

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.

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

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

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

confusing imperialism
was
the
Cold
War.

accuracy