

508

80/100

Part 1:

The reliability of a source is dependent on the information that one wishes to acquire and portray. The subject of interviewing a person after a period time of an event can cause some discrepancies in the story. Some details may be missed or transformed into something more or less than what actually occurred. Certain key events that impacted the individual may be more prominent in their memory which will allow an individual to remember the minute details unless the individual chooses to try to block the event from their memory. In the interview with Dung Vu Hiep about how a village woman wounds herself to acquire medicine for an injured soldier is such an event that stood out to him. He didn't go into details in describing the woman or the wound that she or the soldier was inflicted with but he remembered the unselfish act she performed. Usually these types of remembrances are more reliable than great detailed stories but that is not always the case when it comes to recollection. Almost all events are remembered with some bias or personal interpretations of the event. The other detail that Du Vu Hiep mentioned in his interview that was interesting was the Northern Vietnamese troop he was in depended on the cassava plant to supplement their food shortages. Especially, since the cassava plant if not prepared properly it can produce cyanide.

Your analysis here was certainly on the right track, but where does Hiep come out in your final analysis?

Part 2:

Paul Kattenburg's interview was frustrating to read. He knew the efforts in Vietnam were pointless and didn't voice it to the American public. Even though he was only a junior member, he could have tried to do something. It is commendable that he voiced his feelings in the National Security Council Executive meeting, but the defeatist attitude he portrayed was grating. For him to feel that he wouldn't have made a difference is disheartening. He was in the meeting and knew what was happening on a more intimate level than many Americans. He states that he regrets not making the statement and believes that it "wouldn't have done any good." He continued to make excuses for himself proclaiming that no one would notice, but he will never know because he never tried.

In Paul Hare and Malcolm Browne's interviews, showed the potential for good could have come from the situation in Vietnam. In Paul Hare's interview he was able to have a good relationship with the different factions by participating in cock fights. It may have been a small endeavor but it was part of Vietnamese culture that allowed them to be on a common footing. Also in Browne's interview both sides were able to put aside their differences to celebrate Christmas Eve in a peaceful manner whether it was their personal beliefs or not. It has been stated in many different interviews and other parts of the "Appy" book is if the Americans would have taken more time to understand the Vietnamese culture the outcome of the whole situation may have turned out differently.

certainly Appy's hope/purpose

this is where more words/length could have helped

Interesting perspective here. You essentially don't trust him. Today's sense of "empowerment" perhaps is your bias?