

80/100

718



min

Part 1: The story from PART ONE in *Patriots* that stood out to me and had the most impact was that of George Watkins. Out of all the interviews I read, this one really held my attention and made me sympathize with him more and more as the story progressed. Like many other fellow soldiers, he understood little about Vietnam and the political circumstances going on there. In the book he says, "I just knewed that we was fighting over there against Communism, so called." One thing I found particularly interesting was when he is describing going through the Que Son Valley and exterminating literally everything there. He explains that two days after the destruction of villages, half the people went right back to living there again. He then goes on to say that he didn't bear any hatred toward them; that it was the fault of politicians why they were in that situation. Almost in a joking manner after stating this however, he adds that he would like to get his hands on the one who planted the booby trap. I found that to be an interesting characteristic about him as opposed to everyone else in Part 1; that he had the ability to recall the obviously horrific events that he was involved in but be able to lightly joke about it. The part where he is describing his incident with stepping on the land mine really stood out to me as well. He is able to recall quite a few of the events leading up to, and after he is wounded; and explains them in pretty extensive detail. From all of the details he can recollect, I believe that he is quite trustworthy. The way in which he explains his past is such that even though a lot of time has passed, the memories are still with him as if they took place only a week prior to being interviewed. Even though his injuries cost him his sight, he still has a very clear image in his mind of what occurred and how it did. awk

PT

all narrative
to this point

okay...

details

credibility

= analysis?

Part 2: The first story that I was, in a sense disappointed with in part 2 of the reading, was Richard Olsen's. The main reason I did not think as highly of this one as I did the others is because he seems to not explain his past history in the war with as serious a tone as everyone else. Rather he talks about his memories almost as if they are fond to him. In one sentence he states, "So I'm not one of those veterans who's embittered with a whole host of grievances." He then goes on to say, "I have nostalgia and enormous reverence for my experience." This mentality stuck out to me in particular because the attitudes of most every other veteran interviewed so far has been a lot darker, and serious toned. I mean it is somewhat refreshing to get a more optimistic recount after so many negative ones, but I just didn't find it as captivating to read as the others. The second story I found disappointing in terms of the actual experience that the person had to endure was Malcolm Browne's. In the part where he is describing being at the scene when the monk Thich Quang Duc commits suicide by lighting himself on fire, he was present the whole entire time it was happening and had to witness the gruesome event up close in person. It was a little unsettling to read his graphic recount of the event, and also to know that he had to observe something like that in reality.

- awk

weak analysis

to be brief
pick 1 story
or another

dark = good
optimistic = less interesting
bias here?

To end on a happier note however, even though I chose Richard Olsen's story as one that disappointed me, I also found some positive aspects to it as well. He states that both him and his twin brother became officers and had the ability to fly with the world's greatest aviators. Even though it was war, and he obviously had to contend with the harsh realities

oh no,
don't
use the
same story

of war, he was still able to find a certain amount of enjoyment in being a pilot and fly with veterans of previous wars, whom he considered himself lucky to have the luxury of being able to do.

What is positive here? He had a good time?

Strange conclusion

Paper was brief in analysis
but Part 1 was better
than Part 2

lacking depth of analysis