



You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

Home ► My courses ► HST 195 F12 (Escobar 26516) ► October 7 - October 13 ► Forum 1 CLOSED ► Week 1 - Determining the truth



Search forums

Display replies in nested form

Move this discussion to ...

< Previous (Week 1 - Determining t...)

**Week 1 - Determining the truth**

by Joe Escobar - Monday, October 8, 2012, 08:57 AM

This is a history class. We are trying to determine what really happened in history. How do you/should we deal academically with conflicting information (such as is being presented in the PBS videos, web videos, and AIM video this week)? How can your two textbooks help you to approach this video information and be confident that you are learning accurate historical knowledge?

Be sure to use SPECIFIC examples from class materials to illustrate your point or to support your position.

Cite your sources in your posts and replies. Use parentheses.

Examples (PBS Episode 1), (AIM historian "Smith"), (Herring p.34), etc.

Change the subject line of your post to something more descriptive. DO NOT leave the subject line Re: Week 1 - Determining the truth

Sum of ratings: -

Edit | Delete | Reply

**Everyone has an opinion**

by Michael Sitterley - Tuesday, October 9, 2012, 09:43 PM

History is like trying to solve a puzzle and everyone has a different idea of how to solve the puzzle. Books and documentaries are created by humans and by nature humans are inherently flawed in that we all have our own opinion. One way to avoid falling into the pitfall of opinion would be to watch and read everything objectively and not believe the first thing you see or read. In this course we have been greeted with many different sources of information to pull from, giving the ability to cross-reference the information objectively. For instance, in the AIM video, Dolf Droge (Agency for INT'L. Development) stated that in the second video of the Vietnam: A Television History, they claim that Ho Chi Minh was a patriot of Vietnam for over a quarter century before he took power in 1945, but Droge notes that Ho's name was changed to Ho Chi Minh after he got out of a Chinese prison in 1941. It is the situations like this that you should refrain from making an opinion before all the information has been gone through.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) 2

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply

**Re: Everyone has an opinion**

by Timothy Haley - Sunday, October 14, 2012, 11:47 AM

I agree Michael, that history can be an ambiguous subject, and we therefore should maintain a level of skepticism while finding and consuming as much information as possible. However, I think that means we should strive to create a complete picture of past events, and avoid as much as possible cherry-picking specific facts, isolating them from the whole, and then doubting mountains of contrary evidence. I'm not sure why it is important to note when Ho Chi Minh changed his name in the context of when "he took power in 1945". The A.I.M. video did not answer this question for me. Simply stating facts without drawing connections to the larger story is an effective tool of propaganda. It seems to me that the A.I.M. video was emphasizing specific facts that perpetuated the narrative that was used to bolster American support for the war. What I get from the PBS documentary is an attempt to present large amounts of information that the majority of Americans were never aware of. I know I've only watched three episodes, but I haven't observed a direct conclusion of "the U.S. should not have been there". I've only observed a questioning of the official narrative through a presentation of largely unconsidered facts.

Sum of ratings:3 (1) 3

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply


Certain Things Shouldn't Be Subject To Opinion

by Sierra Lavoie - Wednesday, October 10, 2012, 09:23 AM

We live in a world where everyone has an opinion. It may be wrong it may be right. We have the privilege of living in a country where we are allowed to not only have our own opinion but to have the freedom to share it if we desire to. This is one of the things that makes America so diverse and this diversity makes us strong. There are certain things that shouldn't be subject to opinion though. History should be subject to fact. The history textbooks in children's classrooms, the PBS television series the public is encouraged watch, and college textbooks are things that must be based on the facts. Once we are shown the facts than it is up to us to form an opinion. In order for an accurate opinion to be formed we must be presented with true, unbiased facts. The AIM video confronted the PBS Series and declared to the public that there were many things left unsaid and many things purposely skewed to change the public's view. The AIM Video stated in the beginning the purposes PBS had when making their series. These purposes were not fulfilled. PBS stated that the series would be an antidote to the misuses of history. AIM says that this video is an example of the misuses of history. The AIM video very thoroughly pointed out many things that the PBS series had deliberately left out or misstated. For example the PBS Series glossed over Ho Chi Minh's negative side, showed South Vietnam and U.S. as the enemy, and didn't talk about all the assassinations of nationalists that caused over 10,000 deaths.

One must not be quick to believe everything that circulates the media. We have the Herring book, Appy book, and many other historical books we can turn to check out the facts. The books we are using state their sources and are extremely thoroughly written. Historical books have a harder time getting away with skewing the facts than a TV program does. PBS states its sources at the end of the program but it is harder to reference each thing said to their source. When reading a textbook the citation are at the bottom of the page. The more books that are read on the Vietnam war the more information one is able to get to be able to form their own opinions on the war.

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

Re: Certain Things Shouldn't Be Subject To Opinion

by Stephen Fowler - Wednesday, October 10, 2012, 11:26 AM

Sierra,

You make a good point here. History should in fact be subject to fact. As us being a diverse world and nation people do tend to think differently about certain topics, but the fact of the matter is the right information should be presented when it comes to opinionating. No matter what topic it is, the media tends to sugar coat one side of a debate where in history that can cause unjustified biased opinion. When it comes to text like Appy's book where all sides are touched upon then you can count on information to be more legit which will bring on a better understanding and opinion.

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

Re: Certain Things Shouldn't Be Subject To Opinion

by Emerald Jones - Saturday, October 13, 2012, 09:50 PM

It is true that history should be subject to facts rather than opinion. The PBS series did portray things from a perspective that seems to have little basis in facts. Not were things not presented correctly but according to the AIM video PBS was well aware of the flaws in their "facts". It is important that we always question what we hear and see, that we look for verification and not believe something the first time we hear it. The overlooking of Ho Chi Minh's less than positive contributions do not speak well of PBS's intentions when making the series. We learn from the past, so in order to learn properly and sensibly we must be learning from facts, not just misconceptions and PR spins on history.

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

Re: Certain Things Shouldn't Be Subject To Opinion

by Barbara Bolt - Sunday, October 14, 2012, 10:56 AM

I concur that we should not believe everything that the media puts out there; we need to investigate other sources and put all the pieces together before making any decisive conclusions. With that being said, I also believe that we need to further our research into the opinions of the other side so that we will be able to make clearer opinions of what was really going on.

 Sum of ratings: 1 (1)
[Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
Re: Certain Things Shouldn't Be Subject To Opinion



by Phillip Hubbard - Sunday, October 14, 2012, 10:13 PM

I like how you say, "everyone has an opinion." But that opinion is not always correct. Neither are the facts from which the opinion is generated. If I had not known anything about the Vietnam War and watched the PBS series that was later debunked by the AIM video than my opinion of the war would be wrong. With that, I would most likely view the AIM video as misleading because all of my knowledge about the war would first have come from the inaccurate PBS series. Would I realize the error in the series or conclude that the AIM video was wrong? I would need to keep an open mind in my conclusion and consult additional resources most likely. I also would need to put my faith into a particular source of information to form my opinion whether it was right, wrong, or kind of right and wrong, or more wrong than right but not totally wrong or totally right. As we do when we vote during the elections we have to trust a particular source to provide us with accurate information and dive head first into our opinions and hope we will stay afloat. Good post Sierra!

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



An Honest Country

by Barbara Bolt - Wednesday, October 10, 2012, 03:14 PM

Our history should be a honest history; there should not be so much hidden from the people of our own country. We have to consult several pieces of information to clarify one detail from our past. In the second episode from the PBS series they state that Ho Chi Minh came to power in 1945 and was known by the Vietnamese for about a quarter of a century; Dolf Droge clearly states that this cannot be true; Ho Chi Minh did not introduce himself this way until 1944 after taking the name in a Chinese prison in 1941. However, it needs to be understood that research benefits developing and prosperous minds; on the other hand, our people need to be given a truthful education.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: An Honest Country

by Phillip Hubbard - Sunday, October 14, 2012, 10:29 PM

Hi Barbara, I agree that the people should be allowed to receive a truthful education. But do they need/deserve to know the whole truth? To me, our citizens are to concerned with being informed on matters for which they 1.) Have no direct benefit for gaining knowledge of & 2.) Are not educated properly in the specific area's to form a proper conclusion of why it happened. For example, when the economy collapsed and the government proposed the bailouts for companies in major industries, auto and bank, I personally was not educated enough to grasp the reason's behind that decision. I did not agree completely with that choice of our government. I asked, "why help these companies that put themselves in that position?" Was not helping them going to hurt our economy more than helping them would? Or would helping them help our economy more than not helping them? I honestly did not know. So I formed my opinion. I concluded that the government of this great country that I served had my best interest in mind when making this decision. Whether I agreed with it or not I had to trust the people that were appointed into these positions through a public election to protect me during this crisis. So if that meant spending billion's of dollars to help a company that did not help themselves than I needed to be behind them 100%. So again, I agree with you when you say "our people need to be given a truthful education," but can we handle the truth? Or even truly comprehend it?

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



"Go back to bed, America, your government has figured out how it all transpired."

by Tanaya Fonseca - Wednesday, October 10, 2012, 06:01 PM



How the Media can manipulate our viewpoint

This image demonstrates how many perspectives there are to a situation. There is what the left side shows us, what the center shows us, then what the right side shows us. However, within that photo there are three other perspectives, the captive, the water supplier, and the gun bearer. In order for us to make an objective and fair judgment on the situation we need to at least understand the context of the situation. The Vietnam war documentary gives us an overview of the war from the perspectives of a few who were involved. With the media, those perspectives can also be skewed; not just by the speakers subjectivity, but by the filmmakers subjectivity as well as the film editor, producer, and the television studio. So how do we get an honest look at what is going on within the Vietnam war?

By having as many sources of information as possible. The more textbooks we have discussing the different sides, the more well rounded our idea of the subject will be. Although, having as many sources as we want to does not mean that we will **choose** to believe them. We are left with our own judgments, our own sense of what is right and wrong, and our own ability to sift through connections, conflicting information, and subjective views. We have to put trust in our own abilities to determine what it is we choose to believe. In the Herring book, the author points out the overwhelming anger and disappointment that American journalists have with the incoming reports from Vietnam. American troops were being brought in but under the guise of “advisers”, and that false name stuck even “after they were actively engaged in combat.” (Herring, pg. 104). Even though the reporters were on both sides of the argument, some of them keeping to the false stories, others having enough of them and daring to report the truth. With conflicting reports it puts a strain on the relationship that the Americans have with their government.

By comparing facts from the Herring book, to the PBS documentary, to the experiences of those involved as told in the Appy book, we can paint a picture for ourselves of what exactly went on in Vietnam. Some facts will require further research, others will be plainly obvious (no one knew why we were in Vietnam, other than America’s “pride” was at stake), some questions will be left unanswered. As long as we ignore the overwhelmingly implied “you will believe what we tell you” sentiment from our government and media, and have enough faith in ourselves and our own judgments will we be able to see glimpses of the truth.

--- Subject quote by Bill Hicks.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: "Go back to bed, America, your government has figured out how it all transpired."

by Stephen Fowler - Thursday, October 11, 2012, 09:17 AM

Tanaya,

This is a great picture to show how the media can misconstrue information to the public! I agree with you that our own judgments and abilities to see right and wrong should be the foundation of our beliefs. From all the different recourses that are at are exposal we should be able to choose what to believe because of the different pieces of information. I do believe Tanaya that the government’s media has that “you will believe what we tell you” persona that needs to be challenged by our ability to go find the truth or at least find your own opinion out of the right sources.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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

**Re: "Go back to bed, America, your government has figured out how it all transpired."**

by Barbara Bolt - Sunday, October 14, 2012, 11:03 AM

The image you have shown is a perfect example of what the media can do to manipulate our minds into believing certain ways. Although this is the same image; I am getting three different stories from them. People as a whole can be manipulated into believing such images; however, an individual will ask questions and want to discover the truth behind these altered images.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: "Go back to bed, America, your government has figured out how it all transpired."**

by Michael Sitterley - Sunday, October 14, 2012, 05:41 PM

Everyone has an agenda and the news media are no different. Think about the mess we have in news today with the elections and the fight between the republican sand the democrats. There were elections that transpired during the Vietnam War and I think it is safe to say that the media used the war to their agenda. The image you provide is an excellent example of manipulation and personal agenda.

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Different points of view**

by Emerald Jones - Wednesday, October 10, 2012, 06:13 PM

It is good that we have many different accounts of the same events throughout history. If we didn't I doubt we would truly know with reasonable certainty, what had occurred. I think multiple accounts can ensure that the truth is found. It requires us to think critically, to ask questions. Seeing the differences in the PBS videos and the AIM video made me realize all over again though, how hard it can be to know what to base our opinions on. The PBS video painted a different picture than the AIM video. The book "America's longest War" also seems to differ from some of what is presented in the AIM video. Ho Chi Minh's role, in particular seems to have a much divided opinion. According to PBS he was a dedicated nationalist interested in freedom and independence. However according to the AIM video he was a communist who had no interest in freedom or independence. His name did not even come to him until he got out of a Chinese prison. It was also said that PBS had the opportunity to fix the inaccuracies in the series yet they did not. He was cited as "the best known nationalist leader in all of Vietnam. (Herring p.56) So we definitely have more than one version, or point of view to say what happened. We do our best to make intelligent choices and sound judgments in regards to what we think or believe.

Sum of ratings:2 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: Different points of view**

by Andrea Porter - Wednesday, October 10, 2012, 10:41 PM

I agree that its good to have different accounts of the same event as long as the facts atleast match. Personal experiences mixed with facts work the best as giving good information to a person. The video did state one story on Ho Chi Minh and the book has a different. I feel that at times its the author of the book or texts opinion and feelings being displayed.

Andrea Porter

Sum of ratings:1 (1) [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**The Role of a Historian**

by Jacob Pusey - Wednesday, October 10, 2012, 08:56 PM

Modern history is often more subject to debate than ancient history due to the fact that people are still living who experienced the event. When studying all types of history, we need to remember that ancient history is usually chronicled by the victors or those who had the most influence. When we are talking about studying a modern war, we need to remember that opinions still dominate the discussion. This does not mean that we deny or ignore specific actions such as battles or actual events but, if you read or watch an opinion on whether we should have fought the war, you may get an entirely different answer. This also depends on the source you use for information. For example the Herring book is based on acknowledged factual historic events spanning over a quarter decade. The Appy book is a collection of first person observers who witnessed these events and may have a distorted perspective of the same events. The videos give a combination of both of these and are also edited by people who may not have direct knowledge of what took place or may have some sort of agenda that would make them try and influence the viewer. I believe that a combination of all these sources is the best way to fully comprehend what actually happened. The role of

a historian is to mesh the different opinions of individuals with the hard facts and then try to put together an educated, informed and hopefully accurate perspective of what took place.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The Role of a Historian

by Sierra Lavoie - Saturday, October 13, 2012, 01:39 PM

Jacob,

The Herring book and the Appy book are a very good combination. The Herring book is factual and the Appy book gives us a unique outlook of both the Vietnamese and American opinions. I agree with you a combination of many different sources is the best way to form an accurate opinion on the events of the Vietnam war.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The Role of a Historian

by Dylan Curran - Saturday, October 13, 2012, 10:22 PM

Jacob,

Very true that in ancient history dissenting opinions have been all but silenced in the mainstream. Does this mean that we should trust historical accounts less the older they are? When events are fresh there is controversy and struggle to distinguish fact from fiction, and in this state truth is present, if hard to discern. As events cool and solidify, one (not necessarily accurate) account tends to become the official story.

Dylan

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The General Election

by Dylan Curran - Wednesday, October 10, 2012, 09:25 PM

Everyone has an agenda and no one is unbiased. Even the omission of information is a form of bias, even though omissions are necessary to create a readable document. In search of accurate and complete information, the best a reader can do is to find the least biased sources possible and check them against one another. The more reliable sources that confirm a supposed fact, the more likely it is to be true.

One of the claims presented by Charlton Heston in the AIM video is that the PBS series portrays Ho Chi Minh as having legitimate authority over South Vietnam (AIM host Heston). Heston asserts that this claim to legitimacy is based on the agreement at the 1954 Geneva conference that a general election would be held to determine who controlled what part of Vietnam, and the fact the U.S. and South Vietnam reneged on this agreement (AIM host Heston). Heston claims that no such agreement was made, and that the U.S. had only agreed to these elections being held if supervised by the U.N. (AIM host Heston).

The argument which Heston presents conflicts with information in the history book "America's Longest War" by George C. Herring. Herring reports that the head of the U.S. delegation at Geneva, Walter Bedell Smith, said of the accords (including the general election) "that the U.S. would not 'disturb them' by the 'threat or the use of force.'" (Herring 51).

Herring confirms the PBS series' stance that the U.S. recognized the agreement to the general election. Having these two sources in agreement, the argument of the AIM video loses some of its weight, and calls into question the validity of its other complaints against the PBS series.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Facts don't cross borders

by Phillip Hubbard - Wednesday, October 10, 2012, 10:12 PM

Periodically an event will happen in history in which there are three sides available to tell the story. In the case of the Vietnam War those sides are America, Vietnam, and the American media. The American side is the men and woman who were fighting for a blurred cause. Vietnam was obviously split into two sides with different feelings about the war. The south, for the most part, was pursuing freedom and democracy. The north was trying to instill communism throughout the nation. Then there was the American media's involvement. Often times walking side by side with American troops. However close

the media felt they were to the troops their job was still to sell papers. Then, as it is now, stories of heroism and patriots building schools and buildings and giving people a better way of life are generally left out because those stories don't sell. Accounts of troops killing innocent civilians or smoking pot and taking drugs sell papers. The truth lies in all sides.

The American involvement was obviously controversial and met with protests and demonstrations. Never before had Americans outwardly protest a war in such extreme numbers. Was it the war or the reason we were there? Or both? The information about what actually happened is often skewed and met with hostility from people who feel we should not have been over there. When I hear a Vet talk about their time over there I always give them the benefit of the doubt. I might think I know, but I trust the soldier more than I trust a book or a documentary on PBS. I have been fortunate to meet many, many men who fought for this country in the jungles of Vietnam. Perhaps their feelings have changed but each time they are happy to have done what they did. They enjoy living knowing they fought for their country regardless of the reason they were there. Can a journalist say the same thing about a paper they wrote?

The media will portray an event in which ever way will sell the most papers or give their company the most recognition. Their cause is for profit and I personally have a difficult time trusting them for this reason. Would you leave your kid with a car salesman? Why not, you trust them right? The media is selling a product. That product sells better when their story is more appalling to their demographic. As the protests and demonstrations grew the media's ideals changed. It was no longer about our boy's protecting freedom and saving a nation it was now about our boy's are smoking pot and killing children. They fed the angry American public what they wanted and that was any reason to end the war.

Our textbooks however accurate must also be met with skepticism because in short they are also trying to sell the book. I would like to believe that the book with the most accurate information is the one used by most teachers and professor's but those people who are requiring the book for their class are also basing it on their opinions or fact's they have acquired and trust to be accurate. I could keep going but that already sounds like border line paranoia. It is up to the consumer to exam the data before finding a conclusion.

Vietnam was a divided nation. Caught in their infancy and torn apart similarly to America during the Civil War. America's cause was just because it battled to end slavery but Vietnam's wasn't because it was communism? What about Korea? Even Germany and Japan likely teach different accounts of the war. The cause, the outcome, the goings on during the war are all different from country to country. They are all different based on what land mass you are standing on. During my time in the Marines I was able to go to Nagasaki where the second atomic bomb was dropped during World War 2. They have a peace museum and in it are historical facts that appeal to their culture. For instance, when they describe the city before the bomb they continuously say that of the thousands of people killed most were woman and children. The men were fighting for their country. Why do they have to word their situation in such a way? Because it makes them feel empowered, or better about the outcome because Japan would surely never do anything like that...they would rather conduct a surprise attack on Pearl Harbor on a country that was neutral at the time. So the point is that the country and their government will manipulate the facts to save face in times of adversity.

Textbook, papers, documentaries and governments all have a hidden agenda. Whether it is to make money or "protect" there own people. It is up to the public to research as many different references as possible and come up with their own conclusions.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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



Re: Facts don't cross borders

by Sierra Lavoie - Saturday, October 13, 2012, 01:31 PM

Phillip,

I think you bring up some very important points especially regarding the media. Often times I think we forget that the media's goal isn't to bring us the most accurate story, they are trying to sell their story. So, of course, their stories will not be the most accurate. The Vietnam War was extremely disliked and the media used that to their advantage. As you said in the beginning the media is more likely to talk about soldiers smoking pot then soldiers helping the Vietnamese people. Its important to be able to recongnize that the media is not the most trusted source.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Facts don't cross borders

by Jacob Pusey - Saturday, October 13, 2012, 09:01 PM

It is the consumers job to educate themselves, unfortunately this has become increasingly difficult in this country. Unlike others have freedom of the press here as opposed to some countries who have a state run media. Imagine trying to read those newspapers or history books. Regardless, American media is an industry just like any other. Sensationalism sells papers and gives us twenty four hour news channels. It seems to me that Americans want to be shocked and sometimes outraged by our news rather than actually be informed by it. This is pretty sad but, I think accurate. During

the Vietnam war the media did the same thing that they do today. They followed whatever story that made them money no matter how unimportant it may seem when looking at the larger picture. When the war became unpopular, the media jumped on the bandwagon and began writing about protesters and disillusioned soldiers who were returning home.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: The General Election

by Tanaya Fonseca - Thursday, October 11, 2012, 09:57 AM

Dylan,

"In search of accurate and complete information, the best a reader can do is to find the least biased sources possible and check them against one another."

I definitely agree with this statement; cross referencing sources is the best way to find out what are really "facts" and what is just fiction. I have taken a few history classes and never have I actually been presented with conflicting material. The purpose, I think, of presenting conflicting material is so that the reader has the option of searching out the facts for themselves and really get involved with the historical information. It also gives us a new perspective on viewing history textbooks. How can we really be sure that they are accurate? Do we take it at face value simply because it is presented in an academic format? We rarely stop to think that maybe our textbooks or news programs are false. We never consider the motives behind those to lie about information and what impact it has on us as the listener/reader/viewer.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



What is the real truth?

by Andrea Porter - Wednesday, October 10, 2012, 10:36 PM

There are two sides to every story. Everyone sees and hears things differently. What one war meant for one country and its peoples can be completely different than any others. In the text book *Patriots* by Appy the author shares different people's perception of the Vietnam War. Many of these stories are what led up to the war, how the war was dealt with by each country and the final outcomes. Appy gives accounts of what it was like to be a American soldier and a Vietnam soldier. Also different views of what went down in the war. I am sure that anyone can argue and debate stories but these stories are based on their personal experiences. Everyone recalls things or experiences differently. In the text by Herring is a fact giving book about the Vietnam war. There are many fact giving books and videos yet they do not always match with each other. In my opinion experience based facts mean a lot more. In the text 11[Herringpg 54] they discuss Geneva as a disaster but in the video they discuss it as if the French just walked away.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



Re: What is the real truth?

by Barbara Bolt - Sunday, October 14, 2012, 05:15 PM

I agree with you that experience based facts mean a lot more than fact giving books and videos. Fact giving books give a lot of truth; however, they also hide a lot of what actually happened which in my opinion doesn't hold them as a credible source. The men who actually experienced the war first hand has way more credibility than the reporter.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

Show parent | Edit | Split | Delete | Reply



The Truth... You Can't Handle the Truth.

by Michael Newcomer - Wednesday, October 10, 2012, 11:41 PM

When it comes to war what really is the truth? Is the truth that America was wrong in Vietnam and lost or is it that America was right in Vietnam and the way it was fought lost it for us? This is just one of the many questions that can be asked about the Vietnam war, and the answer to this question can be just as diverse depending on where you look to find the answer. For my answers I feel the most solid piece we have available to us in this class is Appy's book *Patriots*. I can look up online and find information about the Vietnam war, and I can watch things like PBS' series on it, or I can go straight to the source and ask someone who was actually there what it was like. I feel the biggest problem in American citizens getting the real facts is the media, they skewered the information about Vietnam just as they are still skewering information about many things today. The right to free speech and free press has its amazing advantages, but to find out accurately about history you have to get personal accounts from both sides. History is like a crossword puzzle, you may have seven answers that would work for one line but when you put another line intersecting it does the answer hold up. While "*Patriots*" may be more of a story book than a text book the fact that Appy takes personal accounts from both sides from high ranking officials down to lowly grunts you can really start to get

a overall picture of how the war was from both sides. History is about facts, facts are about truth, and truth is about an overall viewing of an issue. Would World War Two be viewed as so horrific if we didn't know about the Holocaust? The fact is we do know about it and it gives a much better all around picture of how horrible the Nazi party was and is. The history of the Vietnam war is still trying to be determined because people are still trying to gather the truth about it.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

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



Re: The Truth... You Can't Handle the Truth.

by Andrea Porter - Thursday, October 11, 2012, 10:33 PM

Appys text is very informative in a personal way. Reading or hearing a persons actual accounts of a situation makes it more believable because you can see and hear their experiences through their voices and emotions.

Sum of ratings:1 (1)

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



Re: Week 1 - Determining the truth

by Stephen Fowler - Thursday, October 11, 2012, 09:46 AM

I will have to say that there is not much you can do with conflicting information but make sure you understand all of the information and base your opinion thereafter. Like many of my classmates have said before me there are two sides to a story, we live in a world where everyone has an opinion, History is like trying to solve a puzzle and so on and so on. I agree but there are actually three sides to a story: what one side says, what the other side says, then the truth. There are no similarities in different points of views and falsification. What we need to do is know the difference. That is where our text books come into play. From the get go I could tell that the PBS videos were missing key details that made it biased but what would save my own opinion from become one minded was the fact that I had our text book to show me more than just a piece but the whole ordeal from many eyes. That way I can base my opinion from repeated facts instead of falsified information. Ho Chi Minh was a piece of falsified information.

Ho Chi Minh tricked Americans to come to public meetings to make it look like to the Vietnam people that we were backing Ho up behind his beliefs and opinions. This was not stated in the PBS document how cunning and sly Uncle Ho was. It also didn't state too much on his negative criminal side but instead made him seem majorly Patriotic and heroic. If I did not have the text books or watch the AIM video I may have never known that critical information about the history of the Vietnam War. My opinion (that is my own) would have been misguided.

Sum of ratings:3 (1)

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

[< Previous \(Week 1 - Determining t...\)](#)

You are logged in as Joe Escobar (Logout)

Moodle Docs for this page

