

Travis Jones

90/
100

(964 words)

BoB Gabriel-

The turning point, as far as I am concerned, has to be around the Tet offensive. After reading Bob Gabriel's account of his experiences during his time in the war, and to relentless onslaught that he and his unit encountered while caught in the Tet Offensive, I have to say that it's likely that was the turning point in the war. He spoke of shooting his friend in the foot to get him out of the war, and just the absolute beating his unit took, dwindling down to just three men in a platoon and replacing them with South Vietnamese soldiers. The whole situation just speaks of the beating the US was taking at that time. He spoke of them being holed up in a French bunker for three days, as well as his prior account of having guys just leave him behind as they were running scared.

When the idea of a turning point is brought up and is applied to Bob Gabriel's story, one has to really read into his actions. He never turned south in the war, always kept doing what he had to do, and fought with honor and pride. The overall idea of a turning point stems back to when the US was really put on the run and defeat was in sight. That whole mission was turned over, but the individual soldiers, such as Bob, I personally believe never faced a turning point to where they mentally gave up or accepted an ill fate. His account accurately describes the idea of being put on the defensive by the enemy, leaving no time to regroup or pose a solid resistance and the inability to organize or just fight back, exemplifies even greater the idea of a turning point in the war. Whether Bob ^{sp} Gabriel was intending to or not, he described a near frame of what can happen when an army is put in reverse and has its leadership ability removed forcefully.

circle

huh?
are you
contradicting
Part 1
there

I sort of get your point, but Tet was
a military victory of US & ARVN, right?

One counter argument or oppositional statement I have towards Bob's account is the choppiness of his story, it jumps around a lot and can lead to a bit of questioning as to how accurate some of the information incorporated really was. Its doubtful that Bob was lying in his accounts, it just appears as if he can only recall some portions of the actual events, he himself stated that "when action starts something takes over and you do stuff you don't even realize you do until it's over.". The statement he made leads me to question his personal account a

slight amount, yet overall the events and brutality of the Tet offensive matches up reasonably accurately.

Chalmers Johnson-

mark — The personal account that represents the end (as far as where my own thoughts were geared) was the account of Chalmers Johnson. Having gone from a Kennedy-Johnson, McNamara avid supporter and department head at Berkley and off to the CIA and then to change his views as they related to his stance on the war. NS — Reading his account and understanding the views journey he went through signifies the meaning of an end as it could be described. Chalmers describes the scenes on the Berkley campus and the Maoism and how the students looked like Che Guevara in class. It shows the opposition to the war and how after being so opposed to it then to flip in retrospect. To understand the lies and deceit of the government whom he left to work for, as well the relation to the Japanese around the Second World War and the atrocities they committed and it's relation to the American troops own acts of inhumanity. ? Awk

lacking clarity here

When it came to how he was able to change his views after the exposing of the government's lies and corresponding with his Japanese generals from his dissertation on how the US and Japanese were similar it's easy to see how that could spell the end for the US. The fact that a CIA member would change his stance even years later shows that the US saw that it had not only lost the public war in Vietnam and the United States, but the guerrilla insurgency by the ~~NVA~~ NLF and how they had not won hearts and minds, but alienated a population instead and were fighting a population in the midst of what really was a civil war and not just the excuse of stemming the communism's spread. Awk again

A prime example of how the Vietnam War was lost and how the Iraq war post 9/11 was lost are mirror images of one another. Obviously given slight differences, but in the end the same result. We as a nation made the same mistakes again, losing a public war at home, and a guerrilla war in theatre. The populous was not won in our favor and as such no "real" progress was made as it pertained to the mission objectives of creating a strong democracy and stemming a dictatorship. The economic mission in Iraq was crippled by a national population that resented the US aid and also its tactics as a whole in how they were treated. Though Iraq was relatively free of from solider inhumanity, especially in relation to the Vietnam soldiers treatment of its native population. Though the argument could be made that perhaps then "end" in the Vietnam war

was drastically different in the case of perhaps the public display at Berkley was not an accurate representation of the national opinion of the war, as northern California was a source of great disparity and divisive sides in opinion of the war. Therefore that aspect of his thoughts can be questioned as what if an isolated case of such public displays of antiwar sentiment? was

was it isolated?

what facts do you have to either support or oppose this position?

Proofread your paper for better readability.

I'm sure analysis is there (because we've spoken before, but it does not come through at times in this paper.

And even though off topic, I'll accept your Vietnam / Iraq analogy attempt, even though the Iraq conclusion may be premature.