

Part 1

The story that had such a huge impact on me and caught my attention is one from Phan Xuan Sinh titled "All my ancestors are buried here." When I read this story, I felt so sad for the soldiers with Sinh and the civilians who were caught in this war. They had to kill innocent people and lose so much over nothing. I felt about ready to cry when I read the part about the old couple rebuilding their house and refusing to leave because it was all they had in life. It makes me feel so grateful for everything I have. I feel that this story was reliable and trustworthy. Being there in the war gives the more credibility because they have first hand experience and we just get to hear the stories that people tell of what happened. I feel like this story is objective and factual because things like that are things you can not forget your entire life, even if you wanted to. Killing innocent elderly people, men women and children is something you will not forget because it impacts you. You took away the life of someone who was just in the wrong place at the wrong time. Anyone with a heart would feel terrible about it.

Part 2

I have to say, the most disappointing story that I read was "My cock lost the fight" by Paul Hare. I really felt like it didn't really bring anything into the stories about the war. It just told of us of what the vietnamese people did in their spare times and what it was like to be an American in Vietnam with a war going on. I also felt disappointed that he ended his story with losing \$500 in a cockfight and being told he is doing good by "rubbing elbows" with the Vietnamese people. I feel that there was no need to send that man into Vietnam for no other reason than to just be there.

I was pleased to read about Paradise Island. I learned that even though there may be a war going on, you can still help the innocent ones. It made me feel happy that even though there was a war going on, there were people trying to help the innocent people caught in the middle. Reading about John Singlaub's story titled "We sent them all back with a generous gift package" made me feel like a little faith in humanity has been restored. Basically the people in Paradise Island, also known as Cu Lao Cham Island, kidnapped people who needed help. They treated people who were malnourished, sick, had diseases and other various things. Once they were healed and treated, they were sent home with a care package with things that they needed most. The packages were confiscated but eventually they were sent with two packages, one to hide and one to have confiscated, that way they were still able to receive the things they needed. I felt there was a little bit of good in the war and that made me feel happy.

Seth Heffron

Escobar

HST 195: History of the Vietnam War (Assignment 1)

April 13, 2014

Part 1

One story from our book, “Patriots” that caught my attention the most was the account of an American soldier by the name of George Watkins. He was drafted into the army on June 19, 1967 then was suddenly thrown into a war he knew very little about, as did many Americans at that time. All he knew was that he was to fight for the American government on a war against so-called Communism, which was a vague concept to him at the time. Before he knew it, he was thrown into an unknown country and given a gun in order to fulfill his duties. He recalls clearing out an entire valley of Vietnamese people, and witnessing them moving right back into their homes in the valley within two days. What impacted me was his reaction to the resilience of the Vietnamese people, and discovering their strong-willed nature and determination, regardless of the brutality they were facing in the war. At one point he even states, “I don’t hate them.” This statement, followed by, “...I don’t have much bitterness... I just wish that none of it had ever happened- for everybody’s sake.” Impacted me the most in realizing how convoluted the Vietnam War was, and the perceptions people carry of how each side felt in reality. I think this speaker has absolute credibility in his opinion, seeing that he was a participant of the war. Regardless of how much time has passed, his view is valid in that he is expressing how he felt about the war. I usually expect a lot of hatred and tension between America and Vietnam after what happened, but hearing stories like this show the complexity of the war, and the reluctance both sides had in being a part of it.

Part 2

I chose the first story in Part 2, which was about Henry Prunier training Viet Nimh soldiers and about Vo Nguyen Giap’s relation to Ho Chi Minh. Since this is the first time I’ve ever studied anything about the Vietnam War, it is a little confusing as to who is fighting for who, and all the political ties and dynamics between countries. I suppose it is disappointing that the American government spent so much time and money into training soldiers who would eventually turn on them in the end. It is also disappointing that we stepped into a conflict between countries that has been unraveling for centuries, and assume that we could bully them into submission. In general, it is disappointing hearing about so many people dying for what seems like such a pointless battle.

On a positive note, it is inspiring reading about the determination and dedication the Vietnamese had for their country, as well as the brave people who fought for ours. Although the basis for the war is completely ludicrous, the people who fought in it seemed noble and good-willed.

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 turn. 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.

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.

Part 1

Ta Quang Thinh's story "They carried me the whole way back to the North" was shocking to me, a doctor who was leaning over a patient, in a sense protecting him, when they were bombed being the only survivor of six. Even though he was drastically injured he was still forced to stay in battle, unable to go home or contact his family, constantly in danger and more vulnerable than ever, it shows how powerful the war was, how unpredictable. Ta Quang Thinh's story is short, and therefore, I believe, more believable. When I think of stories, especially when the story being told is close and emotional to the teller, I remind myself that parts can be exaggerated. When your adrenaline is rushing your brain can play tricks on your mind. However, Ta Quang Thinh's story is short, descriptive, and to the point.

Part 2

The story I found most disappointing was Ngo Ving Long, "If they're making maps, they're preparing for war." As a child Long looked up to the American's, only wanted to learn English, and despised the French. As he grew up he got involved with the war participating with the Americans, as he assisted them and vouched for them, he worked with them and started realizing what they were doing was wrong. We, his hero's; the Americans let him down. I was impressed with Long himself, how when he realized that the ones he'd believed in for so long were not as amazing as he initially thought, he continued to try and make things better. When he couldn't do it from the side of the American's he left and tried protesting from home (the States). Knowing how heart broken and disappointed he must have been and instead of giving up and sitting back while he knew what awful things were going on, he continued trying and fighting for what was right, it gives me hope for humanity.

Zoë Valentine

Joe Escobar

HST 195

13 April 2014

Assignment 1

The story that had the greatest impact on me from part one of Appy's book *Patriots*, was the account of George Watkins. He really gave the reader an intimate account of how bad things were for the United States infantrymen during the Vietnam War. It was shocking that even though Watkins was trained as a combat engineer, they merely threw him on the front lines as soon as he got there. Another striking thing about Watkins was his compassion, or at least respect he had for the Vietnamese people. "They's some of the most determined people I've ever run into. I don't hate them. They did what they had to do. It's the politicians that put everybody in that place." (Appy 23) Even after Watkins had stepped on the land mine which cost him both his legs and eyesight, he still didn't bear a great prejudice towards the Vietnamese people as a whole. This really breaks the stereotype some people have of all American GIs hating and showing cruelty towards the Vietnamese. Even though there were cases like that, stories like Watkins' are very important because it breaks that stereotype.

As for the credibility of the speakers in the stories read so far, they all probably suffer from a certain amount of subjectivity – everybody perceives experiences differently, whether because of ideas, political beliefs, moral code, station in life, et cetera. However, such subjectivity doesn't necessarily negate the truth of the stories or what they say of their experiences. Most of what these people say they experienced is true, but it is definitely warped in some stories, especially because of political belief systems.

This leads me to one of the stories in which I found disappointment. In Malcolm Browne's account in Part Two, I was particularly disappointed by what he said about John Wayne. While I have always been a fan of John Wayne, I am not inclined to think that he was a saint. It is entirely likely he had his drunk moments, but it was really disappointing to think that he got in a shouting match with this person Browne. It seems possible that a political slant of Browne's could have made him decide to embellish his interactions with Wayne. However, thinking from Browne's point of view, it's easy to see how frustrating his own position might be; being someone who can see and understand all the problems with the Vietnam war, and nobody wants to listen to what you have to say, simply because you ally yourself with certain political parties. The ineptness of the U.S. officials concerning Vietnam was really shocking. It seems like none of them even bothered to get to know anything about Vietnam or its people. It was this that was disappointing in Chester Cooper's account, where he said that the people on Kennedy's team "... couldn't [even] find Vietnam on an outline map of Asia.'" (Appy 85) It's rather bothersome to think that we were fighting a war in a country about which we knew nothing.

I did take away some positive lessons from these stories, however. A lot of the stories speak almost like it's impossible for our Western culture and that of Asia's to find connections with each other and get along. But, at the end of Richard Olsen's story, it was really touching to see that he was saved by a Vietnamese man from a riptide. "I thought, how absurd. I survived the war and here I am getting drowned as a tourist! ... All of a sudden a ninety-pound man came up to my face like a dart. We were face to face. The first thing I thought was Viet Cong! Here he was, rescuing me, eyeball to eyeball. We looked into each other's soul and he was

brilliant.” (Appy 64) A lot of the U.S. officials seemed to treat the Vietnamese almost like aliens – our cultures are so foreign from one another’s. But in reality, we are all human. Another surprising story was the account of Nikita Krushchev’s son Sergei, particularly what he said about how the Russian people perceived the Cold War. “‘The Russian people always wanted improved relations with the United States. They never believed that the American government was against them.’” (Appy 88) Being someone who did not grow up in the right generation, I do not understand how frightening the idea of Communism was for people in this time. To someone like myself, it seems almost ridiculous the amount of fear-mongering the U.S. had about Communism. As Krushchev said, “‘I think ordinary Americans were far more affected by Cold War propaganda, much more hostile to Russians, and much more fearful.’” (Appy 88) It tends to make one wonder how things would’ve gone if the governments of all countries had been more open to discussion, and less swayed by paranoid thinking. Overcoming prejudices has a lot to do with it, and maybe a lot of the failings in Vietnam were because we couldn’t overcome those prejudices.

Appy, Christian G. *Patriots: The Vietnam War Remembered from All Sides*. London: Penguin, 2003. Print.

Assignment 1

P20—PAYING THE PRICE—they carried me the whole way back to the North

This story just caught my attention because the author used a real example to tell people how the army thought about war in the short story. As the author described, he was the only survivor in the bomb hit from a B-52, and he survived because he was closer to the surface of ruins of the hospital and easier to breath and be dig out by aid workers than others. In that case, the author hates war from his bottom of heart. He doesn't like the war, and he doesn't think that anyone liked the war. This is the truth, and I do believe him. Sometimes people have ambition to attack and aggress others for some benefits, like lands, natural resources and maybe defense. Then those aggressors will use some other reasons to make the purpose of war right to avoid the name of aggression. In this story, the author knows that this was a war with its purpose and he still took part in it, and he had seen the sad result of war. Indeed, wars are cruel and absurd. The bomb hit in the story is just an epitome of all the wars in history, WWI, WWII, civil war, and so on. All the wars killed many people who could not really enjoy the benefits after the end of the war. The top commander will distribute the spoils of the war, and soldiers just paying their bloods and lives for their commanders. The most important part in the story is that the author really didn't like to be separated from his family, he could not keep in touch with his family because they were always moving during the war. The story is objective and factual. Typically, people who experienced war would not like the war and would not want to remember and memorize all the happenings and events during the war. It was same happened on the author, he said he had memories but he didn't want to remember them. This is not subjective, and this is not that author had too much things forgotten, it's just too merciless to have those people to tell the black stories from their bottom of hearts.

P84—THE EMPEROR HAS NO CLOTHES—boy, you speak just like an American.

This story makes me feel disappointed is because all the story just talk about how terribly U.S. army prepared for the war. Firstly, they don't know about Vietnam. They don't know where Vietnam is, and even though someone shows the Asia map to the commander of U.S. Army, they will not recognize where Vietnam is and what the shape of Vietnam is. Probably they think Vietnam is weak and easy to beat. Secondly, their staff were stolen. It is important to have strong back support in the war, but U.S. Army did terribly on this one, they have two third staff got stolen, which are for South Vietnam army. Thirdly, U.S. had a terrible President—Johnson, who made people disappointed. He canceled all the reservation of the hotel for the meeting with Saigon government, which is an impulsive decision.

However, even this story shows lots of negative things, it also shows positive things. For example, U.S. Army are really strong. They have very advanced equipment, such as battleships, cruisers, and nuclear-powered submariners. Those are the equipment which will brings the victory to United States. Indeed, those strong equipment and well trained soldiers are showing a big chance to win the war, but the ego of United States government and army force is the strong weapon to beat themselves. Perhaps this kind of strong force brings both confidence and ego, unfortunately, U.S. Army had chosen ego and they paid a lot for their ego during the war.

Part 1

The story that caught my attention was the Ta Quang Thinh story. I think this story caught my attention because the ending was sad and personal. His relationship with his wife seemed very changed by what happened to him and that was really upsetting. After reading the story I have a few questions about how reliable or accurate this story is. I feel that this might not be the most reliable source for information because of the possible lost information in translation, because Thinh was so injured he might not remember things as well and because of the lack of detail in the story. I feel that Thinh was emotional about the story because of what it cost him which can also change the way you remember things.

Part 2

The story I found disappointing was Evelyn Colbert. Evelyn Colbert's story was too short, lacked details and was hard to follow. There was no beginning or end to the story. I have no idea why I would need to know what she is telling me. I felt it came out of nowhere. It didn't help me understand the war and left me confused as to what it was talking about. I also felt that the speaker was trying to prove a point more than anything else.

The story I chose for the second half of part 2 is the Henry Prunier. I liked this story and felt it showed the potential for hope. Giap remembered Henry and what he had taught him so many years before. It shows that kindness is not forgotten even after many years. The Vietnamese needed our help badly and were helped and I don't think that is forgotten. If you can remember the things that are done for you by others there is always potential for hope.

The story that had the greatest impact on me the interview with Roger Donlon. It had the greatest impact on me because Donlon talked about the battle that he was awarded the Medal of Honor for. Donlon talks about one of the interpreters, George Tuan, and describes Tuan's death very vividly saying, "he just kept running on stumps" after his legs got blown off. This story is the most reliable and believable in this section because Donlon probably told this story many times since people asked how he got his Medal of Honor. This gives him more credibility since he would have told the story many times and not changed the facts. This story seems more factual since Donlon vividly remembers so much of the battle it seems. It is something that he would never be able to forget especially after being honored for his valiant bravery and action during the battle.

Appy's interview with Sergei Khrushchev was disappointing since Sergei focused more on the relationship between the US and Russia during the war and not on the war itself. Sergei's father, Nikita, probably didn't talk much politics with his son and didn't voice his opinion of the war to his son. Sergei never even gave his opinion on the war since he was sure if the Vietnamese "stood with the Soviet Union or China." Appy's interview with Malcolm Browne was also disappointing since he only described burning of the monk and not the controversy that his picture stirred when it was the front page of every newspaper the next day. The interview never talks about Browne's emotions during the burning of the monk or his reaction when his picture of the monk starts nationwide protests back in the US.

Appy's interview with Ngo Vinh Long showed compassion and goodness when Long realized what he was actually doing for the military mapping teams in Vietnam. When Long quit in 1962 he began protesting US intervention and the Saigon government. I don't understand why other Vietnamese people would think that would make him a Communist just because he didn't support the government or the US intervention. Appy's interview with Richard Olsen, Olsen admits that the US rules of engagement were sometimes broken when he was flying. This was confirmed in Appy's interview with Malcolm Browne when Browne was at a military air force base in Bien Hoa and saw a T-28 take off with a full rack of bombs, then return later with any bombs. Browne even noticed that one of the pilots was American. Even though this was not considered "good," Olsen told the truth about what really did happen in Vietnam.

“Paying the Price” (pgs. 20-21) I chose the story of Ta Quang Thinh mainly because of the imagery it provoked throughout his story the descriptions of what he went through were vivid for me I could see him at the convalescent home, as an older gentleman in his wheel chair as clearly as I could imagine him swinging in the bow of a hammock and the agonizing pain he must have been in. As far as accuracy of the account of his story, since Ta Quang Thinh was the only survivor I only have his version to go by but regardless I believe the story is as he remembers it. Thinh I believe has allowed time to erase a lot of the emotions of war and focus it in a way that is acceptable to him, being medical personnel he must have viewed war in a different manner.

“The Emperor Has No Clothes” (pgs 79-81) interview with Robert McNamara was a disappointment to me due to the ignorance displayed by McNamara and the American policymakers and then the recanting portrayed in later memoirs and private conversations. The ability to send the country to war without learning anything about the enemy just tied it all up with a communist red bow on top and focused on that. Also the fear that consumed them of possible defeat, they were fighting the war not to win it just not to lose it.

The only good points I can think of, because it truly is disappointing to see America portrayed in this light, is that the policy makers who can't normally agree on what day of the week it is can willfully keep the entire country in the dark of how bad it was.

Assignment 1

By the time Roger Donlan received his battle injuries and ultimately the medal of honor for his actions, the western cause in Vietnam had been doomed to fail for almost 9 years. The toleration of the recolonization of Vietnam by the allied forces after World War Two paved the way for a bloody conflict that no western power could have anticipated. Donlan's account sheds a stark light on the sheer ignorance to the threat at hand as well as the sheer unpreparedness of the United States when it finally dove into the conflict. This isn't to say they had not dipped a toe or two before that, the millions in military aid to France as well as the small amount of special forces operating in-country at the time (operating out of small bases just as Donlan did). The vivid descriptions of the combat, such as a man running on stumps after his legs were removed by an artillery shell, strike deep. One must note however an underlying theme throughout it. They *were*n't ready. One artillery shell takes out all communication, no idea that one-third of their force are friendly to the enemy, the previous day's hostile takeover of a similar base wasn't reported and the hanger housing the ground attack planes is locked due to the 4th of July. It seems to be a laundry list of errors that weren't addressed perhaps due to the light nature in which the US took the fight they were slowly wedging themselves into. One would have a hard time trying to discredit the information conveyed in his interview. A brutally honest description of the situation is easily gleanable from this account. Having taken part in the battle itself Donlan shows a credibility few talking about the war can convey. He has nothing to protect by altering the story, in fact it almost feels as if he *wants* the reader to know both sides of the story no matter the outcome. Donlan's account mirrors so many that came before and after. Dien Bien Phu is a perfect example, the French and their underinflated view of the opposition. Believing there was no way to get artillery up the surrounding mountains, or enough men to counter the twelve thousand French troops dropped there, the French were totally unprepared for the crushing defeat that followed. Donlan's vivid account of the five-hour battle, and his humbleness regarding his deeds done and awards earned, make his story fascinating yet somber.

Part 2

People seem to forget that the story of the conflict ranges so much further than the United States' involvement, and yet the U.S. was there at the beginning; dropping Henry Prunier into Vietnam to meet with "Mr. Ho". The two accounts, one from Prunier and the other from Vo Nguyen Giap, tell of a disappointing missed opportunity for peace and a moderately clear reason why the U.S. had no chance at victory. Understandably the U.S. used "Uncle Ho" and his

fighters to clear the japanese from the territory during world war two. What is hard to understand is the complete rejection of any pleas for help from the Viet Minh before recolonization as well as during. They had nowhere else to turn, so why would they not accept help from red china and russia? The second story reveals that. Giap puts it quite honestly "We won the war because we would rather die than live in slavery". When the U.S. deployed troops, they were fighting a losing battle of attrition against an entire people who had nowhere to go but to defend their homes. Westmoreland's strategy of search and destroy didn't help either but thats an entirely other can of worms.

While the pages turned, it is very hard to find any hope, or compassion within them. Most comprise of confusion on why they are fighting or tales of hardships that are near unimaginable. Ngo Vinh Long recalls a story that has some glimmers of hope, even though they are crowded by the fog of war. One of the few in this book so far where an effort is made to distinguish between a country's government and its people. Long recalls her father explaining that the american people would not be replacing the french, it would be the american government and its soldiers. There is wisdom and a degree of understanding in that statement that seems to lack so far through these accounts of the war.

Eryne Grant HST 195 Joe Escobar 12 April 2014 Assignment 1 Part One The story that had the greatest effect on me in the book "Patriots" was the account of Roger Donlon. I found this story to be emotionally attached to me because of the way he humbly wrote about his time in Vietnam, his injuries, and his fellow soldiers. His quote at the beginning of the story read, "We were just babes in arms in every way." This really hit an emotional string with me because my own father, who passed away in May of 2013, was only 19 when he was drafted into Vietnam, and this is how I pictured him. I believed for Donlon to be very reliable and believable in regards to his personal story of the war. I sensed a type of serenity and truthfulness through his account. He never used vulgar language, kept his stories to the point, and talked about everyone in a respectful manner. It takes a lot of courage to talk about your enemies in a respectful way, and I thought that by his doing so that he showed he was a great man. Also, as being the first man to receive the Medal of Honor in the war, I was reminded that he had plenty of courage to go around. I think his reliability gave him more credibility, but to a certain point. Yes, he did receive the Medal of Honor and was a respectable man, but he also may have upset or embarrassed about the situation. He may have forgotten a few details here and there, but I believe that his overall story was to the point and true. I never once doubted the authenticity of his overall story while reading it. Lastly, I was reminded of a quote in Herring's text that reminded me of this story. Kennedy said, "It is our offspring, we cannot abandon it, we cannot ignore its needs." I admit to not knowing much about politics or the Vietnam War, but this quote seemed to pinpoint the feelings I thought while reading this story. This quote was obviously related to the entire war in Vietnam and the relations in general, but I thought it could be fairly compared to the soldiers lives and dedication to the war as well. In a way, it was their offspring as well. They may not have wanted to fight it or be involved, but they could not abandon it or ignore its needs. They were all in once on foreign soil, and Donlon proved this. The courage and strength that he found was all for the greater good. Part Two I was highly disappointed in the story of General Baker Jr. From his quick introduction of his job title at Ford Motor Company to when he got arrested, I didn't like his tone and lack of personal details. Yes, it was probably hard for him to write about the situation, but it was really hard for me to try to connect with his words on a personal level. I wasn't necessarily disappointed with the events in his story, but rather the quickness in which they were told. It seemed like once he hit a major event in his Vietnam story, he was talking about the next one. I definitely felt this way about his time in Cuba. It would have been nice to know a little bit more about why he said that "I would have never have been the same person without these two and a half months in Cuba". I felt like he left the reader hanging. Despite these disappointing factors, I was still impressed by his lack of fear of going to jail. I would be scared no matter what to go to jail, but he seemed to not care at all. He knew what he believed in and stuck to that. To go against the draft you have to be extremely determined and have plenty of courage. The line "I had my toothbrush in my pocket because I thought I was going to jail" proved to me that he was ready to receive whatever punishment the government had in store for him. His story was a reminder that you need to stick up for what you personally want and believe in.

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.

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?

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.

ASSIGNMENT 1

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. 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 then 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 commandoes 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

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.

Assignment 1

Jordan Derrick

History of the Vietnam War

Joe Escabor

4-10-2014

PART ONE:

In the readings George Watkins stands out more than the other contributors of the war, because he tells his part of the war without emotion where a lot of emotion could be applied. Which, allows the reader to think of his story open mindedly and not from the view point of political party. Watkins began his story from the beginning when he knew he would be drafted, but honestly didn't know why he was going to war or what this war was about. He was severally injured, didn't know why exactly he was fighting, but he still went to serve his country. While serving the United States he stepped on a pressure-detonated mine and lost both his legs and eyes. His story is trustworthy, because he tells us the parts of the story everyone might not want to hear, like his eyes being hurt and looking like scrambled eggs. If he wanted his story to be more polished and not as true he would have left out significant parts like the eyes, not knowing the cause of the war, and not really knowing how to work the M-60 machine gun. His wounds will always be carried with him and the names of his fallen brothers will forever be etched on the wall, no amount of time can makes those memories fade.

PART TWO:

Ngo Vinh Long lived a heroic life standing up for what he believed in, but was forced out of his country due to being chased by his enemy. His father was beaten to the point of near death, for what he believed in, and by people who intruded his country. Fortunately the love for his son and country kept him alive, his son mentioned that he refused to die. Long was highly intelligent and learned Chinese and French. His country admired him for graduating when only about five percent of the people graduated high school and invited him to public events, and rewarded him with cola. Long traveled Vietnam and had to witness the devastation happening in the country. People were starving, their crops weren't burnt, and forced to move from their homes. Long was disgusted by this and stopped his work to help the people. He fixed them food for three weeks until they got somewhat better. That's when he begun to write to the U.S. embassy and Saigon government, but didn't receive any help. That is so sad that the United States couldn't help the people, and their excuse was that's how they will defeat the communist people.

Long's story is believable and without exaggeration, because he starts out his story with all this love of the United States and kept that faith in them even when his father warned him of their intentions in Vietnam. It was when he saw that the United States was in the war for politics and not to truly help the Vietnam get back on their feet he lost hope. When he saw the heads of his people being chopped off by the enemy, because they thought the people of Vietnam were communist, the reader can almost feel the pain he felt by witnessing the harm of his people. In the end of Long's reflection on his past the readers begin to feel proud of Long for making his voice heard. Perhaps, even got a smile on their faces when Long noted "I made myself a nuisance to the government." When Long finally got out of his country he didn't stop protesting and even warned the people that if the United States invaded Vietnam there would be a long war. The United States probably

wished that they listened to his cries for help.

Malcom Browne, a strong man who has seen more than anyone wants to see. His story is especially sad, because what he saw and interpreted couldn't always be posted in his work due to the politics of the war. He had to write about the Dam Doi, and they were often attacked and their villages were burnt down and the people were also attacked just so the enemy could practice. He then witnessed twelve or thirteen of the people they killed and had put them around a flag pole with flag flown by the Viet Cong. Being a reporter is hard, because he had to write the story the American's wanted to hear and when he got out of line he would get a call telling him he had to rewrite his story. The part that makes the reader the most sick is an incident in 1963 when a Buddhist went on an anti-war protest. Browne knew that there were rumors going around about a ritual suicide, but didn't think that it would happen like this. He saw a bunch of monks and nuns gathering around and before he knew it there was chanting and then an old monk came out had gasoline poured over him and lite himself one fire. His story is reliable due to the fact the stuff has seen cannot be made up. While reading his story the reader automatically feels sick to their stomach and heartache for the people. Not to mention, the next story in the book was his wife Le Lieu Browne and she kept his stories in line too.

I have read the article "Ta Quang Thinh" It looks like he is a doctor of North Viet army and he was the only survivor from one air attack, then he stay in South for a long time, after he has express he is sick of war. I choose to report this article not only because I don't like war neither, but also because the complex status of this character and I believe that a man who has survive from slain can more deeply understand the cruel of war. He is a doctor and he save people's life from death so he knows how rare the life is, he is an army so he have been taught by patriotism education, he was a prisoner, a husband and now he is a disabled. These different status makes him take different way to think about what the war means. And after that all he just talk about how worse the war is instead of to attack the old enemy. I think he can only see the nature of war, if he can talk about history objectively, this also why I choose to believe him and why his speak is reliable. Otherwise, he has nearly face death, disabled by an air raid, and he has been a prisoner separate from his family. I think this kind of experience makes him more trustable, especially he talked about his wife at the last, that makes me feel true, it is not like the story our parents told to teach us what is the right things to do, it makes people feel more reality and cruelty, but we know that what real life looks like. And I think he talk about the war objectively, as I said he did not trying to attack the enemy group in the interview or eulogize their own group neither just stay on how war hurt him and how war changed his life, looks he has experience too much suffer but fortunately he can keep his voice objectively. This war has passed a long time, people might be forget it but I don't think the people who has experience or surviving in the war can forget that, the memory of battle will be the nightmare around them day after day after month after years until the end of their life. War makes too much pain for people.

For the part 2 I choose article "Paul Kattenburg" This story looks are talking about upper-level administer did not truly understand what happened in Vietnam and they just trying thinking about it automatic or use the old historical experiences, that makes me feel disappointment, because I think that is a kind of irresponsible, commander need to understand what happened in the place of battleground then they can make the right diction for their army who are tasting the bullet. And some of them are too much care about honor to notice what they have cast. I think this kind of thing not only happened in Vietnam War but also on the others. Some of opportunist will trying to use this chance getting benefit, so the original war was full of political, power and business.

I feel disappointment about this story he told, because I feels the ugly of politic, but fortunately, there still someone can calmly think about this thing without honor or other staff. This is important to know because if no man in one country can think calmly about war, this country will going to a wrong side. For example the old Japanese militarism is one what I'm talking about, this out of mind thinking not only hurt on the people whom you flight with but also hurt the people you trying to protect. So someone can keep calm shows there still people can lead our world being better.

Justyn Dockery
Instructor: Joe Escobar
HST 195
12 April 2014

Part 1:

In the first part of the book *Patriots*, written by Christian Appy, one particular story resonates with me much stronger than any other story in this section. The first story, the story told from Bernard Trainor, stands out to me for three main reasons. In the second paragraph on page four I found myself full of questions when Appy penned:

We viewed Communism as a monolithic dragon which controlled all of the Eurasian land mass. (...) We were on a holy crusade to stop the spread of godless Communism and to give the budding democracy in South Vietnam an opportunity to take root.

This Particular excerpt brings several pieces of information regarding the history of the United States to the forefront of my mind. I recalled learning about the colonists in the United States and our country's westward expansion being taught as the idea of Manifest Destiny. Through my experience learning about Manifest Destiny, I found that the United States seemed to collectively justify their actions and slaughter of the Native American population, because Manifest Destiny was saying that God himself desired the Anglos to inhabit and control the land of the United States. So when Appy writes about Bernard Trainor's understanding of the situation in Vietnam as a holy crusade to stop the spread of godless Communism, I find myself wanting to read the propaganda from this era that brought people to believe that the violence and the death of soldiers and civilians alike was in fact a holy event.

Furthermore, and from the same previously quoted excerpt, I find several more disturbances or questions arising from the two words godless Communism. The United States seems to continually push propaganda onto the nation's civilians and military personnel collectively portraying any group of people that do not adhere to the expectations and desires of the United States ruling elite as godless people. Again returning to Manifest Destiny, the United States regularly portrayed the Native American population as godless savages to gain the support of the Anglo population in the United States attempt to conquer the country.

I found the story of Bernard Trainor to re-cement my preconceived understandings and beliefs regarding why the United States goes to war and how war becomes justified. I have a major problem with God and or religion being used as a qualitative reason for anyone to take the life of another person. Continually, and in conjunction with God and religion, I also have a problem with a group of people, in this case the U.S. Government, invading another country in an attempt to convert the people of the invaded country into a population of people that abide and live by the American standards, specifically governmental democracy. I cannot speak for you the reader or anyone else in the world, but I do not see how the U.S. has the right to forcefully attempt to tell any other group of people how to live and behave. So in conclusion as to why this particular story resonates with me the strongest, I found this story to enrage my intellectual being and increase my desire for the United States to mind her own business, so this story is likely to continually resonate in my mind for an immeasurable amount of time.

However, when coming to my conclusion regarding why this story resonates with me so strongly, the questions related to source credibility become paramount. Personally, I find a few reasons why this particular source is credible. First, and likely the most obvious reason for believe this source to be credible, Bernard Trainor was a general in the United States Marine Corps commanding troops in Vietnam during the war, so Bernard Trainor had to have been an upstanding, trustworthy, and responsible soldier for the Marine Corps to give him the rank of General, and Trainor was actually an on the ground eye witness to the struggles in Vietnam during the war.

Secondly, I believe the story Bernard Trainor shares is credible, because Trainor was also an instructor at the Command and Staff College. Although not everything an instructor says is completely factual and 100% accurate, being an instructor requires a person to be professional, knowledgeable, and trustworthy in the eyes of the institution that employs them. Furthermore, Trainor speaks of the Westmoreland tactics that are being used in Vietnam in a manner that reads as factual instead of entertaining when Appy pens, "You could see the disillusionment and unhappiness that officers returning from Vietnam had toward Westmoreland's strategy of search-

and-destroy,” in the fifth paragraph of page five.

Although I ultimately believe that Trainor’s story is a credible one, there is one part of his shared experience in Vietnam that arouses some questions regarding the degree of credibility I can give this story. My question of Trainor’s credibility comes from his story about how two marines found an entrance to a cave in the Hue-Danang-Chu-Lai area when Appy wrote:

A day or two later, two snuffies [marine infantrymen], out of sight of their maters and bored to death with senseless exercise, decided to entertain themselves with a Frisbee. They tossed it back and forth until it went over one kid’s head and landed in a clump of bushes. When he went to retrieve it, lo and behold he spotted a hole. He enlarged it with his K-bar and sure enough it opened into a tunnel. It turned out to be one of the many entrances to a cave that was the Quang Da Special Zone headquarters for the Hue-Danang-Chu-Lai area. (Appy 6)

The possibility of two marines being bored and wanting to throw a Frisbee for entertainment is believable in and of itself. However, believing that the Marines found a cave entrance that later resulted in a large gain of intelligence information regarding covert agents from a poorly thrown Frisbee is hard for me to believe. But overall, and as I stated previously, I believe Trainor’s story is credible, but one must decide for him or herself whether or not they wish to believe anything written in Trainor’s story.

Part 2:

In the second part of the book Patriots, written by Christian Appy, one story was extremely disappointing for me to read. Malcolm Browne’s story, “You could smell the burning flesh,” was extremely difficult and disappointing to read, because Browne talks about a horrific event that he witnessed, and I became overwhelmed with feelings of grievance when Browne described the Buddhist monk Thich Quang Duc burning himself in protest against the anti-Buddhist policies of the South Vietnam catholic president.

Later on in Browne’s story I again found myself being highly disturbed, specifically when Browne describes one of the common tortures during the Vietnam War known as the “ding-a-ling” torture. The “Ding-a-ling” torture was common. It was done with a hand-cranked generator used to produce electricity for radios. The interrogator hooked electrodes to the genitals of prisoners and turned the crank, causing agonizing pain. (Appy 66)

The idea of someone hooking a person up to an electric generator by electrodes connected to their genitals is disturbing and appalling. I cannot imagine being either the interrogator or the person in question when this torture tactic is being used, and being utterly disturbed by the burning monk and the “ding-a-ling” torture method is why Browne’s story was the most disappointing story for me to read.

Unlike Browne’s story, however, I did find a story in the second part of this book that showed me some signs of hope in humanity or at a minimum some goodness in the people involved in the Vietnam War. Daniel Redmond’s story, “The doctor who won the war in Indochina,” is one story that gave me some good vibes, although limited. When Appy writes, “Occasionally he’d suggest we go up to a field hospital and visit the French survivors of Dien Bien Phu. He was genuinely concerned about these people,” I find my first real feeling of anything or anyone being something or someone positive during a time of atrocities. (Appy 49) To me, knowing that during a time of war someone was genuinely concerned about anyone involved in conflict provides me with a sense of faith in humanity, because caring about the wellbeing of ones fellow man plays a paramount role in a society being good, hole-some, and peaceful.

Kailey Regoli
Professor Joe Escobar
History 195

Assignment 1

Part 1

In the first part of *Patriots*, the story from Roger Donlon had the greatest impact on me. It first grabbed my attention when I read about how he was the first American in the Vietnam War to receive the Medal of Honor. Yet, I was continuously engaged throughout the entire story. I was able to picture his words very clearly and vividly. This detail was sketched into my mind, and gave me the ability to have strong emotions while reading. There were multiple times when I had disgust written all over my face and tears filling the corner of my eyes. I felt that this speaker was extremely passionate, frank and bloody honest. Although I'm sure there are many things that Donlon left out of each individual story, I believe him to be honorable and trustworthy. I feel that each soldier at war is unquestionably more creditable than anyone who was not in the war, and I don't believe the soldiers ever forget their time during active duty. Most veterans suffer from PTSD, and can never get rid of gruesome images, even if it was forty years ago.

Part 2

One specific part in Malcolm Browne's short story greatly disappointed me. After traveling through the jungle to Dam Doi, Browne explained that "the Viet Cong had taken twelve or thirteen of the people they'd executed and laid them out like the spokes of a wheel around a flagpole and on the flagpole they had raised the red, yellow, and blue Viet Cong flag" (p68). This disgusting atrocity happened each time after a massacre. No matter if you stand for war or criticize it, I do not believe that anyone should think this obscene reoccurrence is morally or politically acceptable. In addition, Browne talked about how that Americans weren't slaughtering prisoners (that he was aware of), but I'm sure it was happening in some cases; which makes me extremely disappointed in our troops.

In contrast, there was also a positive lesson in Malcolm Browne's story that really touched me. In celebration of Christmas Eve, drunk American troops fired mortars into the sky that seemed warlike. Surprisingly, the enemy began firing tracers out of the Viet Cong tunnel complex into the sky, rather than aiming at the Special Forces camp. Although we were at war, this rare instance showed that both sides shared a bond during this joyous holiday. This should always be remembered in history as an indication of hope for the future.

Part 1: Phan Xuan Sinhcccc

What caught my attention first and last was the sadness of his stories. The “accidental” shooting of the fishermen. The old couple who would not stay away from their land. The letters home of the enemy fighters. The apathy with which some of these drafted South Vietnam soldiers “fought”, and the world they were going to have to live in when the war did end. The fact that the old couple would not leave their land was explained well. It was where their ancestors were and it was all they had, all they loved. In all of our reading so far it has been brought out that a lot of the Vietnamese soldiers did not fight well and that the countryside was inhabited by peasant farmers, so his story was believable and trustworthy to me. By 1971 the war had been going on for so long, his attitude of exhaustion and anger over the injustices he saw seem completely credible. Time does not change the things he saw or participated in, but maybe his objectivity has been re-focused by the passage of time and increased learning.

Part 2, Paul Kattenburg

He was a Vietnam specialist from the 1950's, when most of us had never heard of Vietnam, so in 1963 why wasn't he listened to. Why did the National Security Council disregard his information. In fact, why was he excluded from all top levels of discussions of Vietnam policy. I found the governments' attitude disgusting. To send boys into battle in ever increasing numbers to save the reputation of the government or the people in it is wrong. To not listen to, or take into account reports from people who know more than you is irresponsible to say the least.

Evelyn Colbert

“Dissent that contradicted the public optimism was ignored”. That the Secretary of Defense could say he didn't know anything about Vietnam, and what was really happening was not understood was indeed “garbage” as she said. My, but that does sound familiar, so try as I may I am having trouble finding something positive out of these stories. I guess the potential for good exists where the worst has been lived through. The only hope or goodness I found was the story of Luyen Nguyen who became a student counselor.

Assignment 1

Part 1

There were many stories in part one of the Appy book that caught my attention. Some in different ways than others. The one that had the greatest impact on me was that of Phan Xuan Sinh. It would be such a heart wrenching experience to be in a war in general. Always needing to be on your toes, Not knowing when you could be attacked or shot at. So when Phan told his story about ambushing near the beach south of Danang it really caught my attention. Just imagining being there at one or two in the morning hardly being able to see really opened my eyes. The fact that they started firing before they could really even see who or what they were firing at. How the boats got closer and saw what they thought looked like "many rifles silhouetted against the sky" and a full boat load of Viet Cong. I couldn't imagine the feeling of what it would have been like to open fire on the boats only to realize there wasn't any return fire coming back to them. Then to find out they had accidentally opened fire on a large group of fisherman would be heartbreaking. It really made me think about how in warfare it's better to be safe than sorry. The fact that you never know who it really could be coming at you in the boat. After this experience it seems you could think twice in this situation if it happened again. If you do that and it really is soldiers next time then you open yourself up to getting hurt next time. It's just an experience that is hard to imagine without seeing it first hand. I tend to think this speaker is a reliable source from the way the story was told. He seemed to remember many exact details. Like the things they thought were guns turned out to be fishing poles. You never know exactly what happened when you get a single persons point of view, after all they are speaking on what they saw through their eyes. They couldn't have possibly seen everything. Yet, I feel that Phan had a good feeling of what happened that night and did a great job of re telling this to us as the audience.

Part 2

In regards to a story I found disappointing, There really hasn't been one that I would have to call disappointing. I have enjoyed getting to read these and really see from first person accounts what it may have been like to be a part of this conflict. If there was one that wasn't my favorite it would be the story of Henry Prunier about the "Deer Team". It was something that just seemed like a little extra information. I was kind of disappointed in the way he thought the Vietnamese were viewed as a whole by us. As being "ragtag". It made me think that we had severely underestimated the strength of the Vietnamese. That we thought they were a ragtag people and could easily be walked over without a fight. He told us that they were actually a very smart group of people. Considering the fact he said many of them could put together an M1 from pieces blindfolded after only doing it once. So like I said, I wasn't disappointed with the story. More disappointed in the way we were at the start of this conflict. The point of view and underestimation of a Nation. I feel if we had given them more credit originally that the war may have been a different story.

It can be a hard thing to find a positive aspect of such a terrible, bloody war. It was hard for me to pick one of the individual stories that we have read so far and try to make it into something "good". As many of these stories are presented in a negative light, or at least have negative influences on us. I think part of it in the back of my mind, As an American it's just hard to find something positive out of the Vietnam conflict. The one thing that I keep coming back to in regards to positivity has come out of more than one of the stories, And is something that is a part of all wars. The idea of brotherhood, We see this a lot. The fact that these guys were in such a horrible thing, together experiencing it at the same time. The relationships that are built through an experience like this are never going to go away. To know that you weren't the only one who had to deal with this. That is how I find positivity in such a horrible event. So many times have the storytellers mentioned their friends they made while fighting. It's almost that the lucky ones to make it back became somewhat of an extended family. Sharing that experience seems to be a form of release for them. I find this to be the best way to find and make some "good" come out of this. The relationships that will last a lifetime

Keeler McJunkin_1197047_assignsubmission_onlinetext_onlinetext.html

868 words

and will never be forgotten.

George Watkins story had the greatest impact on me. There are several reasons that his story especially had an impact on me. The way he talked about not knowing much at all about the vietnam war and how scary and difficult that most of been being drafted for a war you hadn't really paid much attention to. Then after telling his story and explaining that he didn't have much bitterness, that right there was surprising. Someone losing their legs and eyesight in a war they didn't know much about and still having that kind of attitude towards it. You could tell the sadness in how he wished all those people didn't die and how he felt about the war even happening, but he seemed to have a better attitude about it given what happened to him then I think I would have. George Watkins, I believe, seemed trustworthy. The way he told his story made me feel as though he was telling the truth. He didn't seem to pushy or one sided with his recalling of the war. Another thing is, to a certain extent people may tell a lie or stretch the truth, but really who am I to say that he wouldn't be trustworthy I wasn't there. He seemed to have pretty clear memories of what happened while he was in vietnam. I would say what he told in that story to be credible and that what he went through isn't something that someone really forgets over time. You could tell he had his opinion on the war but from what I read, he didn't seem to tell stuff that didn't happen.

In part two I found that one story shared some details that made me very disappointed in United States and their decision making. Ngo Vinh Long talked about the French and his hatred for them. How he would go to the lake or a pond and see corpses floating because the French would do patrols and kill a lot of vietnamese. This seems to be a common thing I am reading and hearing, how the French really did treat the people of vietnam like dirt. Then to know that we were aiding them and supporting them. It makes me sad that we would support people who would do things like that. When Ngo Vinh Long talks about how great he saw America and how much he admired our country and refused to learn French because he wanted to learn English. Well this was also disappointing because as his father says we were siding with the French. It seemed we were supporting the French for our own selfish reasons and we were ignoring all the negative things that came along with supporting the French. The way the United States were handling things didn't seem much better. Ignoring the fact that villages were starving and saying they were just sick. Ngo Vinh Long made many good points showing that the United States didn't understand the culture or the right ways to help the people of vietnam. Instead of fighting the way people there were telling them to fight America did practically the opposite, ignoring so much information that could have been very useful.

From this same story I felt there was a certain goodness in people. Ngo Vinh Longs dad said not to hate the French people but to hate their policies. Then again he said the same thing with the American policy when he told Ngo Vinh Long about how the Americans were supporting the French. This to me is amazing to read about. Instead of just hating each person individually, there was an understanding that it wasn't that individual it was its government's policies. In many of these stories though, I find many Americans having respect for the Vietnamese including the Vietminh. Even though they were fighting against them there was a good side, an understanding that maybe things like this shouldn't have happened, that as a country we shouldn't have interfered with something like this. The fact that the soldiers who fought in this war knew this and understood it, in a way it takes away from some of the hate.

Kristine Wallace Assignment #1

Part 1

There is so many stories that I encountered in this book that made an impact on me for so many reasons but I chose the story by Roger Donlon for the simple fact that it made the LARGEST impact on me. We have in the narrative an individual that was thrown into a war that, although he had great training, was working with a group of individuals that he could not completely trust. He had the small infrastructure, than the Nungs than the North Vietnamese Strike Force which he could only trust a small percentage of (which was unfortunate from the fact that so many people were being relocated at this point, it was impossible for the Americans to know who the infiltrators were and who were actually on the American side).

What caught my attention most was the fact that he was trying to deal with all of these individuals that could ALMOST be trusted but not quite so. Donlon went into this with full trust and that unfortunately was not the case. They were fired upon not only by the enemy but also by at least half the people on the perimeter that were supposed to be protecting them.

Donlon goes on to speak of his compassion for the people in his unit, specifically Pop Alamo and John Houston. The saddest line I believe I read referred to Houston's wife having given birth to twin children. Because of the prematurity of the birth (which could most definitely be a cause from the father's death), one of the children died. Donlon's line of "casualties of war go far beyond the immediate battlefield" (pg.15) resonates such a feeling that Donlon understands, as should many, that it is not just the soldiers in the field itself but so many others end up experiencing the pain and suffering that had occurred.

I believe Donlon to be a credible and apt party in his narrative, not only because he experienced the situation but that after so many years he can still account for everything with a sensible head. He is now a grandfather, living on a Kansas home with still a sense of pride for the American public. This I feel was represented in the red, white and blue birdhouse outside his home. American pride can be exemplified in many ways, and this was one small reminder.

Part 2

Malcolm Browne wrote a narrative on his experiences in the war and the Buddhist people he came into contact through the war. The reason I found this disappointing was the fact that the Buddhist Monk ended up burning himself in effigy. Although, I realize that he and the other people that was with had their reasons, I do not feel like burning yourself would do anything to stop a war. This is why I found this story disappointing. Browne, I felt, wrote a really good narrative but the fact that a person would go to such lengths to protest something is a very hard concept for me to understand.

Although I ended on the negative, I am also going to look at the positive point to this issue. The monk (and his fellow compatriot) had obvious reasons for doing what they did. They did not want a communist take over and they did not want war. They simply wanted peace and although this is not the way I would go about trying to achieve this, they had their reasons. Buddhist Monks are known for their way of life including compassion, love and to live life with a moralistic ideal. So, I am guessing that they felt that was their best way to make an impression, even as extreme as it was.

Part One:

Ta Quang Thinh's story has great impact due to his point of view about the war. It may be unclear to some readers exactly which side of the war Thinh fought for, as the narration simply states that he went south as a nurse. Because we know that many of those who lived in the north went south for religious or political reasons, it is not clear which side of the war he was helping with his medical training. The fact of which side he worked for is less important than the message behind his story, which stated his disillusionment with the war in whole, and the great toll the war had taken on his life and country. This account was reliable as a first hand narration, despite the time which had lapsed since the events took place. Thinh could still recall the name of the patient he was checking on at the time of the bombing, as well as the protocol they used to carry Thinh back to the North. These facts show objectivity that supports Thinh's credibility with regard to the account. The fact that this story could be told years later in such a way as to make the reader feel that they too were there, and that the confusion over the reasoning behind this war was felt by all sides, makes it an account which had and will continue to have a great impact on those who read it.

Part Two, A:

The account by Richard Olsen was disappointing in its delivery. This soldier was in Vietnam for a very specific purpose and recounted this experience as a very nostalgic, positive time in his life. Olsen was there early in the war and did not claim to see the ugly side of the war. He spoke of the differences between Vietnam soldiers he encountered from the north and the south, but did so in a way which gave a light-hearted tone to it all, as with the soldiers in the south having their "siesta" time. He also recounted an almost comical exchange between he and another soldier when the South Vietnamese soldiers wanted to leave their post with a deceased comrade. This attitude doesn't appear to give the proper respect to the experience of many others who were in Vietnam at the time, and could make one feel that Olsen must have lacked the mental or emotional ability to fully appreciate the grim circumstances he was in.

The narration which follows his account tells another story. Olsen, an artist, is talked about in relation to the art he created, and it becomes clear that the account of comical and light-hearted reminiscence may have been a cover for the reality of the experience. Olsen may have said one thing, but his art was telling another story, a dark one. Even though the attitude he portrayed is disappointing, there is redemption in the possibility that Olsen was a veteran who continued living after the war as best he could- surviving on rose-tinted stories of the good old days, while reliving the harsh reality in his art.

Part Two, B:

The account by Ngo Vinh Long was one which showed that Long may have been able to see the worth in the war, but how another truth was able to be seen when Long looked at things from another point of view. Even though his father became disillusioned with the benefit of the war and the United States' role in it, Long had a hard time falling in line with these ideas, due to very different ideas which his father gave him when he was younger. He was young and found it difficult to see that the United States would be anything darker than the place of beauty he had grown up dreaming about. He was, as the story shows, the embodiment of hope within a time of great challenge. It appears as though, with the experiences he had while assisting in map-making across the South, Long grew up. In doing so, Long lost some of the fairy tale ideals that he grew up with. This loss for Long involved his positive view of the U.S. and the war in general, and shows that he was able to come around to the opinion which his father had come to some time before him.

This change of heart was the pivotal step in changing the path of Long's life. This is a story which showed the humanity and love between father and son, and embodied the goodness that those in the midst of this struggle were capable of. It also served to highlight how one boy was able to see a new truth, use his life to move for change, and symbolize a small part of the potential for good which came out of the war.

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.

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.

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.

Part 1

In the account from Phan Xuan Sinh he presented a personal view of his experiences in the war, and his feelings towards it. He endured many hardships, from a soldier in his reconnaissance dying from a landmine (Sinh lost his right foot), to his platoon mistakenly killing and wounding fisherman with young kids. Sinh was in a position where he was drafted to fight, so he did, but all he wanted was peace between his people. This made him feel no passion behind the war, unlike the passionate Viet Kong, but still he had to endure these hardships which subsequently carried past the finish of the War.

Hearing about the people that died, especially the innocent fisherman, hurt but what hurt the most, yet was peculiarly inspiring was hearing about the old couple in the “free fire zone.” Sinh took them from there and to a refugee camp to make sure they were safe. Even though he burnt down there house in front of them, so they wouldn’t be inclined to come back, they did. Sinh came to them and said, “Uncle, I told you before, this place is too dangerous to live in. Why in the world did you come back?” The old man said, “All my ancestors are buried here and this is our land. We’re not going to leave.” Land is very important to peasants and it just shows the passion that the Vietnamese have, even though this was a very dangerous area, they would rather be there with the possibility of death, than in a different place that is safe. This strong will is inspiring, and reading this makes one feel close with the Vietnamese people.

Yet it is tragic and makes one wonder how many innocent people died in these “free fire zones,” who were just trying to live their life. Also how tragic it is for these people who love their land and country so much, to see it get obliterated in war, along with the people they love. This ruining of the land wasn’t done from just the effects of war (bombing, Landmines, and shooting), but was done on purpose by the U.S.’s strategy to get the people out of the country and into the cities. Here they dropped Agent Orange, which had a disastrous effect on the environment. “An estimated 72.4 million liters or 100,000 tons of herbicides were sprayed on South Vietnam, affecting 43% of the cultivated area and 44% of the total area. Seventy per cent of the South’s coconut groves and 60% of its rubber plantations were destroyed, together with 110,000 hectares of forest and 150,000 hectares of mangroves, along with enough crops to feed 2 million people. It has also been claimed that 43% of the South’s plantations and orchards were destroyed, and 44% of the forest wealth.¹ All of this makes one feel for the Vietnamese people. Often in the U.S. we hear about how hard Vietnam was on our soldiers and youth, which it was, but it must have been ten times harder for the people of Vietnam. Here the war was actually on their land, so innocent people and their beloved land took terrible undeserved punishments.

This account from Phan Xuan Sinh seemed very believable. Initially one may think that too much time had passed to really remember, and that people may want to skew the truth somewhat in order to make themselves look better. But Sinh gained credibility through factual truths he presented, showing the good things he did and the bad, especially the bad. Like when talked about how he and his platoon killed innocent fisherman, which included old and young people. If he was going to skew the truth of what happened, he wouldn’t have mentioned this.

Part 2:

In “The Emperor Has No Clothes,” It was disappointing to hear about how the U.S government lied to the people. Like when McNamara noticed how much worse Vietnam was after a two day trip, but told the press that there was great progress. Part of this is understandable, where he is trying to lift the hopes of the people, but aspects later in this excerpt are even more disappointing. Such as the fact that the U.S was in Vietnam fighting a country for the purpose of fighting communism. Even though Vietnam had no desire to form this alliance that the U.S. spoke of. The Viet Kong was thought of as pawns to the communists of China and

Russia, and it was upsetting that the U.S didn't look into the culture and motives of the people of Vietnam before going to battle and destroying people lives and their surroundings. "Since the main enemy was always thought to be located somewhere other than the battlefields of South Vietnam, Washington never regarded it as a top priority to understand the particular cultural, political, and economic realities of the Vietnamese." Then even when it was seen that the War efforts were a lost cause and that the U.S wouldn't win, they still fought on through the egotistical pride of not wanting to lose.

All of this deceit the government put people through, was to push their mixed motives. This is extremely upsetting because the government is supposed to be in place for the people, they should never be able to get away with this type of behavior. The fact that they are bigger than the law, and just make huge decisions for the people, covered by lies, is a terrible thing. They should go to jail for something like this. This resulted in killing of so many people from both countries, and for what?

It was refreshing to hear that there were people, like Chester Cooper (CIA intelligence analyst for Southeast Asia), that were actively trying to get out of this war. He saw the terrible things and did all he could do to chase any possibility of negotiating. "I traveled all over the world chasing every possibility, fighting for every extra day of a bombing halt, and looking for every indication of a diplomatic opening." This is a man that hated the war, and unlike the government officials that deceived people in order to keep the war going. He went around in an unpublicized, unheroic way, to do anything he could to resolve the war into peace.

Index

1. "Vietnam: war and the environment. *Green Left Weekly*. Jul. 14, 1993. Web. Apr. 13. 2014

<https://www.greenleft.org.au/node/6044>

In part one of Appy's "Patriots", Phan Xuan Sinh's story was the most impacting. Hearing a perspective of someone who fought for the South Vietnamese military was very enlightening. Most military stories of Vietnam come from soldiers from the United States. His retelling of removing an elderly couple from a "free-fire zone" and burning their house down, only to find them there again in a couple of weeks because they couldn't leave the land where their ancestors were buried was a shocking story. It showed how much the Vietnamese loved their country and their dedication to their traditions. Operation Passage to Freedom, mentioned in Daniel Redmond's story, which transported 900,000 refugees from North Vietnam to South Vietnam in 1954, showcased the same loyalty to tradition and culture that the Vietnamese had (Herring 62). The U.S. and South Vietnam played on the fact that many people in North Vietnam were Catholic and used the fact that Diem was Catholic and many types of propaganda to convince people to move to South Vietnam. In disc two *America's Mandarin* of "Vietnam: A Television History", the hesitation of the people in North Vietnam to move was discussed. Many were afraid to leave or did not want to abandon their homes and the place where their ancestors were buried. They had respect for their ancestors and did not want to leave. Propaganda had to be made to help push them to make the decision to leave. The culture and tradition of the Vietnamese was shown just as it was in Sinh's story. The Southern Vietnamese Army and the United States's attempts to relocate and move the citizens would not help their cause. By doing this it only interfered with their culture and way of life and created more hostility.

Sinh appears to be a reliable speaker but one can never be certain. No records can back up his story yet he was the one who lived them. Taking his word as law is not something that would be advised, but understanding that it was his point of view and experience that can be interpreted as another way of looking at the war. Since he was there during the war, some of what he says can be taken as more credible but at the same time credibility can be taken away. Some of what he remembered could have been changed over time as he has gotten older and his mind could have tempered with his memories to help make them easier for him to digest. Depending on how many times he was retold his story he could have also elaborated what actually happened without realizing it over the years. However, the fact that he was there and lived through the war gives him a credibility that can not be taken away from him just like any other person that fought during the war. It can not be denied that he was there and fought. Therefore, he can be counted on as a reliable speaker who is telling his own story.

Luyen Nguyen's story was very disappointing. The way that he was treated by North Vietnamese soldiers while captured as well as the way that the Americans that he encountered treated him was horrible. It would be easier to understand the way that the North Vietnamese treated him since he was one of their prisoners and was their enemy. However, the fact that a U.S. captain told him that he did not know anything and told the student commandos that they were not fighting for their country but for the Americans since they were paying them was absolutely disappointing. Although this was obviously not the case for many Americans in Vietnam it was surprising to read that the U.S. advisors that Nguyen encountered were so arrogant. The fact that he had not told his family any of the terrible conditions that went through while imprisoned is saddening. For someone to hold those memories and thoughts in for so long is something that no should have to go through.

A story that one might find to have plenty of negatives is Malcolm Browne's. Being the journalist that took the famous photo of the Buddhist monk committing suicide by lighting himself on fire in protest against anti-Buddhist policies in South Vietnam, it would be easy to only see the negativity that takes place in Browne's story. However, there are moments of hope and good. Browne's friendships with several Buddhists is an example of how many Americans that went to Vietnam made lasting relationships with citizens, and his marriage to Le Lieu is another. He spoke of the Buddhists with respect in his story. When Browne sent the raw film of the monk it showed that he was reporting the truth without censorship. His need to constantly push the boundaries with his writing despite his own safety being put on the line showcases his compassion which is admirable.

Part 1

The story of war hero Roger Donlon is of great impression. It caught readers' attention at the beginning. Because of his heroic actions in the battle of Nam Dong he became the first commander in Vietnam War to receive the Medal of Honor. It revealed his legendary experience and represented wide influence and significant impacts on U.S. history of Vietnam War. So he's a typical war hero in U.S and an influential storyteller of Vietnam War as well. This honor stood for American government's point of view. Next, his firm belief as a soldier with unconditional obedience and absolute loyalty is very impressive. He was a great patriot. His spirit of heroism, being responsible for the call of duty and bearing the risk of his life were extraordinary from American army's perspective. After reading the whole Medal of Honor citation, it can be seen that the experience and spirit of Roger Donlon was spreaded propaganda among the masses. The belief that the mission of the war was to advise and assist the Vietnamese people was widely held by American soldiers at the beginning of the war. Furthermore, the fragment that he tried to rescue his fellows is very moving. The belief that kept him going on was the deep love and respect he felt for his fellows. And that's glittering point of humanity from the war in sharp contrast with its cruelty. The speaker in this story is reliable, trustworthy, and believable in many aspects. After referring to a number of historical materials, the record of the battle of Nam Dong and the description of Roger Donlon ^{are} very detailed from many sides. This part of history is well documented and thus personal memories could be corroborated by the historical materials. It's a fairly good restatement of this clip of history from this point. Roger Donlon experienced at that specific moment in time which could give him more credibility. However, in other cases, as many years have passed after the war, memories about facts during the war could become blurred with time out of human nature even if they were directly involved in war. Besides, memories of war are often painful under extreme conditions and awful to review, possibly resulting in people's inaccurate perception about the war. What's more, people's description about the war could be greatly influenced by their political standpoint, their nationality, identity, belief and so on. Some of these memories suffer too much subjectivity and could be exaggerated, which decreases their credibility. Some people could fake in front of the public for their own war experiences that could be learned from some news. Therefore readers should hold critical attitude toward these narratives.

Part 2

1. The most disappointing part in part 2 to read is the first part about why and how American became involved in the war step by step and the story that gave an accounts of the effects and great sufferings the war had brought to all people in both countries. As one of the story described the Vietnam War as the most atrocious war in human history, it was the longest foreign war in American history, resulting in incalculable trauma and losses. Former U.S. Secretary of State Henry Kissinger said the Vietnam War was a tragedy and the United States should not get involve in it. Senior Senator George McGovern described it as greatest military, moral, economic and political mistake of US history. The war was obviously conducted by powerful forces. From the first story, readers could see the process of the war and figure out that to start and get involved in the war was not that responsible for American people. They sacrificed lots of lives and soldiers didn't even know what they fought for. Pains and loneliness were full of all their relatives' heart. Needless to say, the biggest victims of the Vietnam War were the Vietnamese people. Americans had a fatal weakness, which was the attitude they hold toward the war. They made wrong policies and rarely considered losses and sufferings it had brought to other countries and people.

2. The positive lessons readers can learn from the stories is about why the Vietnamese could win and what good changes may take place in this land in future. The justice of Vietnamese people's struggle against aggression had a decisive impact on the result of the war. As the story said, rather than live under slavery, they would rather die. The Vietnamese people won also because they knew how to use their intelligence. The Vietnamese army chose the right strategy and tactics as well. Readers could learn from the story that strength of unity of the people was immeasurable and thus they could overcome difficulties. And that is where the hope lies for Vietnamese people's future. The unity could provide the country with creativity and courage in rebuilding their beautiful homes. Another positive lesson readers can get is that both countries should hold a right attitude toward the war and enhance understanding as it mentioned at the end of the story.

The stories in the first part of the Appy book were intriguing and quickly enraptured me into obsession. Reading these eye-witness accounts of a war many have long been confused by politically, has had a humanizing affect. The most impactful story was told by Bernard Trainor, a seemingly reputable former Commander who did two tours in Vietnam, and worked with credible media sources such as The New York Times as a military correspondent. Trainor came across believable, objective, and factual which made the years in between the events and the interview with Appy not seem too extreme. This may have to do with the fact that even after retirement from the military, he continued to stay in the tactical mind frame as he did work for the media. Even if he was chiming in on other national news or crises, it is more likely that he has been able to keep these facts fresh in his memory, in comparison to a person that got out and rarely, if ever, talks about it. In his account, Trainor compared the Vietnam war to the American Revolution, where he explained that the Vietnamese would fight to the death. Just like the American colonists, the Vietnamese demanded independence at any cost. This could strike a cord in any patriotic American who feels deeply that Americans will accept nothing less than a free nation and will stop at nothing to achieve it. Even the younger generations, who may have experienced that great sadness and fiery anger of 9/11, could most likely relate to the idea that countrymen will stand proud and strong behind their own people to defend them and their ideals, even if it means the ultimate sacrifice of their lives. What a powerful concept. The Vietnamese also had certain advantages like knowledge of the land and support of the people. In the second DVD episode, Ho Chi Minh was quoted as he answered concern regarding their lack of weaponry, stating, "if we have the people, we have the most powerful weapon". This reminds me of my own father's recollection of his time in Vietnam that he recounted years ago. He told me that there was nothing more frightening than an enemy you could not clearly decipher from your ally. He went on to explain specific instances where Viet Cong would dress as peasants and ambush the Americans. On the other hand, the Americans in Vietnam were compared by Trainor to the British in the revolutionary war; lacking "national sentiment" lead to "disenchantment" of the operation. The message was clear: motivation has everything to do with who can win a war, money and heavy machinery aside. Part two was also impactful, but in a different way, especially with the story told by Journalist Malcolm Browne, who covered the war in Vietnam for the Associated Press. It is amazing what these journalists must have seen and heard, that they were not allowed to report, due to censorship. To read his account of the two-seater T-28 that left with full racks of bombs from the main airstrip, to return with empty racks and a clearly exhausted machine gun was frightening, as was his example of the pilot was a blond-haired, blue-eyed man. Although the pilot had a Vietnamese man in the second seat, it was clear who was running the show so to speak. This was in clear contrast to the U.S. claim that their role was "subordinate" to our allies in Vietnam. Browne explained that he was "threatened with expulsion" by having reported this observation on the airstrip, which makes one question the political twisting of this war and any American involvement anywhere for that matter. It is disappointing to realize that the American people are told what our government wants us to know and even more so that they have the power to cover up details of history we may have resisted, had we known the extent of the given situation. Malcolm Browne's account of Vietnam was not all disappointment, especially his recollection of Christmas Eve, 1961. With all the horrors he had witnessed, there was a touching glimmer of humanity when the drunken men at the special forces camp shot off mortars, and the guerillas from the Viet Cong tunnel complex fired as well in celebration. There was palpable hope in Browne's statement, "for that one night of the Christmas season there was no fighting- a rare respite". The message was that no matter the cruel, violent, and unremorseful horrors the guerrillas set forth onto soldiers and civilians alike, at the core of their souls, they were all just human beings. It is so easy for us to make our counterparts out to be these evil, emotionless demons, such as the opinions of the Nazis during and after WWII. Quite possibly it is easier, considering our human capacity, to mow down "evil demons" with machine guns, than to do it with the mind frame that you're actually murdering someone's son or father.

Qi Wang

HIS195

Joe Escobar

Apr,13,2014

Part 1

During the years 1961 to 1964, United States government initiated “Strategic Hamlet Program” which means the U.S. sent money, guns and special force advisers to South Vietnam. Roger Donlon was one of the special force advisers. Stay in the different country and live in the different culture with few compatriots and deal with war situation, even he is a special force but it was very tough for him. As a soldier, his mission is obeying orders. He trained three hundred Vietnamese to Strike Force. Whatever, there are about one hundred of them were turned out and sympathized with the enemy. At this situation Roger and Vietnamese Strike Force got heavy attack by the Viet Cong. His mind was inundated with fear, fluster and insecurity. He carried Pop who was senior noncommissioned officer and got pretty severely wounded and Roger tried to get him out of a mortar pit. Even Roger got wounded already but he didn’t give up for saving companion. This story described an attack from Viet Cong to a Nam camp. There are many details that described by a U.S special force Roger Donlon who was involved and receive the Medal of Honor in it. He was very brave and skillful in the battle.

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.

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.

"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 thee 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.