

89/100

1002

Travis Jones

History 195

(A question I have is, if I understood the directions correctly were Part 1 is only allowed to be 1 paragraph? And part 2, 2 paragraphs? I just want to make sure I completed this correctly.)

basically ... give 50% to each 1 & 2

Part 1

Roger Donlon analysis:

The story that I felt I related to most or that stuck out to me was the Roger Donlon account. He was awarded the Medal of honor for his actions and reckless disregard that lead to the defense of his camp under tremendous circumstances and odds that heavily stacked against him and his Special Forces team. The reason that I feel I have a connection to this story is the similarity of its situation with the Viet Cong that infiltrated they're camp, and my own ^{sp} experience while in Iraq with insurgents sneaking into the groups of workers of National Police that we would work with. The reason that I feel Roger Donlons account to be ~~that of~~ ~~very~~ trust worthy, is that he speaks of common actions in combat and brothers in arms as well the intricacies of war (that myself personally and likely only someone whom had been in such a situation could truly and deeply know) The part where he talks about his senior noncommissioned officer whom was 47 that had died in his arms while he was unconscious. The greater sense of love he felt for him more than just a respect of being in the same unit. That spoke volumes to me because; it is a real thing that happens when you are willing to risk giving your life to save another. Also the fact he was awarded the MoH also I think validates his claim. The humility he has in his account just goes to provide the legitimacy of what he said and his actions. After giving some thought to the account and weighing it with my own experiences and how some things you just don't forget in moments like that I think Roger was very validated and likely a trustworthy source and account. I do believe that he was very objective and realistic in his statements. There is one portion in his account where I believe fallacy could be, when trying to carry Pop Alamo to safety and he was knocked unconscious and perhaps it may have distorted he recollection of the entire event. This is a bit of a stretch for me to consider, being his comments seemed very probable and it's a bit of a gamble to say this could cause him to become diluted in his claims. Donlon as far as I could tell almost held no animosity towards the VC in his account as if he almost held a respect for them and understanding that they were fighting in a war much as he was, just on a different side.

You didn't tell me here ... Does this make Donlon more believable or not.

And since you brought up the connection, do you feel the same way about your enemies in Iraq?
You don't have to answer me on this.

Most students who haven't served
focus on his lack of hatred
toward the enemy that
took his legs & eyes.

Part 2

Vo Nguyen Giap analysis:

The account of Vo Nguyen Giap to me was very disappointing as well as overly biased. The man holds the interview in his military uniform for starters. He has a sense of arrogance and pride, rightfully so but his account almost appears as posturing or a sense of expectance of worship or gratitude, clinging to the glory of war long past. When reading the small bio of Giap you can tell from his life's events that he has an animosity towards westerners stemming to the French colonials to helping lead an army of 34 to over 300,000 to victory over the French. I was disappointed to read that Giap lets his achievements in his life go to his head. He clearly has no humility when recalling the events and the fact that McNamara and he are so vastly apart of the recounts of history regarding the war only exemplifies this further. When Giap calls what the US did in war (mind you not mentioning the VC's own inhumane actions) the most atrocious conflict in human history. His statement clearly shows a lack of global understanding and self-fulfilling prophecy of the North Vietnamese people. That is the lone time I have ever read of something surpassing the Nazi holocaust. To me personally, I think nothing can attain that level of what the Nazi's did. Just thinking about some of Giap's comments and how he portrays the NVC irritates and disappoints me. Giap's reason for why the NV won the war utterly undermines the actual reasons for the victory and almost appears as eluding the actual question. He made no mention of the terrain in the Vietnam and how it and the guerilla warfare employed by the VC were decisive enough to hinder the US military forces. The US was using outdated tactics and as well the fact it was on VC "home turf" so to say were major strategic advantages, and placed the balance heavily in the favor of the North. His cultural background and how he was an anticolonial communist radical whom was locked in prison for three years by the French in 1929, I feel makes his totally un-objective and biased. The man was a senior leader in the NVC hierarchy, he worked with Americans post world war II, likely valuable education on how Americans operate internally and what they are like, gaining strategic value from his interactions.

A positive lesson I think can be taken from the Giap account is that because he is one of the few remaining from the beginning, and a forefront leader that it open the door to the idea that because the north was able to oust two major "powers" (bearing in mind one was the French) in the world that the north leadership was like Giap equally diluted in the way in which they won the war. Obviously holding a different view on why and how they became victorious. It can allow us to reevaluate how to handle such individuals and countries, much in a similar way we are with North Korea currently.

HA

Travis, good paper
although the biggest problem
is with grammar & proofreading. Writing was
awkward at times, setting in
the way of you making
your points convincingly.

deluded

Story for

to brief
Don't use
the same
pos & neg
See you are
back to negative

Excellent
pt.

I agree
with you
here, but
as the
"losing side",
I'm sure
that aides
our bias
against
his gloating.
... and especially
for you as a
veteran.