation I found when I was inaugurated on January 20. —The war had been going on for 4 years" (Nixon Speech). His speech was delivered on November 3, 1969. He either was misinformed himself, or trying to band aid the already massive wound the U.S. had dove into with the French nearly twenty years prior to his speech. Even According to Herring the years, "1963-1973" was "the decade of heaviest U.S. involvement"(Herring Preface xii). This makes that a big 5 years of involvement instead of the 4 that Nixon claims. He continues to talk about the war as if it were something that we had just recently been a part of. He states, "After all, we became involved in the war while my predecessor was in office" (Nixon Speech). He wasn't using the plural form of predecessor, and obviously was overlooking the fact that we had a part of this war financially from 1950 and beyond. "The strategic reassessment of 1950 thus ended American 'neutrality' and produced in early March a commitment to furnish France military and economic assistance for the war against the Vietminh"(Herring 21).

It amazes me that he overlooked all of these things. However I do understand that this was a sensitive topic at the time (not that it still isn't) , but he must define "war", a whole lot differently than I do, because from what I have heard, the war had started long before he claims it did. Maybe that is why there were so many problems that troubled ending the "war". Perhaps that definition of our involvement in it was misguided.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Vietnamization of the War.... When did the REAL war start????

by Michael Sitterley - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 05:18 PM

Official troop deployment was in 1965 and before that it was American military advisors and it was considered a conflict when they first arrived in 1950. This is carefull wording by the president trying to get support from the silent majority, the silent non-activists in the country.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Vietnamization of the War.... When did the REAL war start????

by Natasha Haynes - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 09:00 PM

Very true Michael. That was very careful wording alright. Not only were there military advisors there, there was also millions and millions of our money and weaponry. That to me, is enough to be considered war, and not just the French's. When we made the move to openly supply the French, in my opinion it did become our war. Nixon was very clever with his words. However, it makes perfect sense that he would shed light on this matter in this way, because it was a touchy subject. The body counts (which only included American men) that supposedly tracked the progress of the war, only became relevant to the U.S. when it was our men out there dying.

All of this, and all of the words that he did choose to say, are words and ideas targeted towards the silent majority, and the people that didn't have access to the necessary information to make sense of it.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Vietnamization of the War.... When did the REAL war start????

by Evelyn Deutscher - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 07:27 PM

I think Nixon had defined the war as the time when America first sent combat troops into Vietnam in 1965. Before that it had been more a conflict, with America having dubious policy with our 'advisors' being in active fighting. Essentially though this

wasn't in the public's attention therefore Nixon shouldn't bring light to this fact in his speech for that would incite more opposition to the war and also I don't think that was how he chose to define that as a war. I think before 1965 Nixon was defining U.S. involvement as supporting a free country and helping it stand on its own. When talking about our involvement in the French-Vietnam War it wasn't our war so I think that is why he didn't address it. Yes we were involved, but it was France's war.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Vietnamization of the War.... When did the REAL war start????

by Emerald Jones - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 11:05 PM

I am reasonably sure that Nixon's statements were less a result of being misinformed and more of a result of wanting to tread carefully. As you so justifiably pointed out Natasha, this is and was a very sensitive subject. I was shocked to learn how far back we were actually involved. And from what I understand there were a few predecessors involved in the decisions, or lack of decisions involved in the war. I think your ending statement is very appropriate.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Fog of War

by Justin Wease - Wednesday, November 21, 2012, 08:33 PM

Robert Mcnamara's recollections are valid and important, but the most important fact that I think one must remember is the fact that these are merely recollections and that they are the recollections of an aging man who, even with such a commanding presence, must face the same biological time clock as the rest of humanity. Mcnamara, in the fog of war clips, sounded sort of unsure of himself as he described certain events. At first I chalked this up to his age and the length of time in between the war and this video, but what I believe the actual case is more about Mcnamara being very guarded with the information he does possess regarding Vietnam and either LBJ or JFK and that he was choosing his words very carefully. At one point in the documentary he declares:

"I don't remember authorizing agent orange...but it happened while I was secretary." (Robert Mcnamara, Fog of War)

It is in this comment regarding the war that proves to me that Mcnamara's memory is a bit foggy just because the situation and the war itself was foggy at the time. In his attempts at remembering his own past, complexity and confusion prove to be at the forefront of the Vietnam recollections.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Fog of War

by Jacob Pusey - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 10:19 PM

You make a great point by saying that these are "merely recollections" from Mcnamara. It would be really interesting to hear what he has to say about the war with the camera off. I for one do not buy his lack of recollection regarding the authorization of Agent Orange. I do appreciate his admission that "mistakes were made". Even though he does not really take any personal responsibility, he at least acknowledges that they mistakes did occur. I do not think he has a whole lot of foginess regarding the war. I would say that the time between the war and the video gave him plenty of time to rehearse. This was not his first interview and he has contributed to dozens of books about the administrations he was a part of. I think you are right when you suggest that he chooses his words very carefully.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Fog of War

by Natasha Haynes - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 10:23 PM

Justin, I do not think you could have said this any better. I think it is important to at least credit his age in his foggy recollections of the war, but also to not be so swayed by it to disregard the fact that he possibly could have been trying to shield the information that he does have and does remember. Being choosy with words is something I think that he learned to do very precisely during the time of war, and or before it. Perhaps that's why he got the job in the first place.

Where Michael Sitterley makes a good point in stating that , " there is no way for even someone in charge to grasp or comprehend all the components of a war", I do not disagree with him. However, I will say that it might be impossible, but it is certainly their job. If McNamara is truly old, and full of foggy memories, it is completely understandable. He could also have been hiding and withholding information, and completely ignorant (possibly why he got the job). The possibilities are endless.

Ya gotta love conspiracies.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Looking past the "Fog of War"

by Michael Sitterley - Wednesday, November 21, 2012, 09:34 PM

Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara talks about the "Fog of War". From my understandin, he is stating that the war is too complex to understand all of the variables involved in the war. So many people and situations were all happening simultaneously, that it is why it is difficult to grasp all of the details.

McNamara talks about the use of agent orange. This was a chemical that was used to kill vegetation. At the time, there was no knowledge of the side affects it had on humans. It was only at a later time that it was discovered that the use of this had adverse affects on both the native people and the soldiers. This is where the variables come in to play and that is why it is difficult to know what is "morally appropriate" for war time. The effect this has had on my understanding is that the more I learn about the details the more complex and difficult it becomes to fully understand the whole story. When asked about agent orange, McNamara, said he didn't remember authorizing the use of the chemical. However, it was approved when he was in office. At the time of his interview, he was at a more advance age in life. Sometimes our memories can become less detailed with age.

In regards to his use of the phrase, Fog of War, there is no way for even someone in charge to grasp or comprehend all the components of a war.

If LBJ and/or Nixon were alive and they were being interviewed, they could definitely give more insight to the war. We would receive insight, however, would they be able to be unbiass to their cause? Could they give us factual information that is not skewed? Is it possible for them to be interviewed and not project a response that would be one sided and defend their own agenda? That is what I am unsure about.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Nixon's Vietnamization

by Emerald Jones - Wednesday, November 21, 2012, 09:40 PM

Nixon wanted the war to be less "Americanized". He wanted the vietnamese to be able to fight for their own independence. He did not withdraw troops because he saw it leading to complete collapse of South Vietnam, if troops were withdrawn before the vietnamese were educated on combat. He felt an abrupt withdrawl "would not bring peace; it would bring more war." He spoke of many peace plans that had been rejected outright and Hanoi refused to listen to negotiations until surrender happened. Nixon did not want this to be "his" war.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



We all make mistakes: Mcnamara

by Emerald Jones - Wednesday, November 21, 2012, 10:00 PM

I am not sure what counts as understanding,. It seemed as if Mcnamara himself hardly understood the war. He even said that he calle it the "fog of war" because nobody could ever really understand war because it was so complex and so many things went into it. I do not think he is foggy on the war I think he chooses not to discuss certain things. That is how it appeared in the video. If Nixon or LBJ had been able to provide us with a similar documentary I am sure it would have added to the perspectives that affected the war. I do not suppose you really could understand war ever. And would you really want to?

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: We all make mistakes: Mcnamara

by Michelle Srstka - Saturday, November 24, 2012, 06:19 PM

I agree that it would be interesting if we had the perspective of Nixon or LBJ. Would they look back and say that they should have done things differently? We are studying the war decades later and trying to take in different perspectives; the war was so complex that even now it is hard to arrive at one truth.

I think they would all say that they did the best they could with the information that they had.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: We all make mistakes: McNamara

by Evelyn Deutscher - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 07:37 PM

I liked your first sentence about not being sure as what counts as understanding. I think a lot of people would like to say they understood things at a time, but then when looking back they realize they didn't. I think understanding of events changes as you age, for how you might look at a situation will change from the time you are going through the situation to the time you are reevaluating it. I think McNamara understood the war in terms of what he was expected to do and what the administration was saying, but McNamara might not have understood the war in the implications or moral effects it would have. I agree with your point that the 'foginess' of the war for McNamara seems to come from his unwillingness to discuss certain topics.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Negotiating Peace

by Evelyn Deutscher - Wednesday, November 21, 2012, 10:40 PM

There were two main problems that surfaced to hamper the effort to conclude the war. The first was that Nixon wanted to achieve his goals his way, and Hanoi was unwilling to make concessions. The first was best displayed by our Herring textbook which said Nixon was still "confident that he could make peace by threatening Hanoi," and also that Nixon was "unwilling to make concessions" (281, 291). With these quotes it clearly displays that Nixon, while pursuing peace, wasn't pursuing pure peace, but peace as equated to his goals. He wanted to achieve his goals while he had the upper hand in the peace negotiations or agreements. As steadfast as Nixon was in his beliefs so was North Vietnam. Herring also stated that Nixon would not be able to "intimidate Hanoi into making even the slightest concession" (281). As a result both of the political leaders/nations were unable to make the concessions needed for peace. Each was highly committed to their goals and with each being so highly committed, peace at least for a time was hampered.

I think in terms of negotiations Nixon was right to de-couple Vietnamization and American troop withdrawals. For when discussing aspects of the war these topics need to be addressed separately. However I do think that these two strategies essentially complementary to each other. Nixon himself even said "as South Vietnamese forces become stronger, the rate of American withdrawal can become greater," ("Vietnamization"). Therefore the basis of Vietnamization would lead to American troop withdrawals, while still keeping the struggle for peace. Though instead of Americans upholding peace, we would be "Vietnamizing the search for peace," ("Vietnamization"). Therefore each of the programs are complementary to each other. The idea that each could build from each other, for example as South Vietnam got stronger American troop withdrawals could increase and with the increasing troop withdrawals it would test the Vietnamization of the war.

Herring, George. *America's Longest War: The United States And Vietnam, 1950-1975*. New York; McGraw-Hill Companies Inc. , 2002. Print.

"Vietnamization and Silent Majority (3 November 1969, by Richard M. Nixon)." *Dictionary of American History*. 2003. Encyclopedia.com. 20 Nov. 2012 <<http://www.encyclopedia.com>>.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Political Leader's Reflection; Is It Useful?

by Evelyn Deutscher - Wednesday, November 21, 2012, 10:52 PM

Robert McNamara's statements provided understanding of the war that is similar to my thoughts as I read the Appy or Herring books. Since when reading these books we are able to look at the war in an overview of past events. This provides, at least for me, the same as hindsight reflection does for McNamara.

There are only a couple of parts of his discussion that made me think he might be suffering from a blurring of details. The first of these was his saying that he didn't remember if he authorized the use of Agent Orange in Vietnam. The second was his general unwillingness to talk about some aspects of the war. While I can understand why he would not

speak on several subjects, I think McNamara could have managed to make statements without causing problems that he thought he would.

I don't know if LBJ or Nixon being alive and in a documentary similar to the one we watched would provide more or better input on Vietnam that would add to a better understanding of the war. It appears to me that their reflections on the war would be more interesting than useful. It would have been interesting to see if their opinions would have changed given time of reflection. However I do think that LBJ and Nixon were so committed to their beliefs that their statements made in a documentary similar to Fog of War would be like the statements they made during the war. The only differences they might have made is to indicate regret for the innocents that were victims of the war.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Political Leader's Reflection; Is It Useful?

by Sierra Lavoie - Friday, November 23, 2012, 11:03 AM

Evelyn,

What you said in your last paragraph about Nixon and LBJ and their reflections on the war if they were still alive was very interesting. Both these men were committed to their approach to the war but if they could look back all these years later would their understanding and approach change? Its hard to know what they would think. I agree with what you said, "I do think that LBJ and Nixon were so committed to their beliefs that their statements made in a documentary similar to Fog of War would be like the statements they made during the war." If these former presidents were interviewed I doubt they would admit they took the wrong approach but I am sure they would show some remorse for all the innocent people on both sides who were killed.

Robert McNamara's approach didn't seem to change all these years later. He showed some regret for the people affected by Agent orange and the innocent people that were affected. It was clear in the video clip that all these years later he still felt like he did the right thing. I am sure all the people involved with making decisions about Vietnam still agonize over their choices and wonder if a different approach could have won the war and saved more lives. The war is over and all we can do now is learn from the mistakes that were made and become a stronger nation.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Political Leader's Reflection; Is It Useful?

by Evelyn Deutscher - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 07:46 PM

All political leaders will have remorse for their actions because of the people that were affected, but they will still stand by their decisions. As you brought up I do think they would have remorse for the innocents killed because they are all human and they will still feel loss of life as a tragedy. But as you said with your point with McNamara it seems that these leaders don't really change in what they say, so why would Nixon or LBJ if they have been alive.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Political Leader's Reflection; Is It Useful?

by Michael Sitterley - Saturday, November 24, 2012, 11:00 PM

Evelyn:

I agree with you that this is just little more than a personal reflection. The more I digest the interview in the video of McNamara, I begin to see that he had too much vested in the war to help cut through the "fog". The interviewer asked McNamara, "are you damned if you do and damned if you don't" and McNamara said, "I would rather be damned if I don't." The fact that he would rather save face than shed light on parts of the war proves that it is probable that he was withholding pertinent information. Thus contributing to the overall "fog".

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Political Leader's Reflection; Is It Useful?

by Evelyn Deutscher - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 07:50 PM

It is interesting that you bring up that McNamara would rather save face than shed light on parts of the war. It makes sense, but I find it tragic because it seemed that throughout learning the Vietnam war that the critical error throughout

these years is the fact that political leaders wanted to save face. To prove that America was strong and would win the wars it chose to fight. I do think in McNamara's interview he tries to save face not only for himself, but for other public leaders because he doesn't want to reflect poorly on them.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Nixons Vietnamization

by Michelle Srstka - Wednesday, November 21, 2012, 11:38 PM

There were several problems that hampered efforts to conclude the war. One was an unwillingness to negotiate, both on Nixons part and the part of the North Vietnamese. Another problem was Nixons belief that withdrawal would result in a worldwide collapse in confidence in American leadership. Nixon also mentioned in his speech that withdrawal would result in more massacres like the ones that occurred when the Communists took over the north.

I think American troop withdrawals and Vietnamization were essential complements of each other. A stronger Vietnamese army would allow American troops to be withdrawn. Without a stronger Vietnamese army, troop withdrawals would not have been possible. When two things like this are so closely linked and have such a great effect on each other they should not be de-coupled.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Nixons Vietnamization

by Sierra Lavoie - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 03:12 PM

Michelle,

I to think that the troop withdraws and Vietnamization went hand in hand. Because of Vietnamization the South's army got stronger and was enabled with all they would need to fight alone. Once the army had been fortified American troops could withdraw. "Most military experts agreed that without full American assistance, the South Vietnamese Army could not stand up against the combined threat of the NVA and NLF." (283 Herring) Its really discouraging to see that before America pulled out of Vietnam most experts believed that once South Vietnam was left to fight on its own it would fall to the enemy. All the money, supplies, and weapons that were placed in SV by America in an effort to undergo Vietnamization was all just a quick cover up so America could leave there with "Peace with honor" as Nixon said. America was at the point where there really were few choices about what to do with the situation in Vietnam.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Nixons Vietnamization

by Michelle Srstka - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 11:16 PM

I had the same thoughts about 'peace with honor'. It was really about getting out of Vietnam, because Nixon didn't want it becoming his war. He was trying to find a way out that would save face. Unfortunately, by that point we were so deeply involved in Vietnam that there was no good answer for how to get us out of the war without it seeming like we were abandoning South Vietnam.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Nixons Vietnamization

by Michael Sitterley - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 05:23 PM

Does the Vietnamization and American troop pull out really complement each other? On the same level, wasn't the troop removal more to pacify the growing anger in the U.S. and not to strengthen the South, rather just to dump the burden of the war on them.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

Re: Nixons Vietnamization



by Michelle Srstka - Sunday, November 25, 2012, 11:08 PM

I do believe that troops were withdrawn, at least in part, to pacify anger in the US. Regardless of motivations, an argument can be made for Vietnamization and troop withdrawal going hand in hand. Vietnamization of the war was a way to allow troops to be withdrawn without suddenly pulling out altogether. I also think an argument can be made for the other side of the issue. You asked if they really complement each other but didn't elaborate. What are your thoughts on it?

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

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

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

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

