

Running head: ANALYZING U.S. INVOLVEMENT IN THE VIETNAM WAR

Melissa Crider

NWACC spring 2012

Dr. April L. Brown

History of American People Since 1877

HIST 2013 – 18W

Final Essay

Analyzing U.S. Involvement in the Vietnam War

May 6, 2012

The ideology of *enforcing peace* is nothing if not a moronic oxymoron. The phraseology is also aggrieved and abominated by Americans whose intelligence quotients rise well above freezer temperature. Behaving like a savage despot in the name of aiming to overthrow communism is a sick and twisted, most hypocritical affair. In the Vietnam War, catch phrases that poured out of politicians' mouths such as *spreading democracy*, or *ensuring peace*, and *protecting freedom* are such laced milk chocolate, such insipid, dishonest camouflage that only served as umbrella for word-garbage that presidents popped open to gloss over the rotten fences of their actual motives and behavior.

The anguish and tension seeds that grew up like a bushel of once fledgling trees into sturdy oaks served to only humiliate and degrade our country and countless other countries for unknown decades to come. U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War humiliated humanity. It slapped and mocked human dignity to such unprecedented basal levels in American society, and of which should never have been permissible or ever again be permissible on this planet.

Trying to pick apart the pieces of Vietnam is like trying to hand-pick lice from an oily scalp and its lengthy strands of a lush head of blondest hair--for over a decade, with autocratic, automatic cruelest nitpicking fingers taking too many turns over one big lice-ridden scalp—except this isn't a nanny picking away indifferently, this was the behavior of four successive U.S. presidents and their narcissistic half-sleeping administrations.

Hindsight provides the luxury to ruminate over anything, on every single arduous action and aim. Only when glancing in the rear-view may one be permitted the luxury of more easily picking apart sequences in order to deconstruct every single action of a soldier, of grasping the vacillations of the global political climate, of America's position on the almighty chess board of foreign relations, or of its global economic status and rank in power during the period of the Vietnam War.

It is difficult for an American citizen to be made to wade through the murky muck of polished words that pour like fluid silk out of power-mad presidents' mouths in the way of attempting to cover what rancid evils their feet and orders are doing. Some of the speeches and quotes sound much like an airline pilot that comes on over the intercom's scratchy bad speakers in a calm low voice and pacifies his passengers by basically offering '*information-less information*' assuming that the average passenger will believe him when he in actuality possesses full knowledge that the airplane's engine has malfunctioned galore and he can not control the aircraft with his feet hands or mind anymore. In the case of Vietnam, the airplane was never equipped to leave the ground in the first place! "Well folks..." (Then the rest of the stuttered drone is assuagement).

Genuine fear takes somber root when a decent conscience is made to not trust his/her supposed democratic government. American people were witness to our blowing innocent people to bits, pouring gasoline on innocent human flesh--so much so that we couldn't recognize the disfigured body parts in order to be able to count them--and raping innocent South Vietnamese civilian women after cutting off their ponytails and flaunting them in their hats while their naked crying screaming children ran motherless down chaotic dirt roads...killing thousands upon thousands of human beings merely due to... which pole of Vietnam they lived.

This is unequivocally the very worst actual hell ever experienced on this Earth.

American administrations behaved as horrifically as any of the worst dictators in *any* country's, or perhaps this world's history when deciding for over a tumultuous greedy decade to "intervene" [another word slapped on like a sticker to cover truth, far too neutral of a word to suitably qualify as being permissible in being fitting for such atrocities]. The case of American soldiers' savage behavior in the *My Lai Massacre* makes one at least fathom the emotional reaction to the killings of children and innocent women that must have fueled Jane Fonda's feces-smearing behavior, whether agreeing with her austere actions or not. I personally wish that I could have made horse dung sandwiches for White House luncheons and for every member of Congress every single day throughout that entire decade.

The Vietnam War was out of control when Lyndon B. Johnson was in office and the mayhem brewed on when Nixon fell into his big-boy "Johnson's War" shoes. "Added to the mix were the racial divisions in the country, the skepticism toward within the anti-war movement, and a long standing antipathy toward Nixon among Democratic loyalists (Simon)." On November 3, 1969, when giving his address to the nation on the war in Vietnam, President Nixon began by trying to appeal to Americans by letting them know the circumstantial climate in which he had inherited this war's decision making when taking office. When trying to justify his new position in our country's actions in South Vietnam, he said to the American people,

"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 [...] 1,000 Americans had been killed in action [...] The training program for the South Vietnamese was behind schedule [...] 540,000 Americans were in Vietnam with no plans to reduce the number [...] No progress had been made at the negotiations in Paris and the United States had not put forth a comprehensive peace proposal [...] The war was causing deep division at home and criticism from many of our friends as well as our enemies abroad (American)."

Simply put, American administrations that led us through Vietnam painted themselves as *benevolent big brothers* by wielding the power of our country into other countries' business far too much and often (and still) and with seeming "we are only helping you" intentions at the outset (like Eisenhower, or how we would like to be seen, rather), but without considering the cavernous echo that will continue throughout time costing innumerable consequence, or the unknown dominoes that may or will fall long and hard into the future as a result of our inflicted involvement in such travesties. This was not focused upon enough by our government.

The fact is that America acted like a nation promoting the *freedom* of South Vietnam from communistic rule by North Vietnam, but in actuality, our aim was for the entire global spotlight regarding foreign relations and global trade. The presidential administrations, the parrot-like press, and other hate-mongers or the fear-driven held aims of greed and an insanely swollen urge for power and control. What is the difference between communistic rule and America's dictatorial behavior during the Vietnam War? Nothing. Not a single difference. American administrations that led the Vietnam War should have had the sense to grasp the ill oxymoron that was their *imposed despotic freedom*.

To gain even an anorexic understanding of U.S. involvement in the Vietnam War, it would involve delving into the totality of the overall global political climate, our place in the world economy, and foreign trade relations before and throughout the duration of merely the culmination time period of the decade of the war, along with accounting for the different social attitudes of America in all of their secular divided climbing ways. It would especially require knowledge of [at the very least] the four starring U.S. presidencies that led American minds during their perpetuated war and what the aim of each man was, and *who* each man was: Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, and Nixon...to contract a fair bulimia of psyche.

The presidential bookends of the war played big parts in the sad drama. Truman and Eisenhower were mavericks in a pre-brewing place when things began to rev about South Vietnam needing our aid. Jimmy Carter was the caboose and a seeming spot of blonde soft-spoken sunshine after the darkest Watergate resignation of Nixon. Ford's quick stint with his premature immature "pardon" of Nixon's highly publicized paranoia and trashed reputation could not have been thought up by a movie producer.

Vietnam was no *gentleman's war* [yet another nauseating political phraseology aimed at neutralizing the sheer vitriolic acid of horrendous premeditated actions]. President Eisenhower got things started in the short wake of Truman. To call the fact that they had not a clue about Vietnamese culture, nor their peoples' mentality would be an odious understatement; our American people did not have two clues either. To other countries, we must look like a brave schoolboy with a low I.Q. who thinks he knows best for all of the boys and wants to control the playground, but has no idea that some of the boys he will try to control will be worlds different from him...and that there is a good chance that he may fail at inflicting his ideas. Who in his right mind elects to enter into an abominable war of such consequential magnitude without possessing an even mediocre knowledge of his opponents' mentality, lifestyle, or culture as to be able to navigate any kind of reputable dependable strategy?

Only the blatantly insane, inane, or hormonally-mad would prematurely and decidedly devastate three to four million human beings who belonged to Vietnam without knowing a thing about who they were killing and who it was that they were "fighting for". The Vietnamese people were treated like roaches by our American government. They thought they could just bomb the apartment complex with Agent Orange and the roaches would scramble away. This beastly idiocy should never be forgiven, could never be forgiven. Forgiveness is for accidental mistakes. The Vietnam War was far from accidental mistake making.

It was *deliberate murder*...in the name of *protecting freedom*.

After taking Nixon's resigned seat, Ford is the one who should have thought to make an apology to the Vietnamese on behalf of America, but he did not. Not only did he not apologize, Ford sent a conscious message to the world that our president should be forgiven! This was another domino of hasty decision making. In the world's eyes, America had just massacred millions of Vietnamese people and then promptly pardoned its very president who oversaw the war's closing from his own crazy antics and lies due to some tape recordings!?! It is beyond a chore-bore when people say, "Oh, well, *nothing* is truly the President's fault in a democracy--the president is just the puppet!"

I say differently. Puppets have strings and the American people who “*don’t ever blame the puppet*” should sever the strings from their very own fingers and mute their mouths while letting their puppet fall to the floor in the lifeless heap they just mocked it as being. I believe full well that any human being who has the gall to accept such a leadership position and responsibility as to take on the overwhelming burden of being the President of the United States of America-- known to him or unbeknownst to him—may be a parrot, but certainly no puppet, as he takes every single responsibility on his very own head...and for the rest of his life as he will ever know his life.

I wonder what FDR would have done with the Vietnam War. He seemed to take care of his own people and may have represented the attitudes of Americans most quickly. The man did what he said he was going to do and *cared for his own* first. Why did it take two more decades after the stretched out decade-plus war for former secretary of defense, Robert McNamara to confess of our ignorance via some emotive pansy memoir apology? Why did pride bleed on--as if there were any blood left to bleed-- having to *wait* for the office of Bill Clinton to cough out a formal apology? What good is an apology when three to four million dead souls whom you never understood to begin with cannot ever hear you again? That apology took as much root as if one had spoken it inside the deafness of a cave under water. How does such make Americans look to other countries?

Both the Truman and Eisenhower administrations were high on the defeat of the French fiasco when they, “*financed the creation of a pro-American South Vietnamese government, in violation of the Geneva Accords of 1954 that had promised elections to unify Vietnam [...] By the 1960s, the United States was committed to the survival of this corrupt regime (Foner, 1056).*”

Thereafter, Kennedy and Johnson followed suit and echoed similar reasoning, but with each successive presidency, our presence, action, and deplorable behavior grew more and more heightened in Vietnam—first as friend of the South Vietnamese with Eisenhower’s aid, then with military advisors sent by Kennedy, until it culminated into a full-blown war with throughout Johnson’s term due to him having deployed thousands of U.S. combat forces to South Vietnam—embedding further and further into American consciousness “the need” for this “peace war”—telling us how important it was to ensure that communism did not take over in South Vietnam... in the name of “peace.” I understand the grave truth of “peace” being a bought consequence of “war” but in actuality it makes zero sense at all and haunts future generations and their families, friends, and countries into other wars.

The goal as far as presidents told us Americans, was to prevent a communist take over in South Vietnam by North Vietnam. President Nixon was torch-taker of Johnson’s already-inherited insanity in Vietnam. You don’t just shut down a culture of communistic temperature with thousands of men, gasoline, napalm-filled bombs, and guns. American administrations had evil political aims and only wished to play power monger under the guise of verbiage such as *spreading democracy*, until we failed miserably after committing horrors beyond any demon’s unhealthiest imaginings.

In 1968, the My Lai massacre slaughtered, raped, and humiliated “some 350 South Vietnamese

civilians (Foner, 1091).” The news lords of the time proved fickle: once promoting the war and pushing how America had “the right to decide the fate of a faraway people about whom it knew almost nothing (Foner, 1091),” then to go on and do an about-face by producing *The Pentagon Papers*, which would have more appropriately been titled, *The Paranoid Papers*, as it tried to track U.S. involvement in Vietnam all the way “back to World War II (Foner, 1091).” The schizophrenic press pushed the fact that we Americans had been lied to by our presidents. Nixon tried to have the paper stopped, but the Supreme Court wagged its head, and said no. They also required Nixon to get their approval to send more troops over to Vietnam with their War Powers Act of 1973, which was a good-conscience first and so long tardy that it would be difficult to assume that this came from good conscience versus being almost forced to do so due to the malaise of the American people about the whole ordeal.

Eisenhower had sent aid and supplies when South Vietnam had asked America to help them, all in the name of preventing a complete Communist take over. We were supposed to buy this as being a wholesome American aim, but the political reasoning dug a deep trench straight to hell throughout the successive presidencies that followed, unraveling the corrupt nature of our impure intentions and basal bloody actions over time.

In his 1964 campaign, Johnson...

“...Insisted that he had no intention of sending American troops to Vietnam [...] But immediately after Johnson’s reelection, the National Security Council recommended that the United States begin air strikes against North Vietnam and introduce American ground troops in the south [...] When the Viet Cong in February 1965 attacked an American air base in South Vietnam, Johnson put the plan in to effect (Foner, 1057).”

In the eyes of America, this thing was known as “Johnson’s War” because Johnson was the first to have sent combat troops, which most deem was a ridiculous mistake. Nixon’s presidential seat must have been a relentlessly demanding position to assume from which to take over and decide to either continue to execute the former presidents’ political thoughts and actions (Eisenhower, Kennedy, and Johnson-namely Johnson’s actions at that point) or take it upon himself to end it.

Presidents allude at teaching Americans during their speeches while trying to claim their hearts at the same time. This gets tricky. Nixon’s speech writer is who I would like to meet; his address to the nation on the war in November of 1969 made one feel as if he is were his/her best friend who was there to serve.

Nixon’s presidency passed to him this unorthodox torch that was on fire and out of control. The atmosphere of the war in the minds of the U.S. people was fraught with hot and cold sentiment while asking that the new President Nixon please see the whole war with a fresh set of eyes. Nixon was overly concerned with foreign affairs with China and the Soviet Union and that information seems to be underplayed when questioning his motives or attempting to grasp how and why he made the decisions he made. Countries want power. Money is power. = Countries seek power via money.

Even accomplices to mass murder possess good qualities: I appreciate that Nixon did a few very

good and important things such as the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with Soviet's Leonid Brezhnev in May of 1972. He also spurned the opening of more peaceful gates for trade with China in the wake of the bitter taste that the Cold War had left between palettes. However, while our troops were up to sheer bloody rape and other evils in South Vietnam, Nixon ate sushi in Beijing in February of 1972 with China's Premier Chou En-lai in order to quell the nemesis ghosts of the Cold War in hopes of swinging the trade door wide open and straight into a 'detente/cooperation' agreement with The Soviet Union. His priorities were set for America's fiscal future, not for the present day of his own country's scores of thousands of men who were dying after having murdered 3-4 million Vietnamese people.

The USA had no initial business butting into the affairs of North and South Vietnam--aka *intervening*. This out of line intervention would end up causing less peace over the span of so many mortifying years of being there while ironically behaving as tyrant in the name of precluding communism. *Unfrozen ice* comes to mind.

When regarding war in general, there is no such thing as a pure benevolent aim or such sincere "goals" in politics, so if a president of any country states that he is doing something for the aim of "peace," we can bet our decent starving sense that underneath such semantic sugar lies an incredibly intricate game of Almighty Global Power Chess. Hypocrisy abounds because power has nothing to do with true freedom. Freedom has no power reigning over it--and no echelons or tiers of control. Control and freedom do not mix.

At the war's culmination and to many Americans' and soldiers' exhaustion, Nixon was still painting our simply being victorious as primary aim. In the address he gave in 1969 that people were referring to as a way for him to end the war, I do not believe that is what he was saying at all. Near the end of his address, these are the words that he spoke:

"In January I could only conclude that the precipitate withdrawal of American forces from Vietnam would be a disaster not only for South Vietnam but for the United States and for the cause of peace [...] For the South Vietnamese, our precipitate withdrawal would inevitably allow the Communists to repeat the massacres which followed their takeover in the North 15 years before; They then murdered more than 50,000 people and hundreds of thousands more died in slave labor camps [...] For the United States, this first defeat in our Nation's history would result in a collapse of confidence in American leadership, not only in Asia but throughout the world (American)."

The fact that Nixon tried to have Americans buy the idea of *Vietnamization* explains a great deal about American administration mentality: We ravage a country's people for years and then abandon when convenient for our aims and reputation as a global power. An average head-scratcher may use mere common sense to retort that if South Vietnam could have fought the war of freedom themselves, then we would never have needed for America to be there in the first place. Slowly wimping out was the nutshell of Nixon's *Vietnamization* plan. A kid playing a board game may have devised a more feasible, more reputable plan.

The war in Vietnam was beyond unsuccessful. It proved to be a horrible failure, deplorable mistake, and utter travesty for human psyches of Vietnam and America. Our failed efforts left

South Vietnam even more vulnerable to North Vietnam's control than they were before American soldiers got there. South Vietnam fell under North Vietnam and the country was "reunified under communistic rule (Foner, 1091)," making our entire time there pointless and a shame. The only thing America did that changed anything from how we first found South Vietnam, is kill 3-4 million of its people.

It seems that the majority of American citizens of that day felt the exact opposite of what their government was doing after a time. Our government's alleged "goals" were not honest, and so it was and continues to be difficult to sort out the truth--the real aims of our power-money-foreign relations aims--regarding the U.S. government's real motives in order to make claims regarding the justification of our intervention. Each of these four successive presidents carried the pressure and burden of his former president's administration, reputation with Americans, logic, goals, and real aims, while at the same time, speaking to our American people as if we were infants who needed to calm from a decade-long colic spree--from the use of Agent Orange in 1962 to the final disastrous term of Nixon when American troops left in 1973.

Vietnam was the only war the U.S. had ever lost. It is known as "a military, political, and social disaster (Foner, 1091)." There should be a law regarding how many human beings can be killed in a war: "More than three million Vietnamese were killed and 58,000 Americans (Foner, 1091)." The *Paris Peace Agreement* that was signed in 1973 proved to be the final bell that sounded, bringing our mentally, physically, and emotionally tortured troops home.... to Jane Fonda insanely throwing baby feces in their faces as if it was our soldiers' faults! It is our country's peoples' fault that we buy into what our smoothly elected presidents lie to us about...over and over...and over and over...again. Then we re-elect them, surrendering to the brainwashing of smooth vocabulary. "Anticipating the fall of Saigon to Communist forces, US President Gerald Ford, speaking in New Orleans, announces that as far as the US is concerned, the Vietnam War was finished (Vietnam)." Ford also granted Nixon pardon from the Watergate scandal when he was elected president, which shocked people. A president that took the U.S. off of the gold standard for our dollar bill along with his paranoid presidency probably should not have been pardoned.

Does current American administration employ lessons learned? One would think we would learn lessons to be able to use from past experiences. I believe that America repeats its mistakes and is repeating them now in Afghanistan. President Barack Obama said in a live taping just two days ago on May 2, 2012, this:

"Tonight I'd like to tell you how we will complete our mission and end the war in Afghanistan [...] We've begun a transition to Afghan responsibility for security [...] At a NATO summit in Chicago, our coalition will set a goal for Afghan forces to be in the lead for combat operations across the country next year [...] International troops will continue to train, advise, and assist the Afghans, and fight along side them when needed, but we will shift into a support role as Afghans step forward [...] As we do, our troops will be coming home [...] As our coalition agreed, by the end of 2014, the Afghans will be fully responsible for the security of their country [...] We will not build permanent bases in this country (President)."

Finally, Obama encourages the Afghan people with, “As you stand up, you will not stand alone (President).” We started this and we’re abandoning you at our convenience, but you are not alone? Sounds familiar. Too familiar: America shows up and takes over like a dictator, fights and kills as long as it wills, and then leaves the place in shambles telling them that we are their brother and here for them. Obama is currently exemplifying a lesson unlearned.

War for peace: Can there finally be another way?

Works Cited

"American Experience: TV's Most-watched History Series." *PBS*. Ed. 1996-2010 WGBH

Educational Foundation. PBS, 2010. Web. 02 May 2012.

<http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/americanexperience/features/primary-resources/nixon-vietnam/>.

Foner, Eric. *Give Me Liberty!: An American History*. 3rd ed. Vol. 2. New York: W.W. Norton &, 2011. Print.

"President Obama Speaks on Ending the War in Afghanistan." *The White House*. 2 May 2012.

Web. 04 May 2012. <http://www.whitehouse.gov/photos-and-video/video/2012/05/01/president-obama-speaks-ending-war-afghanistan>.

Simon, Dennis M. "Nixon and Vietnam." *SMU: Southern Methodist University*. Southern Methodist University, Dallas, Texas, Aug. 2002. Web. 01 May 2012.

<http://faculty.smu.edu/dsimon/Change-Viet4c.html>.

"Vietnam War Timeline." *Welcome to English « Department of English, College of LAS, University of Illinois*. Web. 04 May 2012.

<http://www.english.illinois.edu/maps/vietnam/timeline.htm>.