

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? 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