



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

(Vietnamization of the War) Next >



Fog of War

by Joe Escobar - Sunday, May 26, 2013, 3:35 PM

This forum thread is for Fog of War posts and replies.

After studying the required materials, address the individual questions in SEPARATE posts.

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

To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post.

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply



Re: Fog of War

by John Howland - Tuesday, May 28, 2013, 4:38 PM

First we must understand that what happened in Vietnam was never declared a war; it was a police action that became known as the Vietnam Conflict. As for McNamara's video clip and if they had any effect on my understanding of war, the answer is simply, no. What I heard was a politician trying to make excuses for his actions in Vietnam. McNamara makes the statement "How much evil must we do in order to do good?" to which I reply, if we have to do evil to do good, is it worth it? In the PBS video, McNamara talks about General LeMay saying "Most Air Force Generals can tell you how many planes they had, how many tons of bombs they dropped but he (LeMay) was the only person that I knew in the senior command of the Air Force who focused solely on the loss of his crews per unit of target destruction". This amazed me, no one talked about the thousands of innocent Vietnamese they sent to their graves or the thousands of both Vietnamese and American soldiers who suffer still from the effects of Agent Orange. McNamara makes another telling statement when he says "What is morally appropriate in a wartime environment?" to this I reply that it should be the same in any environment. If, as the US government always claims, we are better than the people we are fighting then why is it that we do some of the terrible things that we accuse them of doing. McNamara's memory isn't foggy; he is doing what he needs to do to cover all

his bases to keep his friends from going to jail for “war” crimes.

As to the Questions “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?” I feel that, as with McNamara, they would not add anything more than their own excuses for their actions. They would try, like McNamara, explain away their actions as something anyone would have done in their place without adding any new information. A telling statement by McNamara upon being asked “Do you feel in any way responsible for the War? Do you feel guilty?” was “I don't want to go any further with this discussion. It just opens up more controversy. I don't want to add anything to Vietnam. It is so complex that anything I say will require additions and qualifications” this also would be the standard statement by both LBJ and Nixon. It seems that no one in government is willing to take responsibility for their actions, something we have to do every day.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Fog of War

by Elizabeth Gambee - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 6:12 PM

Very interesting points. It's too bad that it's so difficult to achieve accurate information from this era due to the fact that so many of the accounts of particular events are tainted by personal or political bias. It truly does seem like no one in government is willing to take responsibility for their actions...

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Fog of War

by Hao Qiu - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 6:31 PM

As you said, if LBJ or Nixon were filmed in a documentary, they would not add anything more than their excuses. McNamara really did a good job by telling the public the truth and he did hold some truth back that should not let people know. But all he did was not foggy, he was doing what he needed to do and trying to make his country to be good.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Mcnamara and the Fog of War

by Nathaniel Hahn - Wednesday, May 29, 2013, 1:27 PM

After watching former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara talk in the video clip, I am not sure that it changes my opinion about the war. While the stories from the Appy book provide great insight of the war from a range of perspectives, it

would be interesting to have read an account from somebody like Mcnamara to try to, at the very least, understand better where the “architects” of the war were coming from. This video provides a little insight into that. I am not sure that his memory is “foggy,” in fact I think his understanding of the war might even be better now than when it was during the war. He had had thirty years (Fog of War was 2003) to think about all the events that had transpired, all the actions taken during the war, and maybe even more importantly, those actions not explored or taken. He was given an opportunity in 1995 to meet with some officials from Vietnam to better understand their point of view. He even says himself that all this is hindsight and that hindsight is not available during the course of action. I do not think he was apologizing in any way, but I see a man who is conflicted about the war and the decisions that were made; and I think the reason for the video was made clear at the end of the clip when he says that people misunderstood the war and misunderstood him, and this might help people understand just a little more, the decision making and political process that was behind this war.

It would be interesting, for the same reasons as Mcnamra, to hear what Kennedy or Johnson would have to say if they were still alive. Would they regret any of their decisions? Would they still stand firm to their convictions that they held thirty years prior? Again those are questions that are not easily answered without creating backlash. If anything I think it would be important for the same reasons the Appy book is important, and why the Fog of War was important; just a better understanding of the parties involved. It seems that so much was done under a cloud of secrecy and deception, and to have somebody like Johnson or Kennedy to sit down and clarify their actions and decisions I think would be another step in understand the war and maybe even be another step in the healing process.





Re: McNamara and the Fog of War

by Kyle Poirier - Friday, May 31, 2013, 12:11 PM

I agree that McNamara is less foggy now then ever. He has been able to think about the war, and more importantly hear other accounts of the war from different view points. When he met with the former foreign minister of Vietnam, like you said, that was a huge move in gaining valuable insight into the other viewpoint in the war. Such as hearing that Vietnam never wanted to be a pawn of the Chinese (with communism), who they have been enemies with for so long.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: McNamara and the Fog of War

by Hao Qiu - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 1:05 AM

Yes, McNamara is less foggy, he was trying to deeply think about the war and what did it bring to the US. He tried to work on the relationship between the US and the Vietnam, help the president to plan strategy, he did a really good job on his place.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: McNamara and the Fog of War

by David Hartness - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 4:12 PM

McNamara's did see and take a part in lots of events during the Vietnam war. I can also see why he shouldn't live in regret for his actions throughout the war. That lacking of hindsight can make it difficult to know the outcome of events. It wasn't his fault he couldn't see through all of the fog. His meeting with former enemies in 1995 must of really changed his thought's about the war too, as he didn't realize what the Northern Vietnamese were fighting for, until it was too late.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Robert McNamara's recollection of the war

by Kyle Poirier - Wednesday, May 29, 2013, 3:04 PM

In the *Fog of War* documentary, it appears that Robert McNamara's recollection of the war is less foggy. Except for the part where he either doesn't remember, or doesn't want to admit that he okayed the use of Agent Orange. But as far as actually being uncertain in the situation, his recollection is more certain, because he has

been able to look at the affects and causes of the war in hindsight with other people's sides of the story coming out. He even went and talked with former foreign minister of Vietnam in 1995, to get his view. Even though they argued profusely during this, it still uplifted some of the fogginess he had previously.

His recollections help me better understand his thought processes, even though he did hold back some in the epilogue, it was great for him to come out and talk publicly about this war which gives him a myriad amount of criticism. This documentary has similarities with the *Appy* book in that you here opinions from both sides of the war. The most interesting part for me in this video was when the former foreign minister asking if McNamara ever read a history book. Because they have been fighting the Chinese for a thousand years for Independence so there is no way they would have become pawns of them. This was a good thing for McNamara to hear and for the future leaders of our country because before doing something so drastic at war, we need to find out what the other country wants and what actually is motivating them.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Robert McNamara's recollection of the war

by Hao Qiu - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 3:51 PM

You brought up a good point. I do agree that McNamara's recollection of the war is less foggy. He tried to tell the public what really happened during that time, even he hold some truth back and did not want to talk about it.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Robert McNamara's recollection of the war

by David Hartness - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 4:24 PM

I would have a hard time accepting authorizing the use of agent orange as well. Agent orange still affects people to this day. The affects a rather less than pleasant.

http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Agent_Orange#Effects_on_the_Vietnamese_people

The lesson certainly had a big impact on McNamara, but will help help people understand the future effects warfare.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Robert McNamara's recollection of the war

by Elizabeth Gambee - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 6:38 PM

I too only really found the part where he could not recall authorizing or not

authorizing the use of Agent Orange for warfare the foggy part of his interview.

I agree that McNamara's discussion with the former foreign minister was likely eye opening for him as it emphasized the importance of understanding and learning about particular nations that we are so heavily involved with. I think that it's important for future leaders of our country to keep this in mind so that we can avoid such negative implication from occurring. Had we more fully understood the Vietnamese and their culture, I think that a lot of time, effort, and lives could have been saved in the long run.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Fog of War

by Jon-wesley McLeod - Wednesday, May 29, 2013, 3:12 PM

McNamara seems to go back and forth in this documentary. He is constantly apologizing and saying that mistakes were made throughout the Vietnam War and that people learn from their mistakes so as to not repeat them. Later, he basically says war is human nature and we will never change as a species. These two statements contradict each other in my opinion. McNamara says "What is morally appropriate in a wartime environment?" (The Fog of War) Then goes on to explain the use of Agent Orange stating "Were they committing a crime against humanity? Let's look at the law. What kind of a law do we have saying that these chemicals are accepted in use for war and these chemicals are not." (The Fog of War) This seems like a very slick political way of escaping responsibility. The people elected to office in The United States or any position of power in which countless lives are dependent upon the actions of that position and the character of the elected official, should conduct themselves as if there are rules in place (some are, such as the ban on mustard gas since '25) instead of exploiting the fact there are no laws regarding that new specific compound. I don't accept the statement that he doesn't remember if he authorized the use of Agent Orange being able to recollect many other things about the war, but I do agree with the "fog of war" statement in which McNamara describes the context of war being too expansive for man to fully envision. No one man, or party for that matter, had direct control over the fate of the Vietnam War.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Fog of War

by Elizabeth Gambee - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 6:20 PM

I noticed the same thing. A lot of McNamara's statements seemed to contradict one another. I think you said it very well when you mentioned McNamara's slick maneuver of escaping the responsibility of the effects of Agent Orange. Who is to say that laws are always moral enough to establish whether or not a particular action is committing a crime against humanity? I agree that to people

in position of power should conduct themselves as though there are certain rules in place rather than exploiting the fact that there are no official laws regarding any new specific compound.

Personally, I found that statement that he could not recall authorizing the use of Agent Orange for warfare rather disturbing and unbelievable. It seems highly unlikely that something of such magnitude and significance could be forgotten so easily.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Fog of War

by David Hartness - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 9:44 PM

The mistakes and apologizing seem to entirely go with the theme of the fog of war. The actions of violence were used to solve problems in the past, but certainly will continue to be done in the future, which is relevant in the time that has passed since the Vietnam war. He made mistakes that he wished could of been prevented, but continued on because of the fog of war. I accept his mistakes, even though they were extremely wrong choices. Hopefully his mistakes will lead to better choices in the future.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Fog of War Question 1

by Athena Miller - Wednesday, May 29, 2013, 4:06 PM

My understanding of the statements made by former Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara on the war is the government made mistakes in handling the situation in Vietnam, but everybody makes mistakes and they learn from them. What he didn't say was that the United States government repeatedly kept making the same mistakes and wasn't learning from them. They didn't agree with viewpoint of the North Vietnamese in regards to the reasons of the war. The United States believed initially it was a fight against Communism and the North was in affiliation with the Soviet Union and China, while the North believed they were trying to claim independence for their country and have a unified Vietnam. He also did acknowledge that they didn't have an understanding of the Vietnamese culture, which other sources, such as the Herring book do agree with.

I do believe that he was "a little foggy" in his recollection of the war, especially when he said "you didn't get any more than we were willing to give you at the beginning of the war. You could have had the whole damn thing...independence, unification." The United States wasn't willing to give those things to North Vietnam in the beginning; they were more concerned in appeasing the French government during that time.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Fog of War Question 1

by Elizabeth Gambee - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 6:23 PM

I appreciated the fact that McNamara at least acknowledged the lack of understanding of the Vietnamese culture. Personally, I think that this was a huge component to the formula of disaster that was catalyzed over the years of American presence in Vietnam. I think that it's of extreme value to acknowledge this failure of understanding in order to avoid making similar mistakes elsewhere.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Fog of War Question 1

by Jon-wesley McLeod - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 9:36 PM

Yes. I also believe a big aspect of the war was the dehumanization that came with the lack of cultural understanding. But, I do think the Vietnam War was a harsh learning experience for America and hopefully we will have learned from our mistakes for future foreign policies and endeavours.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Fog of War

by Jon-wesley McLeod - Wednesday, May 29, 2013, 4:03 PM

If LBJ, Nixon, or even Kennedy were alive today we would definitely benefit from what they had to say regarding their thoughts and involvement in the Vietnam War. It's really hard to give hypotheticals on how they would feel regarding these issues with the benefits of hindsight. Would they admit mistakes like McNamara or take a hardline approach about the decisions they made during the conflict? Even though he was the president that ultimately decreased the troops in the final stages of the war and to eventual withdrawal, would Nixon have a hard time accepting the eventualities given the characteristics described of him from many different accounts, especially about his anti-communist stance and paranoid behavior? LBJ seems opinionated and steadfast but time has a way of changing people's outlook such as it did with other "hawks", so it is also hard to speculate on what his disposition would be. LBJ didn't even seek a second term because of the stress but was in office for six years during a very tumultuous time domestically and internationally. Whatever it may entail, it would still be valuable to get an autobiography through the president's eyes.

I agree with McNamara in essence that we looked at Vietnam as a “theatre in the Cold War” while Vietnamese saw it as a civil war and a war for independence from China. The other misconception that the Vietnamese saw us as imperial aggressors (one in a long line) and we thought of us as defenders of freedom and democracy. These misunderstandings on both sides could be argued either way with compelling grandiloquence, unfortunately it proceeded with a great amount of casualties and suffering.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Fog of War Question 2

by Athena Miller - Wednesday, May 29, 2013, 4:22 PM

If LBJ or Nixon were still alive they may be able to clarify why they made some of the decisions that they made in regards to the war, but it may also muddle issues more. They might have put a spin on information to make them look more positive in their reasoning to justify their actions. I'm not sure if it would have enlightened us to better understand the war, but it would definitely have given us another dimension to add to our own interpretations of the war.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Fog of War Question 2

by Kyle Poirier - Saturday, June 1, 2013, 2:26 PM

Yes, I agree. They may have been able to clarify their decision making. And anyone in that position doesn't want to look like the bad guy so they both may have tried to make their actions seem better than they were. But in the end I think it would be helpful, at least a little, because we could get more stories that will help our overall understanding.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Fog of War Question 2

by Elizabeth Gambee - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 6:41 PM

Exactly. I think you said it very well when you said that LBJ and Nixon's input could potentially muddle issues further because of personal motives to justify their actions and attempt to shed themselves in a more positive light. As you said, regardless, the very least that we could gain from their insight could be another dimension to add to our own interpretations of the Vietnam War.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Re: Fog of War

by David Hartness - Wednesday, May 29, 2013, 4:37 PM

The McNamara was an excellent video on how history and can be interpreted differently. The thought of the war between Vietnam as a civil war and an part of the cold war is interesting. The lack of clarity to understand what you're facing until it's already too late definitely plays a huge role in history. I understand McNamara authorized things that had a great loss on human life, but also understand why he can't live in regret with it. He didn't know what the outcome would be in the future, the fog of war hides too much about a enemy we already didn't know much about to begin with. I'm sure if LBJ or Nixon were interviewed they would have a similar conclusion. They were just men trying to do something hoping for a good resolution. I think McNamara would of acted differently if he was better informed, but it's history and can only be used to hopefully better the present.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Fog of War

by Athena Miller - Saturday, June 1, 2013, 2:41 PM

I also can understand why McNamara can't live in regret or feel constant guilt for his actions during the Vietnam War. A person couldn't move forward in their life if they live in regret and guilt. He made the choices he made because he thought they were the right choices at the time or he felt he didn't have a choice. In the case of Agent Orange, he said he didn't remember if he authorized its use. This may be a way he coped with the tragedies that have been attributed to the use of the chemical. But even if he knowingly admitted to authorizing the use, he's not a scientist, it's not like he knew that the chemical would cause devastating affects to the people who came into contact with it. Of course the counter argument to that would be "but did they even ask if there would be any side effects to using the chemical?" There are always "what ifs, could of, or should of" when looking at things in hindsight. It doesn't mean that those choices would have been any better in the long run. He made the choices he made at the time and he can't change them, so he has to make peace with them.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Fog of War

by Hao Qiu - Wednesday, May 29, 2013, 11:43 PM

1. After watch this video, a point came up on my understanding of the war, which is we all make mistakes, no one will avoid that. The beginning of the war, the policy of the war, all of these might be mistakenly made by people who were in charge. The war was so complex, it was beyond human's mind, and people killed people unnecessarily.

He was a little foggy when he said he did not want to say any words to the questions that people asked, such as "Do you feel guilty? Do you feel any response for the war?" Mcnamana said people did not know how inflammatory his words would be, but he also did not tell people the truth that hidden by him.

2. LBJ and Nixon were two presidents with opposite opinions on the Vietnam war. Johnson was taking up a more forceful approach to the Vietnam conflict. Johnson expressed that he believe strongly in that,he was not going to withdraw from that effort. For him to withdraw from that effort would mean a collapse not only of south Vietnam, but southeast Asia. This was just same as President Kennedy said. Johnson could never have envisaged what he had started. By the time of the 1968 presidential election, America had become more embroiled in a war than before.

On the other hand, Nixon was trying to withdraw the American troops out of Vietnam. He did not even wait for my inauguration to begin my quest for peace. He wrote letter to Ho Chi Minh to ask for conference for the war to bring blessing of peace for people.

Both of them could be able to add to our understanding of the war, it shows two different opinions of two American leaders. The policies that they used to Vietnam and Asia could represent the attitude that the US trade Southeast Asia, China, and Soviet Union. It can help us understand the relationships among those countries.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



LBJ and Nixon

by Kyle Poirier - Friday, May 31, 2013, 12:02 PM

If LBJ or Nixon were still alive and had been filmed in a documentary like the *Fog of War* it would be interesting, just like McNamara's accounts, to hear. If they weren't bogged down by trying to deny and make themselves look like the "good" guy, I think we could get some valuable insights. They were also put into this position of war without a choice so I think they very well could give us honest insights of what went on bureaucratically. But no matter what it would add to our understanding of the war, just like how the *Appy* book has. The more accounts you can hear from the more people, the better grasp we will get of the war overall, and this then will further uplift the fog.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: LBJ and Nixon

by David Hartness - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 4:06 PM

It's really hard to tell who the "Good Guy" in war is. I think LBJ and Nixon were both trying to do what they found just during the actions within the Vietnam war. Like McNamara, they would of certainly acted differently if they had the clarity and dissipation of the fog of war. It's amazing how easily many of these event's could of prevented the war entirely. But wondering of the what could of been doesnt change what happened.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: LBJ and Nixon

by Elizabeth Gambee - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 5:43 PM

Very well said. I agree that it truly is very difficult to determine who the "Good Guy" was during the war. As you mentioned, had the "fog of the war" dissipated, it's pretty incredible to think about how many of these events could have potentially prevented the war entirely.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Re: LBJ and Nixon

by Kyle Poirier - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 11:44 PM

Good point. We look back on it from a non-foggy view and we think what were some people thinking? but they most likely didn't know what we know now. They were caught up in the midst and didnt have the clearest view to pick the right path of actions

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Re: LBJ and Nixon

by Elizabeth Gambee - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 6:26 PM

I agree that LBJ and Nixon could potentially provide us with some useful insight to expand our understanding of the Vietnam War. I do, however, think that it would be likely that their input would be tainted by personal and political bias, but in my opinion, I still think that their input would be valuable regardless. This is because (as you mentioned), the more accounts that you hear from the more sources, the better understanding and insight of the war you gain.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: LBJ and Nixon

by Kyle Poirier - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 11:47 PM

Yes I think it would be tainted, and maybe they wouldn't even say much. Like in the end of the video when McNamara said he would rather face the scrutiny of not talking rather than talking. This would probably be the case for these presidents, but in the end the more accounts of history the better so I say "bring it on."

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Fog of War

by Georgia Haskell - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 12:47 AM

At the very end of the interview he is asked if he felt like is was "Dammed if you do and Dammed if you don't ". He replied yes and I would rather be dammed if I don't. That is interesting because that is sort of how the Vietnam War was dealt with after a while and they chose Dammed if they do. I don't think he was in a Fog in the interview because he chose not to talk at a certain point.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Fog of War

by Athena Miller - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 3:49 PM

I perceived this statement a little differently than you did. I gathered that he would rather not say anything to allow people to twist his words into something he did not intend or mean to say. Many people have already made up their own opinions of his actions and he basically didn't want to add more fuel to fire. I could be wrong, but I'm sure he must be tired of defending his actions and decisions during the war and just didn't want to add more for critics to throw at him.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Fog of War

by Elizabeth Gambee - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 5:46 PM

I agree. I feel as though that particular statement was made in order to avoid allowing people to twist his words into something he did not mean. In my opinion, the era of the Vietnam War was a time in which this was all too

easy..Everybody's lack of understanding and confusion towards American motives and participation in the war often led to misinterpretations of a lot of peoples' actions.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Fog of War

by Georgia Haskell - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 11:11 PM

I think I was a little to vague in that post. Clearly he was referring to not wanting to talk when he said he would rather be dammed if he didn't. I was trying to point out how the term "Dammed if you do and Dammed if you don't" is how the war war was dealt with after a while. Like no action taken or not taken would satisfy everybody. Sorry about that.

Sum of ratings: (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: Fog of War

by Elizabeth Gambee - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 5:06 PM

McNamara's statements concerning the Vietnam War have very similar effects on me to the accounts that I've read in the Appy book. In regards to my understanding of the war, accounts such as this one and the ones presented in the Appy book have illustrated to me the fact that the war was extremely complex and, in my opinion, can never truly be fully understood by any individual due to the incredible amount of information and perspectives held by so many sources. I do, however, still believe that McNamara's statements and those provided in the Appy book do give valuable insight into the complexity of the war and the circumstances and environment experienced its participants. Based off of McNamara's account, I gleaned that the war was understood drastically differently from one group to another. America's intentions were not only interpreted differently by the Vietnamese, but by many Americans as well. Furthermore, McNamara's statement reflected to me how easy it was to misinterpret things during the Vietnam era. Because there was so much confusion ranging from America's involvement and intentions to who was succeeding in winning the war from time to time, people often relied on drawing their own conclusions.

Something that McNamara said that made me believe that he was a little foggy in his recollection of the war was regarding the utilization of the chemical Agent Orange. While discussing its legality and the future implications that it held over many Vietnamese and soldiers, he stated that he would never authorize the use of an illegal war method. However, he then mentioned he could not recall whether or not he authorized the use of Agent Orange or not. This struck me as surprising seeing as the role that Agent Orange played in the war was rather significant. It seemed as

though McNamara dismissed it as somewhat insignificant based off of his apparent indifference in his attempt to recall whether or not he authorized its use.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: Fog of War

by Nathaniel Hahn - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 7:32 PM

I think it was very insightful when you state that the war was understood drastically different from one group to another and that Vietnamese and Americans alike interpreted the event s of the war differently. And it is helpful having the stories from the Appy book as well as materials like the Fog of War to try to understand the complexities of the war, but you are right when you say that it no one will probably ever fully understand all the “whys” of the war. I too found it interesting when McNamara commented on the use of Agent Orange, but I wonder if it was more not willing to admit guilt and possibly face consequences for his actions and role for the use of chemicals in the war rather than a foggy memory.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



LBJ/Nixon

by Elizabeth Gambee - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 5:41 PM

I believe that if LBJ or Nixon were still alive and had been filmed in a documentary similar to Fog of War that they could potentially add to our understanding of the war if they were honest and straight forward. I believe that they could have provided insight into more of America's political motives and into our agenda for the time. However, realistically, I think that it is more accurate to assume that their statements would be tainted by some sort of bias. Regardless, I believe that their accounts would still hold some value and enough credibility to enhance our understanding of the war.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



Re: LBJ/Nixon

by Hao Qiu - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 11:01 PM

I agree with you, if they could be filmed in a documentary, they'd better tell people the truth, and, all their words will be add to our understanding of the war to help us know to know more about the war.

Sum of ratings: (1)

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



McNamara Seems a Little Foggy

by Jacob Hutchins - Sunday, June 2, 2013, 10:24 PM

But then again, I have to have some respect. It's true that his position on the war in Vietnam changed over time, but i'm not sure whether or not this represents a monumental flip-flop or if his changes in attitude were genuine. I do think that if people such as him had not evolved on the situation it would have dragged on even longer. I truly wish LBJ and Nixon were still alive; i'm sure their insights, no matter how they would have been colored, would be valuable.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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

(Vietnamization of the War) Next >

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

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)

