

Due date:	Sunday, November 18, 2012, 11:55 PM
Last edited:	Sunday, November 18, 2012, 10:09 PM (1221 words)

Peter Kuznick's story represents a turning point in the war because it begins to display the seriousness of the antiwar sentiment, from the depth of their beliefs to the violence of the American police. In addition Kuznick's final statement accurately sums up why his story was a turning point, "Chicago had a radicalizing effect on campuses. It was a real dividing line. In the spring of '68 I felt that on most campuses antiwar students were a distinct minority. But that fall the movement mushroomed and there was a pervasive radicalization," (Appy 316) .

Before 1968 it seems that the antiwar sentiment and especially antiwar protestors appeared in the minority. Their movement while in the process of growing had not reached an overwhelming majority nor had it gained respect . However the publicity of protesting during the Democratic Convention brought the fact to light that many people of America were willing to protest Vietnam policies. The majority of Americans may still have not liked the antiwar movement, but it did enable the protestors to show the government that there was major opposition to their policies.

This story is also a turning point because Kuznick said that "we weren't afraid to risk bodily harm and even our lives. Our commitment to ending the war was certainly as great as the government's commitment to prosecuting it," (Appy 314). The reason Kuznick's statement displays a turning point is because the majority of people aren't typically ready to lay down their body and possibly their life for their convictions and beliefs, but these people were. When there is that kind of transformation happens it shows that people's minds are changing and that change tends to spread like wildfire.

The reason violence of American police represents a turning point within Kuznick's story is because it shows how far the government will go to control protestation and depicts the gravity of the matter. It is conventional for protests to be broken up with demands, tear gas and possible use of moderate violence, but it is not so common for protestors to be broken up under the threat of a shoot-to-kill order, as was the case in Chicago (Appy 313). This escalation depicts how the police force or the government will address these matters in the future and further shows the deepening beliefs of the protestors who are willing to risk everything.

All of these instances with Kuznick's story show why his account is a turning point in the war. It displayed the growing opposition of the war for the American people which is a key factor in any war. For with growing opposition, comes a greater call to end the war and the more a public demands the end of a war the less our government is able to continue the war. It also showed a turn from merely opposing the war to actively fighting against the war. This is a big step for it is one thing to complain to another person about the current war, but it is another to fight our governments policy on the war. This step is crucial because disliking the war can't do much to push our government to end the war, but fighting in opposition of the war threatens the stability of society and forces the government's hand in its wartime policies. Extreme violence on protestors is another step that showed a decisive change in the Vietnam war. For while at first there may be more "sympathy for the police than for the victims of the police," as seemed the case in Chicago, continued violence against civilians will lead ordinary people to further question the government 's actions and with more questions comes a basis for more opposition that could rise as a result (Appy 315). In essence Kuznick's story was a change in the Vietnam war because it showed that the American people are faltering in their belief of the war. Once public belief or faith in the war falters it is a slippery slope from there, for the soldiers and the government rely on public support. With high public support the government can essentially do anything in the war, but without, the government is crippled and soldiers morale is decreased overall decreasing our ability to fight the war.

Charles Cooper's (II) story represented the end of the war for similar reasons that Peter Kuznick's story represented a turning point in the war. It wasn't because of a decisive military victory or defeat, but it was because of the loss of morale and internal division from the ground troops Cooper was commanding.

During Cooper's service in Vietnam the army was suffering from race problems and a defeatist attitude, with the race problems being the most immediate problem. For Cooper himself said that he "was as concerned about race relations as I was about the enemy," and in one situation "you had all whites on one side and all blacks on the other and they all had loaded weapons pointing at each other" (Appy 445 - 46). Having that serious of race problems is bad for the army not just because you have the potential of people killing each other, but because the army can't fight a war within themselves and the war they are supposed to be fighting at the same time. A army needs to be one cohesive unit, to fight together against the common enemy in order to stand firm and produce quality results, with minimal losses.

The deterioration of morale seen in Cooper's companies was because of constant casualties, rather than general discontent with the war. Extensive loss of morale is bad because it affects the will of troops to fight, however in Cooper's story this loss of morale was worse because it appeared that one of his units attacked and murdered people of a village where a VC child had gone a day earlier (Appy 447). In this situation loss of morale showed the worse sides of humanity. For it is one thing for

soldiers to feel depressed, but in this case it affected the judgement of soldiers and influenced them to take questionable if not illegal actions. This situation begins to display that the American armed forces are falling apart from the inside.

All in all as said earlier, both the end of the war and the turning point stories were a turning point and the end of the war, not because of any military action within Vietnam, but because they depicted changes within America. Cooper's story showed the end of the war because it showed the army as being internally divided and disillusioned. The internal fighting was destroying the army's effectiveness to fight to the war they were supposed to be fighting. It was these internal divisions of American people and soldiers that allowed these stories to represent decisive points in the war. A country can not fight a war when it is divided on the homefront and abroad. That is why Cooper's story is the "end" for his story represents the end of Americans willing to fight with each other and fight the war.

Citation

Appy, Christian. *Patriots: The Vietnam War Remembered From All Sides*. New York: Penguin Books, 2003. Print.

Close this window