

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