

694 - 700 = minimum req'd

grammar mistakes

69

There are a few different aspects that could be considered turning points of the conflict in Vietnam. In any war there are so many different decisive battles and moments that can change the outcome of what is going to happen. It can be a hard task to just narrow it down to a single moment. When looking at the stories we've read in the Appy book I couldn't help but realize a turning point may have been mentioned by John Gilligan. A severe mistake and overestimation by America was the significance of air support. We thought having air superiority was going to be the difference in the war. Nobody thought there was a chance to lose with the fact we could bomb the Viet Cong into submission if need be. (To bomb the people as well to make them surrender.) The reason I look at this as a turning point is the fact that once we realized this wasn't going to be the case, we were in trouble. People at home started to complain more and more about the war, and the leaders started to question the tactics we were using. America had never fought a war against an enemy like we faced in Vietnam. The guerrilla warfare tactics of hiding, using the land and elements around them to their advantage. We had never seen it before, and they were very good at it. I feel that once we really got into the war and saw how it was going to be fought, it really changed a lot. We got demoralized by losses and general ineffectiveness of our plans and attacks. This is why the inability of our attacks to be effective was a turning point. If air attacks weren't going to be successful, then what are we going to do? It caused our leaders to really scratch their heads at the time and wonder what to do next. In a war when you start to question what you are doing, That's when you will start to fall down. Everyone will question each other regarding why we are losing and just why we are even in the war in general.

ns

explain

what changed?
alot

ns

no
hypowere PT
cliche

I believe the beginning of the end of the war for us was our overall in effectiveness. Everyone starts to turn on each other when things begin to go downhill. I look at the end of the war as when the anti war campaigns really started to turn up at home. In any war if you don't have good support at home it'll start to get to you. Towards the end of the war the war detractors were getting louder and louder. The voices against what we were doing became more and more. When this happens it begins to demoralize everyone from the top down. Including the men fighting over in Vietnam and the leaders at home. A good representation of this from the Appy book was the story of Nguyen Ngoc Bich. It really focuses on the people at home. How fiery and loud against the war people had become. Asking questions like "why should my son die for your country". A lot of people at home disagreed with the war from the beginning. And after things started to go downhill over in Vietnam it got worse and worse. People wondered why we were fighting for somebody else. It was a completely different situation than what we were fighting for in World War Two. Bich's account of being at the university is very telling. (All of the people yelling and arguing over the war.) If it gets to the point where people at home are arguing and yelling with each other then that is really where things go to the point of no return. When fighting a war you need support from the people at home to be able to keep up morale. This clearly was not the case with Vietnam. It started out poorly and ended even worse. By the time everything was starting to flare up at home, the war was over. There isn't any coming back from a situation like that.

cliche

ww

wrong -

- ns web

ns -

red

Part 1 - lacked
story choice info
beyond Gilligan & air power.
Rest of it cited No detailed
facts about the war.

Part 2
Nothing but generalities
& poor grammar. No
true facts or evidence
is ever cited.