

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 Westmorland 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