

Due date: Saturday, 9 October 2010, 09:10 PM

Last edited: Saturday, 9 October 2010, 08:51 PM (643 words)

<!-- @page { margin: 0.79in } P { margin-bottom: 0.08in } A:link { so-language: zxx } -->

The story that caught my attention the most in part one was Ta Quang Thinh's. Sole survivor of a bombing, paralyzed, unable to see his family for six years, what is not interesting about this story? It was intriguing to see the kind of attitude Thinh had toward the war, he hated it. It ruined six years of his life, he lost the ability to walk, lost his family's money and house. "I have many memories but I don't want to remember them." My question is, was Thinh's attitude toward the war always like this? Or did it change after the war took a piece of him? I think of the people who enjoy war, many of my friends are in the marines and say they love it. They will love it until war takes something very special from them. In Thinh's case, I feel as if he may have lost some patriotism for his country after the bombing.

From reading this short account of Ta Quang Thinh he seems to be a very trustworthy man. One who heals his brothers in uniform, loves his family and waits six long years to see them. I would like to see an argument that takes the side of saying these people's stories should not be trusted because they do suffer from too much subjectivity. Their subjectivity only enhances the impact these stories have on me and I hope others as well. Emotions run very deep in war stories. Subjectivity may bring a little bias tone to a story but that should not take away credibility from the story teller.

Sergei Khrushchev's account of the Soviet Unions involvement in the Vietnam war was very interesting. The fact that U.S. And Soviet naval ships would routinely give each other visits and exchange goods even when there was some tension between the two countries. The only problem I did have with this article is the amount of prejudice Khrushchev seemed to have toward the U.S. "Americans tended to believe what they read and saw on the television." Khrushchev is making a stereotype that Americans are easily influenced. "During the Vietnam war I thought the U.S. antiwar movement was a sign that America was awakening." This statement just sends off the vibe that Khrushchev believes he and the Soviet Union are above the U.S. Lastly he criticizes our actions in the past decade, "With all this fighting terrorism since the 9/11 attack they're making the same mistakes, oversimplifying and creating more enemies than friends."

Out of all the stories in part two the one that I enjoyed the most was Richard Olsen's experiences flying an H-21 in Vietnam. The fact that he was not allowed to fire unless fired upon shows a great deal of courage in his character. Flying around not being able to get the first rounds off made Richard and his flight crew sitting ducks every time they flew. The missions he would take on were transporting South Vietnamese troops, he was risking his life not only for his country but his country's allies as well.

"The first thing I thought was, Viet Cong!" Richard said as he was being rescued from drowning by a local Vietnamese lifeguard. For the most of his life Richard pictured the Vietnamese as his enemies, but when his life was on the line his enemy was there to save him. I believe this was no coincidence, this was a gut-check for the H-21 pilot. You can't remain enemies with someone forever. Eventually all of us need to forgive and forget those who have wronged us. This is the valuable lesson I learned from Richard Olsen.

Close this window

 [Moodle Docs for this page](#)