

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.