

Part 1

The story of war hero Roger Donlon is of great impression. It caught readers' attention at the beginning. Because of his heroic actions in the battle of Nam Dong he became the first commander in ^{the} Vietnam War to receive the Medal of Honor. It revealed his legendary experience and represented wide influence and significant impacts on U.S. history of Vietnam War. So he's a typical war hero in U.S and an influential storyteller of Vietnam War as well. This honor stood for American government's point of view. Next, his firm belief as a soldier with unconditional obedience and absolute loyalty is very impressive. He was a great patriot. His spirit of heroism, being responsible for the call of duty and bearing the risk of his life were extraordinary from American army's perspective. After reading the whole Medal of Honor citation, it can be seen that the experience and spirit of Roger Donlon was spreaded propaganda among the masses. The belief that the mission of the war was to advise and assist the Vietnamese people was widely held by American soldiers at the beginning of the war. Furthermore, the fragment that he tried to rescue his fellows is very moving. The belief that kept him going on was the deep love and respect he felt for his fellows. And that's glittering point of humanity from the war in sharp contrast with its cruelty. The speaker in this story is reliable, trustworthy, and believable in many aspects. After referring to a number of historical materials, the record of the battle of Nam Dong and the description of Roger Donlon ^{are} very detailed from many sides. This part of history is well documented and thus personal memories could be corroborated by the historical materials. It's a fairly good restatement of this clip of history from this point. Roger Donlon experienced at that specific moment in time which could give him more credibility. However, in other cases, as many years have passed after the war, memories about facts during the war could become blurred with time out of human nature even if they were directly involved in war. Besides, memories of war are often painful under extreme conditions and awful to review, possibly resulting in people's inaccurate perception about the war. What's more, people's description about the war could be greatly influenced by their political standpoint, their nationality, identity, belief and so on. Some of these memories suffer too much subjectivity and could be exaggerated, which decreases their credibility. Some people could fake in front of the public for their own war experiences that could be learned from some news. Therefore readers should hold critical attitude toward these narratives.

- True

So, what about Donlon? and his story?

Strange to end on the doubting credibility part. Put this part BEFORE the Donlon credibility section. ★

Part 2

1. The most disappointing part in part 2 to read is the first part about why and how American became involved in the war step by step and the story that gave an accounts of the effects and great sufferings the war had brought to all people in both countries. As one of the story described the Vietnam War as the most atrocious war in human history, it was the longest foreign war in American history, resulting in incalculable trauma and losses. Former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said the Vietnam War was a tragedy and the United States should not get involve in it. Senior Senator George McGovern described it as greatest military, moral, economic and political mistake of US history. The war was obviously conducted by powerful forces. From the first story, readers could see the process of the war and figure out that to start and get involved in the war was not that responsible for American people. They sacrificed lots of lives and soldiers didn't even know what they fought for. Pains and loneliness were full of all their relatives' heart. Needless to say, the biggest victims of the Vietnam War were the Vietnamese people. Americans had a fatal weakness, which was the attitude they hold toward the war. They made wrong policies and rarely considered losses and sufferings it had brought to other countries and people.

2. The positive lessons readers can learn from the stories is about why the Vietnamese could win and what good changes may take place in this land in future. The justice of Vietnamese people's struggle against aggression had a decisive impact on the result of the war. As the story said, rather than live under slavery, they would rather die. The Vietnamese people won also because they knew how to use their intelligence. The Vietnamese army chose the right strategy and tactics as well. Readers could learn from the story that strength of unity of the people was immeasurable and thus they could overcome difficulties. And that is where the hope lies for Vietnamese people's future. The unity could provide the country with creativity and courage in rebuilding their beautiful homes. Another positive lesson readers can get is that both countries should hold a right attitude toward the war and enhance understanding as it mentioned at the end of the story.

Part 2 fails to
answer my questions
as they relate to
the SPECIFIC STORY/STORIES
you've chosen.

Instead to make
generalized statements about
the whole war.

You were supposed to write
on the limited disappointments
found in a single story

- Very Good Part 1
- Part 2 - No

The stories in the first part of the Appy book were intriguing and quickly enraptured me into obsession. Reading these eye-witness accounts of a war many have long been confused by politically, has had a humanizing affect. The most impactful story was told by Bernard Trainor, a seemingly reputable former Commander who did two tours in Vietnam, and worked with credible media sources such as The New York Times as a military correspondent. Trainor came across believable, objective, and factual which made the years in between the events and the interview with Appy not seem too extreme. This may have to do with the fact that even after retirement from the military, he continued to stay in the tactical mind frame as he did work for the media. Even if he was chiming in on other national news or crises, it is more likely that he has been able to keep these facts fresh in his memory, in comparison to a person that got out and rarely, if ever, talks about it. In his account, Trainor compared the Vietnam war to the American Revolution, where he explained that the Vietnamese would fight to the death. Just like the American colonists, the Vietnamese demanded independence at any cost. This could strike a cord in any patriotic American who feels deeply that Americans will accept nothing less than a free nation and will stop at nothing to achieve it. Even the younger generations, who may have experienced that great sadness and fiery anger of 9/11, could most likely relate to the idea that countrymen will stand proud and strong behind their own people to defend them and their ideals, even if it means the ultimate sacrifice of their lives. What a powerful concept. The Vietnamese also had certain advantages like knowledge of the land and support of the people. In the second DVD episode, Ho Chi Minh was quoted as he answered concern regarding their lack of weaponry, stating, "if we have the people, we have the most powerful weapon". This reminds me of my own father's recollection of his time in Vietnam that he recounted years ago. He told me that there was nothing more frightening than an enemy you could not clearly decipher from your ally. He went on to explain specific instances where Viet Cong would dress as peasants and ambush the Americans. On the other hand, the Americans in Vietnam were compared by Trainor to the British in the revolutionary war; lacking "national sentiment" lead to "disenchantment" of the operation. The message was clear: motivation has everything to do with who can win a war, money and heavy machinery aside. Part two was also impactful, but in a different way, especially with the story told by Journalist Malcolm Browne, who covered the war in Vietnam for the Associated Press. It is amazing what these journalists must have seen and heard, that they were not allowed to report, due to censorship. To read his account of the two-seater T-28 that left with full racks of bombs from the main airstrip, to return with empty racks and a clearly exhausted machine gun was frightening, as was his example of the pilot was a blond-haired, blue-eyed man. Although the pilot had a Vietnamese man in the second seat, it was clear who was running the show so to speak. This was in clear contrast to the U.S. claim that their role was "subordinate" to our allies in Vietnam. Browne explained that he was "threatened with expulsion" by having reported this observation on the airstrip, which makes one question the political twisting of this war and any American involvement anywhere for that matter. It is disappointing to realize that the American people are told what our government wants us to know and even more so that they have the power to cover up details of history we may have resisted, had we known the extent of the given situation. Malcolm Browne's account of Vietnam was not all disappointment, especially his recollection of Christmas Eve, 1961. With all the horrors he had witnessed, there was a touching glimmer of humanity when the drunken men at the special forces camp shot off mortars, and the guerillas from the Viet Cong tunnel complex fired as well in celebration. There was palpable hope in Browne's statement, "for that one night of the Christmas season there was no fighting- a rare respite". The message was that no matter the cruel, violent, and unremorseful horrors the guerrillas set forth onto soldiers and civilians alike, at the core of their souls, they were all just human beings. It is so easy for us to make our counterparts out to be these evil, emotionless demons, such as the opinions of the Nazis during and after WWII. Quite possibly it is easier, considering our human capacity, to mow down "evil demons" with machine guns, than to do it with the mind frame that you're actually murdering someone's son or father.

Part 1 - well written, and although you made much more of this single story (and tried to "answer" the entire war ~~so~~ using a single story in week 2 of a 10 week term) your writing was convincing. "on track". Part 2 was more very good 1st paper.

71/100

ASSIGNMENT 1

careful proofreading
many grammar &
spelling errors

1. When reading General Trainor's story, one can see a subtle change in his attitude about the U.S. effort in South Vietnam. He arrives knowing that communism must be stopped and this is the place to do it. PT He feels that his time spent in the SOG unit as an adviser was a worthwhile program during 1965. The only setback for him at this time is caused by faulty U.S. intelligence reports. While an instructor at the Command and Staff College from 1966 to 1970 he was made aware of the effects that General Westmoreland's search-and-destroy missions were having on the returning officers, the dismay and unhappiness was evident. Now, upon his return to Vietnam as a Battalion Commander in 1970, he is no longer the gong-ho Officer and one point, he openly admits that he's called on the carpet for his tactics in the field. It's believe he may be avoiding contact with the enemy, and as fate may have it his unit is engaged the enemy in an extensive battle, that is considered won, a high ranking enemy intelligence officer is captured, leading to the largest cave complex and the largest intel find up to that time. He then goes on in his story of how Westmoreland's tactic was contrary to the early objective of winning hearts and minds. He also compares Westmoreland and Grant's tactic during the Civil War here, however, he does not point out that Grant ceased and controlled territory won, whereas Westmoreland did not. He also compared the efforts of the North and the Viet Cong to our Revolutionary War, where Washington would rather retreat from a battle as opposed to losing a General to the British. General Trainor leaves you believing that had we tried a different tact, say, the type he alludes to in the last portion of his story that of a Civil Action Program, may have led to a different outcome, and again may not.

2. I'm right, everyone else was wrong, the feeling you get from John Singlaub, it seems as though the only successful operation was his Paradise Island mission that kidnapped northern Vietnamese, held them for a month or more and then sent them back with the false belief that all was well in the south. When he took control of the SOG unit, the unit that Trainor had found to be a positive operation in 1965, was deemed, not so good by Singlaub, he found the commandos were, either captured, killed, or turned to the other side. He felt Secretary McNamara was wrong not to cancel this program when he urged him to, going so far as to say that perhaps it make good conversation at cocktail parties. He felt that we used the wrong type of aircraft to bomb the Ho Chi Minh Trail, blaming the air force for wanting an all-jet air force. He feels that Haiphong harbor should have been bombed and mined to close the flow of supplies to Northern forces and the Viet Cong that moved down the Ho Chi Minh Trail, with little regard to the known fact that the North Vietnamese work like ant colonies and would have found a way to move supplies overland somehow. He then calls Jane Fonda, Ramsey Clark and Tom Hayden traitors because they held different views than his own. He feels that the treatment of our soldiers was so bad when they came home that they had to return to Viet Nam to be comfortable again. The media and news agencies were biased and ignored any of the good work that he felt was done by the American advisers, such as teaching sanitation to the Montagnards. The comparison of he and the advisers as missionaries among heathens and the Viet Cong as Indians attacking frontiersmen as they moved west is quite the stretch and demonstrates the closed mind he had to any thought of people tired of being ruled by an outside source.

3. Luyen Nguyen's story has many touching stories, the first, of his own caring for the commandos that he had just finished training, that he would go with them, although not required to so. He also knew that all the teams that had been sent north did not return, the belief in his own ability to lead the mission and return home safely was insight to a man very committed to his people. After capture in the north, knowing that family would assume his death, held a funeral and grieved his loss, he endured the confinement, torture and still refused to contact his family in order save them worry all over again. Then the story of his wife, remarried and having another child, divorces when she learns

all narrative
No mention of
the credibility questionsObviously all negative
information here
but all narrative... I've
read the story myself... why did you
choose it?he was this
point?

that he still lives and then waits for him to return. Last, his reunion with his family is heart- warming. This man and his family are, hope, goodness and compassion all round into one.

John.
This paper read like a book
report. You simply retold
the stories. (with many spelling (grammar)
errors.

It is as if you didn't
read any of the specific
questions I asked you
to answer in the
directions

In part one of Appy's "Patriots", Phan Xuan Sinh's story was the most impacting. Hearing a perspective of someone who fought for the South Vietnamese military was very enlightening. Most military stories of Vietnam come from soldiers from the United States. His retelling of removing an elderly couple from a "free-fire zone" and burning their house down, only to find them there again in a couple of weeks because they couldn't leave the land where their ancestors were buried was a shocking story. It showed how much the Vietnamese loved their country and their dedication to their traditions. Operation Passage to Freedom, mentioned in Daniel Redmond's story, which transported 900,000 refugees from North Vietnam to South Vietnam in 1954, showcased the same loyalty to tradition and culture that the Vietnamese had (Herring 62). The U.S. and South Vietnam played on the fact that many people in North Vietnam were Catholic and used the fact that Diem was Catholic and many types of propaganda to convince people to move to South Vietnam. In disc two *America's Mandarin* of "Vietnam: A Television History", the hesitation of the people in North Vietnam to move was discussed. Many were afraid to leave or did not want to abandon their homes and the place where their ancestors were buried. They had respect for their ancestors and did not want to leave. Propaganda had to be made to help push them to make the decision to leave. The culture and tradition of the Vietnamese was shown just as it was in Sinh's story. The Southern Vietnamese Army and the United State's attempts to relocate and move the citizens would not help their cause. By doing this it only interfered with their culture and way of life and created more hostility.

Sinh appears to be a reliable speaker but one can never be certain. No records can back up his story yet he was the one who lived them. Taking his word as law is not something that would be advised, but understanding that it was his point of view and experience that can be interpreted as another way of looking at the war. Since he was there during the war, some of what he says can be taken as more credible but at the same time credibility can be taken away. Some of what he remembered could have been changed over time as he has gotten older and his mind could have been tempered with his memories to help make them easier for him to digest. Depending on how many times he ~~was~~ retold his story he could have also elaborated what actually happened without realizing it over the years. However, the fact that he was there and lived through the war gives him a credibility that can not be taken away from him just like any other person that fought during the war. It can not be denied that he was there and fought. Therefore, he can be counted on as a reliable speaker who is telling his own story.

Luyen Nguyen's story was very disappointing. The way that he was treated by North Vietnamese soldiers while captured as well as the way that the Americans that he encountered treated him was horrible. It would be easier to understand the way that the North Vietnamese treated him since he was one of their prisoners and was their enemy. However, the fact that a U.S. captain told him that he did not know anything and told the student commandos that they were not fighting for their country but for the Americans since they were paying them was absolutely disappointing. Although this was obviously not the case for many Americans in Vietnam it was surprising to read that the U.S. advisors that Nguyen encountered were so arrogant. The fact that he had not told his family any of the terrible conditions that went through while imprisoned is saddening. For someone to hold those memories and thoughts in for so long is something that no one should have to go through.

A story that one might find to have plenty of negatives is Malcolm Browne's. Being the journalist that took the famous photo of the Buddhist monk committing suicide by lighting himself on fire in protest against anti-Buddhist policies in South Vietnam, it would be easy to only see the negativity that takes place in Browne's story. However, there are moments of hope and good. Browne's friendships with several Buddhists is an example of how many Americans that went to Vietnam made lasting relationships with citizens, and his marriage to Le Lieu is another. He spoke of the Buddhists with respect in his story. When Browne sent the raw film of the monk it showed that he was reporting the truth without censorship. His need to constantly push the boundaries with his writing despite his own safety being put on the line showcases his compassion which is admirable.

Part 2 felt a bit rushed. (Page length 700-1100 words)
so feel free to take more time.
Overall, very good first effort.

Part One:

Ta Quang Thinh's story has great impact due to his point of view about the war. It may be unclear to some readers exactly which side of the war Thinh fought for, as the narration simply states that he went south as a nurse. Because we know that many of those who lived in the north went south for religious or political reasons, it is not clear which side of the war he was helping with his medical training. The fact of which side he worked for is less important than the message behind his story, which stated his disillusionment with the war in whole, and the great toll the war had taken on his life and country. This account was reliable as a first hand narration, despite the time which had lapsed since the events took place. Thinh could still recall the name of the patient he was checking on at the time of the bombing, as well as the protocol they used to carry Thinh back to the North. These facts show objectivity that supports Thinh's credibility with regard to the account. The fact that this story could be told years later in such a way as to make the reader feel that they too were there, and that the confusion over the reasoning behind this war was felt by all sides, makes it an account which had and will continue to have a great impact on those who read it.

3 sentences

not really an analysis of credibility

Part 1 too brief

Part Two, A:

The account by Richard Olsen was disappointing in its delivery. This soldier was in Vietnam for a very specific purpose and recounted this experience as a very nostalgic, positive time in his life. Olsen was there early in the war and did not claim to see the ugly side of the war. He spoke of the differences between Vietnam soldiers he encountered from the north and the south, but did so in a way which gave a light-hearted tone to it all, as with the soldiers in the south having their "siesta" time. He also recounted an almost comical exchange between he and another soldier when the South Vietnamese soldiers wanted to leave their post with a deceased comrade. This attitude doesn't appear to give the proper respect to the experience of many others who were in Vietnam at the time, and could make one feel that Olsen must have lacked the mental or emotional ability to fully appreciate the grim circumstances he was in.

he speaks for himself, not others

The narration which follows his account tells another story. Olsen, an artist, is talked about in relation to the art he created, and it becomes clear that the account of comical and light-hearted reminiscence may have been a cover for the reality of the experience. Olsen may have said one thing, but his art was telling another story, a dark one. Even though the attitude he portrayed is disappointing, there is redemption in the possibility that Olsen was a veteran who continued living after the war as best he could- surviving on rose-tinted stories of the good old days, while reliving the harsh reality in his art.

Interesting story choice. Here, you think Olsen lies to the reader, but author Appy's "art story" that follows offers an explanation of Olsen's lies.

Part Two, B:

You conclude with a positive note, although this was supposed to be negative.

The account by Ngo Vinh Long was one which showed that Long may have been able to see the worth in the war, but how another truth was able to be seen when Long looked at things from another point of view. Even though his father became disillusioned with the benefit of the war and the United States' role in it, Long had a hard time falling in line with these ideas, due to very different ideas which his father gave him when he was younger. He was young and found it difficult to see that the United States would be anything darker than the place of beauty he had grown up dreaming about. He was, as the story shows, the embodiment of hope within a time of great challenge. It appears as though, with the experiences he had while assisting in map-making across the South, Long grew up. In doing so, Long lost some of the fairy tale ideals that he grew up with. This loss for Long involved his positive view of the U.S. and the war in general, and shows that he was able to come around to the opinion which his father had come to some time before him.

This change of heart was the pivotal step in changing the path of Long's life. This is a story which showed the humanity and love between father and son, and embodied the goodness that those in the midst of this struggle were capable of. It also served to highlight how one boy was able to see a new truth, use his life to move for change, and symbolize a small part of the potential for good which came out of the war.

even though he came to a different / opposite
conclusion from his father?

A few organizational issues caused
problems in your paper.

You did have another 3-400
words (200-1200) to take your
time and explain your points
more clearly.

Overall, good first paper effort.

many proofreading errors
spelling/grammar

Dylan Ornas

4/13/2014

History of the Vietnam War

Assignment 1

By the time Roger Donlan received his battle injuries and ultimately the medal of honor for his actions, the western cause in vietnam had been doomed to fail for almost 9 years. The toleration of the recolonization of Vietnam by the allied forces after world war two paved the way for a bloody conflict that no western power could have anticipated. Donlan's account sheds a stark light on the sheer ignorance to the threat at hand as well as the sheer unpreparedness of the United States when it finally dove into the conflict. This isn't to say they had not dipped a toe or two before that, the millions in military aid to france as well as the small amount of special forces operating in country at the time (operating out of small bases just as Donlan did). The vivid descriptions of the combat, such as a man running on stumps after his legs were removed by an artillery shell, strike deep. One must note however an underlying theme throughout it. They weren't ready. One artillery shell takes out all communication, no idea that one third of their force are friendly to the enemy, the previous days hostile takeover of a similar base wasn't reported and the hanger housing the ground attack planes is locked due to the 4th of July. It seems to be a laundry list of errors that weren't addressed perhaps due to the light nature in which the US took the fight they were slowly wedging themselves into. One would have a hard time trying to discredit the information conveyed in his interview. A brutally honest description of the situation is easily gleanable from this account. Having taken part in the battle itself Donlan shows a credibility few talking about the war can convey. He has no one to protect by altering the story, in fact it almost feels as if he wants the reader to know both sides of the story no matter the outcome. Donlan's account mirrors so many that came before and after. Den Bien Phu is a perfect example, the french and their underinflated view of the opposition. Believing there was no way to get artillery up the surrounding mountains, or enough men to counter the twelve thousand french troops dropped there, the french were totally unprepared for the crushing defeat that followed. Donlan's vivid account of the five hour battle, and his humbleness regarding his deeds done and awards earned, make his story fascinating yet somber.

Part 2

People seem to forget that the story of the conflict ranges so much further than the United States' involvement, and yet the U.S. was there at the beginning; dropping Henry Pruner into Vietnam to meet with "Mr. Ho". The two accounts, one from Prunier and the other from Vo Nguyen Giap, tell of a disappointing missed opportunity for peace and a moderately clear reason why the U.S. had no chance at victory. Understandably the U.S. used "Uncle Ho" and his

fighters to clear the japanese from the territory during world war two. What is hard to understand is the complete rejection of any pleas for help from the Viet Minh before recolonization as well as during. They had nowhere else to turn, so why would they not accept help from red china and russia? The second story reveals that. Giap puts it quite honestly "We won the war because we would rather die than live in slavery". When the U.S. deployed troops, they were fighting a losing battle of attrition against an entire ^{Nor South Vietnamese?} people who had nowhere to go but to defend their homes. Westmoreland's strategy of search and destroy didn't help either but that's an entirely other can of worms. *cliche*

While the pages turned, it is very hard to find any hope, or compassion within them. Most comprise of confusion on why they are fighting or tales of hardships that are near unimaginable. Ngo Vinh Long recalls a story that has some glimmers of hope, even though they are crowded by the fog of war. One of the few in this book so far where an effort is made to distinguish between a country's government and its people. Long recalls her father explaining that the american people would not be replacing the french, it would be the american government and its soldiers. There is wisdom and a degree of understanding in that statement that seems to lack so far through these accounts of the war.

☆ In part 1, you try to do too much with a single story. It is as if you claim Donlon's story is an analogy to the entire Western involvement in the war. While interesting, it was not the question(s) I had asked

☆ Again in Part 2 ... too much from a single story. This time, your conclusions are less in accord with historical facts. You essentially "end the war" in week 2 of the term.

Eryne Grant HST 195 Joe Escobar 12 April 2014 Assignment 1 Part One The story that had the greatest effect on me in the book "Patriots" was the account of Roger Donlon. I found this story to be emotionally attached to me because of the way he humbly wrote about his time in Vietnam, his injuries, and his fellow soldiers. His quote at the beginning of the story read, "We were just babes in arms in every way." This really hit an emotional string with me because my own father, who passed away in May of 2013, was only 19 when he was drafted into Vietnam, and this is how I pictured him. I believed for Donlon ^{was} to be very reliable and believable in ~~regards to~~ his personal story of the war. I sensed a type of serenity and truthfulness through his account. He never used vulgar language, kept his stories to the point, and talked about everyone in a respectful manner. It takes a lot of courage to talk about your enemies in a respectful way, and I thought that by his doing so that he showed he was a great man. Also, as being the first man to receive the Medal of Honor in the war, I was reminded that he had plenty of courage to go around. I think his reliability gave him more credibility, but to a certain point. Yes, he did receive the Medal of Honor and was a respectable man, but he also may have upset or embarrassed about the situation. He may have forgotten a few details here and there, but I believe that his overall story was to the point and true. I never once doubted the authenticity of his overall story while reading it. Lastly, I was reminded of a quote in Herring's text that reminded me of this story. Kennedy said, "It is our offspring, we cannot abandon it, we cannot ignore its needs." I admit to not knowing much about politics or the Vietnam War, but this quote seemed to pinpoint the feelings I thought while reading this story. This quote was obviously related to the entire war in Vietnam and the relations in general, but I thought it could be fairly compared to the soldiers lives and dedication to the war as well. In a way, it was their offspring as well. They may not have wanted to fight it or be involved, but they could not abandon it or ignore its needs. They were all in once on foreign soil, and Donlon proved this. The courage and strength that he found was all for the greater good. Part Two I was highly disappointed in the story of General Baker Jr. From his quick introduction of his job title at Ford Motor Company to when he got arrested, I didn't like his tone and lack of personal details. Yes, it was probably hard for him to write about the situation, but it was really hard for me to try to connect with his words on a personal level. I wasn't necessarily disappointed with the events in his story, but rather the quickness in which they were told. It seemed like once he hit a major event in his Vietnam story, he was talking about the next one. I definitely felt this way about his time in Cuba. It would have been nice to know a little bit more about why he said that "I would have never have been the same person without these two and a half months in Cuba". I felt like he left the reader hanging. Despite these disappointing factors, I was still impressed by his lack of fear of going to jail. I would be scared no matter what to go to jail, but he seemed to not care at all. He knew what he believed in and stuck to that. To go against the draft you have to be extremely determined and have plenty of courage. The line "I had my toothbrush in my pocket because I thought I was going to jail" proved to me that he was ready to receive whatever punishment the government had in store for him. His story was a reminder that you need to stick up for what you personally want and believe in.

interesting support,
given your own
father served.

This is not the disappointment
I asked for... not what
he left out, but what was included.
Author Appy is to blame for what was included
in the book or not. I thought you would
have focused on his draft evasion. (again given)
I can accept the positives you mentioned at the
end, but not the negatives.

George Watkins story had the greatest impact on me. There are several reasons that his story especially had an impact on me. The way he talked about not knowing much at all about the vietnam war and how scary and difficult that most of been being drafted for a war you hadn't really paid much attention to. Then after telling his story and explaining that he didn't have much bitterness, that right there was surprising. Someone losing their legs and eyesight in a war they didn't know much about and still having that kind of attitude towards it. You could tell the sadness in how he wished all those people didn't die and how he felt about the war even happening, but he seemed to have a better attitude about it given what happened to him then I think I would have. George Watkins, I believe, seemed trustworthy. The way he told his story made me feel as though he was telling the truth. He didn't seem to pushy or one sided with his recalling of the war. Another thing is, to a certain extent people may tell a lie or stretch the truth, but really who am I to say that he wouldn't be trustworthy I wasn't there. He seemed to have pretty clear memories of what happened while he was in vietnam. I would say what he told in that story to be credible and that what he went through isn't something that someone really forgets over time. You could tell he had his opinion on the war but from what I read, he didn't seem to tell stuff that didn't happen.

In part two I found that one story shared some details that made me very disappointed in United States and their decision making. Ngo Vinh Long talked about the French and his hatred for them. How he would go to the lake or a pond and see corpses floating because the French would do patrols and kill a lot of vietnamese. This seems to be a common thing I am reading and hearing, how the French really did treat the people of vietnam like dirt. Then to know that we were aiding them and supporting them. It makes me sad that we would support people who would do things like that. When Ngo Vinh Long talks about how great he saw America and how much he admired our country and refused to learn French because he wanted to learn English. Well this was also disappointing because as his father says we were siding with the French. It seemed we were supporting the French for our own selfish reasons and we were ignoring all the negative things that came along with supporting the French. The way the United States were handling things didn't seem much better. Ignoring the fact that villages were starving and saying they were just sick. Ngo Vinh Long made many good points showing that the United States didn't understand the culture or the right ways to help the people of vietnam. Instead of fighting the way people there were telling them to fight America did practically the opposite, ignoring so much information that could have been very useful.

From this same story I felt there was a certain goodness in people. Ngo Vinh Long's dad said not to hate the French people but to hate their policies. Then again he said the same thing with the American policy when he told Ngo Vinh Long about how the Americans were supporting the French. This to me is amazing to read about. Instead of just hating each person individually, there was an understanding that it wasn't that individual it was its government's policies. In many of these stories though, I find many Americans having respect for the Vietnamese including the Vietminh. Even though they were fighting against them there was a good side, an understanding that maybe things like this shouldn't have happened, that as a country we shouldn't have interfered with something like this. The fact that the soldiers who fought in this war knew this and understood it, in a way it takes away from some of the hate.

grammar spelling & proofing issues hurt readability.

Comments are NOT supported in this story. You should have pick another if you wanted to talk about them. Here they are vague and really quite out of line with most of the historical evidence

Assignment 1

P20—PAYING THE PRICE—they carried me the whole way back to the North

?
91 This story just caught my attention because the author used a real example to tell people how the army thought about war in the short story. As the author described, he was the only survivor in the bomb hit from a B-52, and he survived because he was closer to the surface of ruins of the hospital and easier to breath and be dig out by aid workers than others. In that case, the author hates war from his bottom of heart. He doesn't like the war, and he doesn't think that anyone liked the war. This is the truth, and I do believe him. Sometimes people have ambition to attack and aggress others for some benefits, like lands, natural resources and maybe defense. Then those aggressors will use some other reasons to make the purpose of war right to avoid the name of aggression. In this story, the author knows that this was a war with its purpose and he still took part in it, and he had seen the sad result of war. Indeed, wars are cruel and absurd. The bomb hit in the story is just an epitome of all the wars in history, WWI, WWII, civil war, and so on. All the wars killed many people who could not really enjoy the benefits after the end of the war. The top commander will distribute the spoils of the war, and soldiers just paying their bloods and lives for their commanders. The most important part in the story is that the author really didn't like to be separated from his family, he could not keep in touch with his family because they were always moving during the war. The story is objective and factual. Typically, people who experienced war would not like the war and would not want to remember and memorize all the happenings and events during the war. It was same happened on the author, he said he had memories but he didn't want to remember them. This is not subjective, and this is not that author had too much things forgotten, it's just too merciless to have those people to tell the black stories from their bottom of hearts. awk

P84—THE EMPEROR HAS NO CLOTHES—boy, you speak just like an American.

? This story makes me feel disappointed is because all the story just talk about how terribly U.S. army prepared for the war. Firstly, they don't know about Vietnam. They don't know where Vietnam is, and even though someone shows the Asia map to the commander of U.S. Army, they will not recognize where Vietnam is and what the shape of Vietnam is. Probably they think Vietnam is weak and easy to beat. Secondly, their staff were stolen. It is important to have strong back support in the war, but U.S. Army did terribly on this one, they have two third staff got stolen, which are for South Vietnam army. Thirdly, U.S. had a terrible President—Johnson, who made people disappointed. He canceled all the reservation of the hotel for the meeting with Saigon government, which is an impulsive decision.

However, even this story shows lots of negative things, it also shows positive things. For example, U.S. Army are really strong. They have very advanced equipment, such as battleships, cruisers, and nuclear-powered submariners. Those are the equipment which will brings the victory to United States. Indeed, those strong equipment and well trained soldiers are showing a big chance to win the war, but the ego of United States government and army force is the strong weapon to beat themselves. Perhaps this kind of strong force brings both confidence and ego, unfortunately, U.S. Army had chosen ego and they paid a lot for their ego during the war. ~6

I have read the article "Ta Quang Thinh" It looks like he is a doctor of North Viet army and he was the only survivor from one air attack, then he stay in South for a long time, after he has express he is sick of war. I choose to report this article not only because I don't like war neither, but also because the complex status of this character and I believe that a man who has survive from slain can more deeply understand the cruel of war. He is a doctor and he save people's life from death so he knows how rare the life is, he is an army so he have been taught by patriotism education, he was a prisoner, a husband and now he is a disabled. These different status makes him take different way to think about what the war means. And after that all he just talk about how worse the war is instead of to attack the old enemy. I think he can only see the nature of war, if he can talk about history objectively, this also why I choose to believe him and why his speak is reliable. Otherwise, he has nearly face death, disabled by an air raid, and he has been a prisoner separate from his family. I think this kind of experience makes him more trustable, especially he talked about his wife at the last, that makes me feel true, it is not like the story our parents told to teach us what is the right things to do, it makes people feel more reality and cruelty, but we know that what real life looks like. And I think he talk about the war objectively, as I said he did not trying to attack the enemy group in the interview or eulogize their own group neither just stay on how war hurt him and how war changed his life, looks he has experience too much suffer but fortunately he can keep his voice objectively. This war has passed a long time, people might be forget it but I don't think the people who has experience or surviving in the war can forget that, the memory of battle will be the nightmare around them day after day after month after years until the end of their life. War makes too much pain for people.

For the part 2 I choose article "Paul Kattenburg" This story looks are talking about upper-level administer did not truly understand what happened in Vietnam and they just trying thinking about it automatic or use the old historical experiences, that makes me feel disappointment, because I think that is a kind of irresponsible, commander need to understand what happened in the place of battleground then they can make the right diction for their army who are tasting the bullet. And some of them are too much care about honor to notice what they have cast. I think this kind of thing not only happened in Vietnam War but also on the others. Some of opportunist will trying to use this chance getting benefit, so the original war was full of political, power and business.

I feel disappointment about this story he told, because I feels the ugly of politic, but fortunately, there still someone can calmly think about this thing without honor or other staff. This is important to know because if no man in one country can think calmly about war, this country will going to a wrong side. For example the old Japanese militarism is one what I'm talking about, this out of mind thinking not only hurt on the people whom you flight with but also hurt the people you trying to protect. So someone can keep calm shows there still people can lead our world being better.

grammar

70/100

643 words min length 700

run on sentences hurt readability

red

we know that now after the fact

In part 1 of Patriots Deirdre English had a profound impact on me. The confusion that surrounded war in the 1960's and 1970's is no different than the confusion that is being caused by war in the present day. Deirdre English caught my attention most because I was close to her age when 9/11 happened and the ensuing war in the Middle East. This caught my attention because I can relate to it with my own experiences, although mine were somewhat different they were also quite similar. I knew exactly why the United States went to war in Afghanistan, but like Deirdre I did not understand why we went to war in Iraq, after all they were not responsible for the attacks of 9/11. Deirdre English is a trust worthy speaker on this subject, it's not like there is anything for her to gain by lying about the events that took place in her life. That being said I do think that her accounts that she is reporting on now may have happened a little differently in the 1960's and 1970's due to the fact that so much time has passed and not one person has a perfect memory. Deirdre English is a credible speaker for her point of view, however some people may have different views on this if their opinions are different. Deirdre English is a factual reporter, she is reporting on the events that she experienced, that being said she is also a subjective reporter because she is only reporting from her point of view. A great deal of time has passed since Vietnam and she has no doubt forgotten several things that happened to her in that time period. The reason Deirdre is a subjective reporter is because she is speaking from the point of view of a un informed student, if she were a top ranking official in the U.S. Government her accounts and views would be much different, but none the less her views are still first-hand a very factual.

what does this mean?

gra

Part 2. The section that was most disappoint was the one written by Evelyn Colbert. Not only was this section far too brief, but it just doesn't seem written by a true professional, like a person should be who is working in the State Department. This story is also extremely disappointing because it starts out talking about McNamara going back on his word saying that the U.S. didn't know anything about Vietnam when in fact they actually did according to the writer. So that leaves the question, who are the readers supposed to believe? This article leaves a lot of doubt in the minds of readers as to how true the events are that they have been reading about in the past and how much of them have been filtered.

No hyp?

→ you are still answering Part 1 questions here.

NOT my question

awk

awk

"Paradise Island" in section two is a great story that restores your faith in humanity. It doesn't seem right to kidnap a person and take them to a place that has been modified to give off a false sense of location, then the reason for the kidnapping comes out. The South Vietnamese were disguised as Northerners and even spoke their dialect. They would help the northerners and get them well, and give them the care they needed. They were given the beliefs of the southerners and give them ideas that people should receive equal and fair pay. These were ideas not fondly thought of in the north. When the northerners were sent back after no less than a month they were given a transistor radio with a frequency to the Patriot Radio. This was a huge radio station and broadcast positive uplifting messages to its listeners in the north. This story makes the "kidnappers" seem less like militia and much more like missionaries as they were just trying to help the northern civilians.

- o - was this a big propaganda campaign?

misunderstanding of this story.

Organizational problems btw Parts 1 & 2

Must profound paper.

Analysis of credibility in Part 1 was the strongest part of your paper

Kristine Wallace Assignment #1

Part 1

There ^{are} so many stories that I encountered in this book that made an impact on me for so many reasons but I chose the story by Roger Donlon for the simple fact that it made the ~~LARGEST~~ impact on me. We have in the narrative an individual that was thrown into a war that, although he had great training, was working with a group of individuals that he could not completely trust. He had the small infrastructure, than the Nungs than the North Vietnamese Strike Force which he could only trust a small percentage of (which was unfortunate from the fact that so many people were being relocated at this point, it was impossible for the Americans to know who the infiltrators were and who were actually on the American side).

What caught my attention most was the fact that he was trying to deal with all of these individuals that could ~~ALMOST~~ be trusted but not quite so. Donlon went into this with full trust and that unfortunately was not the case. They were fired upon not only by the enemy but also by at least half the people on the perimeter that were supposed to be protecting them.

Donlon goes on to speak of his compassion for the people in his unit, specifically Pop Alamo and John Houston. The saddest line I believe I read refereed to Houston's wife having given birth to twin children. Because of the prematurity of the birth (which could most definitely be a cause from the fathers death), one of the children died. Donlon's line of "casualties of war go far beyond the immediate battlefield" (pg.15) resonates such a feeling that Donlon understands, as should many, that it is not just the soldiers in the field itself but so many others end up experiencing the pain and suffering that had occurred.

I believe Donlon to be a credible and apt party in his narrative, not only because he experienced the situation but that after so many years he can still account for everything with a sensible head. He is now a grandfather, living on a Kansas home with still a sense of pride for the American public. This I feel was represented in the red, white and blue birdhouse outside his home. American pride can be exemplified in many ways, and this was one small reminder.

Part 2

Malcolm Browne wrote a narrative on his experiences in the war and the Buddhist people he came into contact ^{with} through the war. The reason I found this disappointing was the fact that the Buddhist Monk ended up burning himself in effigy. Although, I realize that he and the other people that was with had their reasons, I do not feel like burning yourself would do anything to stop a war. This is why I found this story disappointing. Browne, I felt, wrote a really good narrative but the fact that a person would go to such lengths to protest something is a very hard concept for me to understand.

Although I ended on the negative, I am also going to look at the positive point to this issue. The monk (and his fellow compatriot) had obvious reasons for doing what they did. They did not want a communist take over and they did not want war. They simply wanted peace and although this is not the way I would go about trying to achieve this, they had their reasons. Buddhist Monks are known for their way of life including compassion, love and to live life with a moralistic ideal. So, I am guessing that they felt was their best way to make an impression, even as extreme as it was.

Don't use the same story for the positive and negative.

Grammar & spelling problems hurt readability.

Historical accuracy issues as well.

Lacking analysis in Part 1 -

2nd guessing the burning monk, which strayed from my questions.

AWK

not really

public? how does this relate?

huh?

592 words

min length 700

69/100

credibility?

SP
or
gra
Ns
turn
ns

The story that have the most impact was Rodger Donlon's. The reason why the stood out to me is because stories of heroism are always a good read. They are sensational, exciting, and often romanticize. The story, however, loses its romance. When I first began to read the story it was typical hero story line. The treacherous many versus the virtuous few. The battle begins in my mind recalls images of war movies shot with vibrant explosions of color and men narrowly escaping death. The smoke begins to settling you see the triumphant, chiseled heroe's silhouette against the sunrise. The story begins in this fashion, but begins to take a gruesome term. He describes a comrade getting his leg shot off and him continuing to run for his post on bloody stumps. An image he says is "one you'd want to forget." At the end of it all there was no chiseled silhouette. There was a survivor at the edge of death. Wounded in the gut, arm, and leg, he was thought to be dead. Soldiers were toted away in bags instead of shaking each other's hands and celebrating victory.

In regards to accuracy, history will always be skewed depending on who is telling it. If you asked a VC about the same battle their account would be quite different. Having said that, I think Mr. Donlon's account sounds pretty accurate. He refrains from being overly emotional and focuses on the events of the night. There was the occasional comment that seemed to be less based in fact. For example, when he says they survived because of the love you feel for your "fellow teammates". The facts are they survived because of the flares they were fortunate enough to have received a week before the attack and they kept firing their mortars. The fact that he was there does give him more credibility. He lived it. Although you have to weed through the emotions, like when he talks about John Houston and his family, the first hand account is hard to top. Since the interview was several years after the attack he was able to give some scope in addition to what he saw first hand. For example, explaining that communication was so bad they didn't know the same thing had happened a few days before at another location. - unclear huh?

The story I found to be the most disappointing was from Vo Nguyen Giap. The reason is because he says something that I firmly agree with. "History is not made with 'if's', but if American leaders had been wiser I think we could have been spared the war." Its a war that should've been avoided. The Vietnamese had every right to choose their destiny as an independent nation, which was agreed upon at the Geneva Conference. Instead, the French left and the US moved in. The resistance of yet another imperial lord was so strong that they were able to win against one of the world's most powerful militaries. He says their "deepest aspirations as has always been self-determination."

The positive outcome of this unfortunate, avoidable war was the independence of Vietnam. They are a nation that has always been under foreign rule. First the Chinese, then the French, then the Japanese, back to the French, and finally The USA was moving in. Giap said that the war was, for them, "a noble sacrifice". Their movement came from very humble beginnings during WWII to winning their independence. It's a story of triumph and the unbreakable spirit of the people. - in addition to Chinese & Russian aid of support.

Numerous grammar, spelling, & awkward writing problems.

While I agree with some of your sentiment in Part 2,

you "solve" the entire war with 100% hindsight, no source citations for authority (except the enemy's gloating interview) AND zero information from Henry, the PVD's & anything else you read or seen so far.

Too much Too big a claim from one story

Part 1 - Strange combined movie-to-story symbolism.

After that start, your analysis of his credibility was much better - more analytical.

more analytical.

confusing imperialism was the Cold War.

accuracy

65 / 100

521 words min length 700

Part 1

The story that had such a huge impact on me and caught my attention is one from Phan Xuan Sinh titled "All my ancestors are buried here." When I read this story, I felt so sad for the soldiers with Sinh and the civilians who were caught in this war. They had to kill innocent people and lose so much over nothing. I felt about ready to cry when I read the part about the old couple rebuilding their house and refusing to leave because it was all they had in life. It makes me feel so grateful for everything I have. I feel that this story was reliable and trustworthy. Being there in the war gives the more credibility because they have first hand experience and we just get to hear the stories that people tell of what happened. I feel like this story is objective and factual because things like that are things you can not forget your entire life, even if you wanted to. Killing innocent elderly people, men women and children is something you will not forget because it impacts you. You took away the life of someone who was just in the wrong place at the wrong time. Anyone with a heart would feel terrible about it.

red

They or He

? uncle

gra

poor analysis here. ★
cliche we humans all have hearts

Part 2

I have to say, the most disappointing story that I read was "My cock lost the fight" by Paul Hare. I really felt like it didn't really bring anything into the stories about the war. It just told of us of what the vietnamese people did in their spare times and what it was like to be an American in Vietnam with a war going on. I also felt disappointed that he ended his story with losing \$500 in a cockfight and being told he is doing good by "rubbing elbows" with the Vietnamese people. I feel that there was no need to send that man into Vietnam for no other reason than to just be there.

I was pleased to read about Paradise Island. I learned that even though there may be a war going on, you can still help the innocent ones. It made me feel happy that even though there was a war going on, there were people trying to help the innocent people caught in the middle. Reading about John Singlaub's story titled "We sent them all back with a generous gift package" made me feel like a little faith in humanity has been restored. Basically the people in Paradise Island, also known as Cu Lao Cham Island, kidnapped people who needed help. They treated people who were malnourished, sick, had diseases and other various things. Once they were healed and treated, they were sent home with a care package with things that they needed most. The packages were confiscated but eventually they were sent with two packages, one to hide and one to have confiscated, that way they were still able to receive the things they needed. I felt there was a little bit of good in the war and that made me feel happy.

red

I'm not sure you understood the significance of this story.

No
Re-read my instructions.
This is NOT the disappointment + focus on.
Are you calling Apoy stupid?
for including this story?

Was Phan's story credible? You say "they", implying that everyone who participated is, simply because they were there.

Part 1

Phan Xuan Sinh's account sticks out the most, especially the last few paragraphs. This man served in South Vietnam's military, so he brings a unique perspective. He's shaken up by the events he participated in, which brings up heavy emotions. For example, when he's finished talking about the fishermen getting fired at, he says it's clear common people on all sides bore the brunt of the killing. The tears he and the translator shed convey the effect this story has. It's also possible he has rehearsed the answers in his head since that time to rationalize what happened. This is not to say his account is not genuine or unreliable. His description of the South Vietnamese draft and the mood of the time reminded me of the American civil war accounts. In both instances the draft contributed to class resentment, and the prolonged conflict helped wear down soldiers' wills to fight. (He is a man who values life, whereas the enemy he is facing does not.) Vo Nguyen Giap and Robert McNamara's historical views of the war display this difference well. Giap saw it as a noble sacrifice and McNamara saw it as a tragedy. The Communists were willing to kill and give their lives. The hatred of the Communists is also reminiscent of the hatred many Southerners in America felt after the civil war toward the North. This account had objectivity and subjectivity to it. Sinh told the interviewers what happened and occasionally mentioned his feelings on those issues, usually feelings of sadness and regret. It was all together a great interview. - not quite my questions

Part 2

Sergei Khrushchev conveyed a message of condescension with his account of the war period. He talks about the effect American propaganda has on the American people, and seems to suggest Americans are more gullible than Russians. He suggests whatever effect propaganda had on the Russian people was positive or of no consequence. Of course he paints his father as one of the best premiers the Soviet Union had, but his emotional connection, whether genuine or not, clouds objective analysis. He lectures America on Vietnam, even mentioning the Russian invasion of Afghanistan. Mentioning he listened to radio stations like BBC and Voice of America is intended to make it seem he is open-minded. Russia, in his mind, was more enlightened than the United States. I take it you think this negative, but you only imply it. Had I not known you as a student & former student, I'd

Henry Prunier's story of meeting Ho Chi Minh is definitely a story of hope and the potential for it. Everything from Ho Chi Minh quoting the Declaration of Independence to his cooperation with Deer Team indicates the potential for peace instead of war. Even Giap talked of the "intimate relations" held with the United States. Both countries had fought oppression and imperialism, but Ho proved more vicious than George Washington. Both the documentary and textbook mentioned Ho Chi Minh eliminated competing Nationalists in Vietnam. It's not certain whether Prunier's account would have changed because of this information. Still, it gives us a window into a time when ideology did not matter.

Bryan,

Organization issue, and a reliance on our past history hurt the academic & analytical development of this paper

A while I appreciate the Civil War class references, they should have add to the length & depth of your paper

ending?

so again, you see this as "good" or "hopeful."

be lost as to your point here.

501 words

200 word minimum length

Seth Heffron

Escobar

HST 195: History of the Vietnam War (Assignment 1)

April 13, 2014

Part 1

One story from our book, "Patriots" that caught my attention the most was the account of an American soldier by the name of George Watkins. He was drafted into the army on June 19, 1967 then was suddenly thrown into a war he knew very little about, as did many Americans at that time. All he knew was that he was to fight for the American government on a war against so-called Communism, which was a vague concept to him at the time. Before he knew it, he was thrown into an unknown country and given a gun in order to fulfill his duties. He recalls clearing out an entire valley of Vietnamese people, and witnessing them moving right back into their homes in the valley within two days. What impacted me was his reaction to the resilience of the Vietnamese people, and discovering their strong-willed nature and determination, regardless of the brutality they were facing in the war. At one point he even states, "I don't hate them." This statement, followed by, "...I don't have much bitterness... I just wish that none of it had ever happened- for everybody's sake." Impacted me the most in realizing how convoluted the Vietnam War was, and the perceptions people carry of how each side felt in reality. I think this speaker has absolute credibility in his opinion, seeing that he was a participant of the war. Regardless of how much time has passed, his view is valid in that he is expressing how he felt about the war. I usually expect a lot of hatred and tension between America and Vietnam after what happened, but hearing stories like this show the complexity of the war, and the reluctance both sides had in being a part of it.

Part 2

I chose the first story in Part 2, which was about Henry Prunier training Viet Minh soldiers and about Vo Nguyen Giap's relation to Ho Chi Minh. Since this is the first time I've ever studied anything about the Vietnam War, it is a little confusing as to who is fighting for who, and all the political ties and dynamics between countries. I suppose it is disappointing that the American government spent so much time and money into training soldiers who would eventually turn on them in the end. It is also disappointing that we stepped into a conflict between countries that has been unraveling for centuries, and assume that we could bully them into submission. In general, it is disappointing hearing about so many people dying for what seems like such a pointless battle. Some country N & S Vietnam.

On a positive note, it is inspiring reading about the determination and dedication the Vietnamese had for their country, as well as the brave people who fought for ours. Although the basis for the war is completely ludicrous, the people who fought in it seemed noble and good-willed.

Paper makes numerous inaccurate comments. (or unsupported)

★ You lack of familiarity with the subject is a major problem. PUP's & textbook readings in the first 2 weeks should have you as an informed track

OOPS
what does THIS mean?

cite your sources

problems
- time changes everything
- expressing his feelings is not what we are interested in. We are after historical truths.

Then, the answer!
You expect hatred. Watkins gives you none. Therefore, Watkins is believable? Logic problem

Problem with source! Communism was vague to no American living here from 1945-1989.

Very unclear

★

not true quality (this)

strange wording

Some grammar & spelling issues

unsubstantiated claim
ww
war from (1954-1975)

The story in part one that most caught my attention and spoke to me the most was the story from George Watkins, "The sand was probably the only thing that saved me." I think one of the reasons it struck me so deeply was that it was easy to imagine my father in George's shoes. My father is a Vietnam veteran and before taking this class his many photographs and few stories he is willing to share were all I really knew of this war. So while reading George's narrative, it was my father's face I saw. The other reason I felt like I connected with it is that you can really hear a real person talking the way it is written. It didn't need to be "fancied up." There was more impact for me because it was not fancied up. I think George is as reliable, trustworthy, and believable as he could be. The details he gave are the details I would have expected from someone simply stating what happened, he wasn't trying to glorify or gore anything up. I find his account very objective, especially for someone with such injuries. He isn't holding the Vietnamese accountable for what happened to him, but the politics and politicians whose actions he believed put them in the situation.) Awk

The two I found to be most disappointing were the stories from Chester Cooper, and Paul Hare. Both of these gave me a sense of the United States pushing people with little to no knowledge of what was going on in Vietnam into important dealings, meetings, and positions regarding Vietnam. I realize that it might be a lot to expect that everyone knew what was really happening in complete detail, but these men recount what sounds to me like people had no clue what they were doing. They had no idea what the place was like, what it was about, and in some cases even where it was. How could we have expected good results when the people who were dealing with things were so uninformed? - no hypo?

I found a strong sense of compassion, goodness, and honesty in Daniel Redmond's story. He was genuinely there to help people. Regardless of the situation, he wanted to help them. He wasn't impressed by the posturing of others, even the ones whose opinions he shared. I think that is important and I find value in a person's ability to say that a person's actions aren't genuine or necessary even though their position on something might be the same. It makes me feel like I can trust that person more, like their honesty or their credibility is better than someone who reports in a strict black and white, right and wrong kind of way. It humanizes things. And I find that to be a very good thing.

That is, if you believe them! Since the war ended badly, this seems to be the right thing to say.

* more explanation needed here.

a analysis on the right track, but lacking here. I'm guessing you believe George just as you believe your own father. "objective for someone w/ such injuries" - explain.

very awkward 3rd ¶
- vague & lacking specifics
- You also revert to addressing Part I questions of credibility here.

organization problems

445 words *minimum 200 words required*

gra The story that had the greatest impact on me the interview with Roger Donlon. It had the greatest impact on me because Donlon talked about the battle that he was awarded the Medal of Honor for. Donlon talks about one of the interpreters, George Tuan, and describes Tuan's death very vividly saying, "he just kept running on stumps" after his legs got blown off. This story is the most reliable and believable in this section because Donlon probably told this story many times since people asked how he got his Medal of Honor. This gives him more credibility since he would have told the story many times and not changed the facts. This story seems more factual since Donlon vividly remembers so much of the battle it seems. It is something that he would never be able to forget especially after being honored for his valiant bravery and action during the battle.

*Repetition = historical truth?
Interesting analysis, but worth
of more explanation.*

*to you?
seems?*

*Red
PT
Red*

*cite
the
source
for this
comment*

Appy's interview with Sergei Khrushchev was disappointing since Sergei focused more on the relationship between the US and Russia during the war and not on the war itself. Sergei's father, Nikita, probably didn't talk much politics with his son and didn't voice his opinion of the war to his son. Sergei never even gave his opinion on the war since he was sure if the Vietnamese "stood with the Soviet Union or China." Appy's interview with Malcolm Browne was also disappointing since the only described burning of the monk and not the controversy that his picture stirred when it was the front page of every newspaper the next day. The interview never talks about Browne emotions during the burning of the monk or his reaction when his picture of the monk started nationwide protests back in the US.

*Re-read the instructions.
I think you "disappointment" is wrong. You ~~are~~ seem disappointed in what was not said or not done. You have to deal*

gra

Appy's interview with Ngo Vinh Long showed compassion and goodness when Long realized what he was actually doing for the military mapping teams in Vietnam. When Long quit in 1962 he began protesting US intervention and the Saigon government. I don't understand why other Vietnamese people would think that would make him a Communist just because he didn't support the government or the US intervention. Appy's interview with Richard Olsen, Olsen admits that the US rules of engagement were sometimes broken when he was flying. This was confirmed in Appy's interview with Malcolm Browne when Browne was at a military air force base in Bien Hoa and saw a T-28 take off with a full rack of bombs, then return later with any bombs. Browne even noticed that one of the pilots was American. Even though this was not considered "good," Olsen told the truth about what really did happen in Vietnam.

Is this positive?

*logic
issue
here.*

*You attempted to discuss too
many stories in this paper
(3 MAX) and
lacked depth & explanation
on ALL of them in Part 2a*

*with what
info HAS
BEEN
included in the
story.*

FYI - Do you know who Nikita Khrushchev was?

Kailey Regoli
Professor Joe Escobar
History 195

Assignment 1

Part 1

In the first part of *Patriots*, the story from Roger Donlon had the greatest impact on me. It first grabbed my attention when I read about how he was the first American in the Vietnam War to receive the Medal of Honor.

Yet, I was continuously engaged throughout the entire story. I was able to picture his words very clearly and vividly. This detail was sketched into my mind, and gave me the ability to have strong emotions while reading. There were multiple times when I had disgust written all over my face and tears filling the corner of my eyes. I felt that this speaker was extremely passionate, frank and bloody honest. Although I'm sure there are many things that Donlon left out of each individual story, I believe him to be honorable and trustworthy. I feel that each soldier at war is unquestionably more creditable than anyone who was not in the war, and I don't believe the soldiers ever forget their time during active duty. Most veterans suffer from PTSD, and can never get rid of gruesome images, even if it was forty years ago.

only 2 sentences of analysis of crest. b. 7. 4?
And you conclude having PTSD ADDS to help. b. 7. 4?

Part 2

One specific part in Malcolm Browne's short story greatly disappointed me. After traveling through the jungle to Dam Doi, Browne explained that "the Viet Cong had taken twelve or thirteen of the people they'd executed and laid them out like the spokes of a wheel around a flagpole and on the flagpole they had raised the red, yellow, and blue Viet Cong flag" (p68). This disgusting atrocity happened each time after a massacre. No matter if you stand for war or criticize it, I do not believe that anyone should think this obscene reoccurrence is morally or politically acceptable. In addition, Browne talked about how that Americans weren't slaughtering prisoners (that he was aware of), but I'm sure it was happening in some cases; which makes me extremely disappointed in our troops.

How was there

to cite sources for your claim

In contrast, there was also a positive lesson in Malcolm Browne's story that really touched me. In celebration of Christmas Eve, drunk American troops fired mortars into the sky that seemed warlike. Surprisingly, the enemy began firing tracers out of the Viet Cong tunnel complex into the sky, rather than aiming at the Special Forces camp. Although we were at war, this rare instance showed that both sides shared a bond during this joyous holiday. This should always be remembered in history as an indication of hope for the future.

Part 1 - analysis issue - more time/words were required to clearly explain your meaning.

Part 2 - story choices were fine, but again some comments were made and conclusions reached that were not well supported

Part 1: Phan Xuan Sinhcccc

What caught my attention first and last was the sadness of his stories. The "accidental" shooting of the fishermen. The old couple who would not stay away from their land. The letters home of the enemy fighters. The apathy with which some of these drafted South Vietnam soldiers "fought", and the world they were going to have to live in when the war did end. The fact that the old couple would not leave their land was explained well. It was where their ancestors were and it was all they had, all they loved. In all of our reading so far it has been brought out that a lot of the Vietnamese soldiers did not fight well and that the countryside was inhabited by peasant farmers, so his story was believable and trustworthy to me. By 1971 the war had been going on for so long, his attitude of exhaustion and anger over the injustices he saw seem completely credible. Time does not change the things he saw or participated in, but maybe his objectivity has been re-focused by the passage of time and increased learning.

explain this. Is he "matching" his story to the history books?

Part 2, Paul Kattenburg

3 sentences of analysis

He was a Vietnam specialist from the 1950's, when most of us had never heard of Vietnam, so in 1963 why wasn't he listened to? Why did the National Security Council disregard his information? In fact, why was he excluded from all top levels of discussions of Vietnam policy? I found the governments' attitude disgusting. To send boys into battle in ever increasing numbers to save the reputation of the government or the people in it is wrong. To not listen to, or take into account reports from people who know more than you is irresponsible to say the least.

not analyzed well. I agree with your position, but to assume "the govt" will listen to "one person" is not reasonable.

Evelyn Colbert

"Dissent that contradicted the public optimism was ignored". That the Secretary of Defense could say he didn't know anything about Vietnam, and what was really happening was not understood was indeed "garbage" as she said. My, but that does sound familiar, so try as I may I am having trouble finding something positive out of these stories. I guess the potential for good exists where the worst has been lived through. The only hope or goodness I found was the story of Luyen Nguyen who became a student counselor.

I should have stayed with this story.

sarcasm about today? 2014?

Much more time, & many more words needed here.

60/100

327 words

less than half the minimum length ~~was~~ required

Part 1

ro (Ta Quang Thinh's story "They carried me the whole way back to the North" was shocking to me, a doctor who was leaning over a patient, in a sense protecting him, when they were bombed being the only survivor of six. Even though he was drastically injured he was still forced to stay in battle, unable to go home or contact his family, constantly in danger and more vulnerable than ever, it shows how powerful the war was, how unpredictable. Ta Quang Thinh's story is short, and therefore, I believe, more believable. When I think of stories, especially when the story being told is close and emotional to the teller, I remind myself that parts can be exaggerated. When your adrenaline is rushing your brain can play tricks on your mind. However, Ta Quang Thinh's story is short, descriptive, and to the point.

strange analysis have
no adrenaline being bombed?
only 1 of 6 to survive?

Part 2

huh?

gra The story I found most disappointing was Ngo Ving Long, "If they're making maps, they're preparing for war." As a child Long looked up to the Americans, only wanted to learn English, and despised the French. As he grew up he got involved with the war participating with the Americans, as he assisted them and vouched for them, he worked with them and started realizing what they were doing was wrong. We, his hero's; the Americans let him down. I was impressed with Long himself, how when he realized that the ones he'd believed in for so long were not as amazing as he initially thought, he continued to try and make things better. When he couldn't do it from the side of the American's he left and tried protesting from home (the States). Knowing how heart broken and disappointed he must have been and instead of giving up and sitting back while he knew what awful things were going on, he continued trying and fighting for what was right, it gives me hope for humanity.

you?

grammar problems - be sure to proofread or get some assistance.

Better part 2 (than part 1)
but much too brief.

59/100

308 words

less than half the minimum length

Part 1

how
s... The story that caught my attention was the Ta Quang Thinh story. I think this story caught my attention because the ending was sad and personal. His relationship with his wife seemed very changed by what happened to him and that was really upsetting. After reading the story I have a few questions about how reliable or accurate this story is. I feel that this might not be the most reliable source for information because of the possible lost information in translation, because Thinh was so injured he might not remember things as well and because of the lack of detail in the story. I feel that Thinh was emotional about the story because of what it cost him which can also change the way you remember things.

Part 2

on right track here,
but only 2 sentences?

The story I found disappointing was Evelyn Colbert. Evelyn Colbert's story was too short, lacked details and was hard to follow. There was no beginning or end to the story. I have no idea why I would need to know what she is telling me. I felt it came out of nowhere. It didn't help me understand the war and left me confused as to what it was talking about. I also felt that the speaker was trying to prove a point more than anything else.

The story I chose for the second half of part 2 is the Henry Prunier. I liked this story and felt it showed the potential for hope. Giap remembered Henry and what he had taught him so many years before. It shows that kindness is not forgotten even after many years. The Vietnamese needed our help badly and were helped and I don't think that is forgotten. If you can remember the things that are done for you by others there is always potential for hope.

Read the instructions.
This was NOT the type of disappointment

also a logic issue.
You chose the story but are not sure you believe it?

less than half the minimum length

1 sentence? "Paying the Price" (pgs. 20-21) I chose the story of Ta Quang Thinh mainly because of the imagery it provoked throughout his story the descriptions of what he went through were vivid for me I could see him at the convalescent home, as an older gentleman in his wheel chair as clearly as I could imagine him swinging in the bow of a hammock and the agonizing pain he must have been in. As far as accuracy of the account of his story, since Ta Quang Thinh was the only survivor I only have his version to go by but regardless I believe the story is as he remembers it. Thinh I believe has allowed time to erase a lot of the emotions of war and focus it in a way that is acceptable to him, being medical personnel he must have viewed war in a different manner.

click explain "The Emperor Has No Clothes" (pgs 79-81) interview with Robert McNamara was a disappointment to me due to the ignorance displayed by McNamara and the American policymakers and then the recanting portrayed in later memoirs and private conversations. The ability to send the country to war without learning anything about the enemy just tied it all up with a communist red bow on top and focused on that. Also the fear that consumed them of possible defeat, they were fighting the war not to win it just not to lose it.

The only good points I can think of, because it truly is disappointing to see America portrayed in this light, is that the policy makers who can't normally agree on what day of the week it is can willfully keep the entire country in the dark of how bad it was.

obviously there is LOT of backstory here that needs to be explained in a formal paper

Grammar issues throughout paper

on right track, but much too brief

Much more time and
DEFINITE more words
necessary to make a
good paper

Part 1

During the years 1961 to 1964, United States government initiated "Strategic Hamlet Program" which means the U.S. sent money, guns and special force advisers to South Vietnam. Roger Donlon was one of the special force advisers. (Stay in the different country and live in the different culture with few compatriots and deal with war situation, even he is a special force but it was very tough for him.) As a soldier, his mission is obeying orders. He trained three hundred Vietnamese to Strike Force. Whatever, there are about one hundred of them were turned out and sympathized with the enemy. At this situation Roger and Vietnamese Strike Force got heavy attack by the Viet Cong. His mind was inundated with fear, fluster and insecurity. He carried Pop who was senior noncommissioned officer and got pretty severely wounded and Roger tried to get him out of a mortar pit. Even Roger got wounded already but he didn't give up for saving companion. This story described an attack from Viet Cong to a Nam camp. There are many details that described by a U.S special force Roger Donlon who was involved and receive the Medal of Honor in it. He was very brave and skillful in the battle.

you emailed me.

Far below minimum required

but MUCH better than a zero.

2 issues.

(#1) Be sure to answer my questions. None were addressed (credibility) in PART 1

(#2) Grammar issues. Be sure to proof read your work and/or get help in this area.

see "gra" *