

# HST 195: History of Vietnam War Sp18 (Escobar 41945)

[Home](#) / [My courses](#) / [HST 195 Sp18 \(Escobar 41945\)](#) / [Week 7](#) / [Week 7 Forum](#)  
/ [Internet Testimonies](#)



## Week 7 Forum Internet Testimonies

[Subscribe](#)[Internet Testimonies](#) ►

### Internet Testimonies

by [Joe Escobar](#) - Saturday, May 12, 2018, 12:46 PM

This thread is for discussions on the Internet Testimonies topic.

To make your POSTS, click the reply link in this, MY post. To reply to another student's post, be sure to click the reply link within in THEIR post.

IMPORTANT - SUBJECT LINES

BE SURE to use an informative subject line for your post, something that describes which one of the questions you are addressing. Do NOT simply leave it RE: Internet Testimonies

Sum of ratings: -

[Permalink](#) | [Edit](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



### Question 3

by [Parker Mann](#) - Tuesday, May 15, 2018, 9:31 PM

I do not think they should have been included in the *Patriots* textbook by Christian Appy. My primary reason is that pretty much everything included in that book is what happened in direct correlation to the politics/events of the war, and such little specific incidents of anti-war extremists just isn't important enough to include to me. I am not going to deny it is very interesting that there is still such controversy about these incidents, but what we still should be arguing about in my opinion is more important questions and issues surrounding the war and its controversies. I do think the spitting incidents are sad, interesting, and do need to be discussed but it just not an important enough part of the war to still be focused on. When all the living veterans die, the only historical records we will have will be sources such as those presented to us in class, and other similar materials about the war. Times passes, and as it does the importance of events does too. Monumental events that happened just a few hundred years ago are near forgotten today, and the same will happen to the Vietnam war as well.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: Question 3**by [James Alewine](#) - Friday, May 18, 2018, 7:13 AM

I would have to disagree with you because the treatment of the war veterans is a very important part of the Vietnam War. It was the first time in US history that veterans were treated this way.

“When the American soldiers returned home from World War II in 1945, they were greeted as heroes in the United States. Cities and towns across the country held parades to honor the returning veterans and recognize the sacrifices they had made. But the homecoming was very different for most Vietnam veterans. They came back to find the United States torn apart by debate over the Vietnam War. There were no victory parades or welcome-home rallies. Instead, most Vietnam veterans returned to a society that did not seem to care about them, or that seemed to view them with distrust and anger.”

For that reason, they should be in Appy's book. This war encompassed the attitudes of the United States citizens along with the “politics/events of the war”. Plus, the attitudes of the people are the politics.

<https://www.encyclopedia.com/history/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/coming-home-vietnam-veterans-american-society>

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Re: Question 3**



by [Parker Mann](#) - Sunday, May 20, 2018, 11:20 PM

Just because it was the first time in US history that veterans were treated in such a way does not mean that it was a very important part of the Vietnam War. I don't get how you can think events that occurred after the war could have had an effect on the war. I also do not think tales of alleged incidents of mistreatment of veterans in the US after the war fits the tone of stories told of wartime events in Vietnam and in Washington. Perhaps if these incidents of spitting had created massive headlines that swayed public opinion in America at the time of the war they should have been included in Appy's book, but they are still just allegations today that didn't have any impact on anything in Vietnam.

Sum of ratings: 0 (1)

0

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



### Re: Question 3

by [Jonathan Haskell](#) - Saturday, May 19, 2018, 11:56 PM

First let me just agree with you, I agree they should not be included in the Appy textbook. I just don't think it would fit with the nuance of the book. I disagree that the "spitting" or more over the anti war activity in general has a direct correlation to the politics and how events of the war were handled. I bet if Richard Nixon was alive he would agree with me. Actually he would probably agree with you, tape it, have thugs break in, and bomb the country next door.

Anyway, back on point the actual reason I am responding is when you wrote "Time passes and as it does the importance of events does too. Monumental events that happened just a few hundred years are near forgotten today, and the same will happen to the Vietnam war as well." I agree that it is a shame that with the passing of time fewer and fewer learn the happenings of different places of the world at different eras of human history, but if anyone has forgotten the past it is because they choose not to care to know. No we don't know too much detail about the Assyrians or Parthians but we know enough that learning about it is fascinating and should be shared with our offspring so it isn't forgotten.

"The importance of events does too?" I bet a ton of religious people would argue that when their prophet walked the earth its importance has not passed. If you are proud of your country or ethnic background then the importance of the past has not passed. Every genocide or terrorist attack importance will never differ as time goes on to those affected by it in any way. Every war that takes people before

their time alters the future as they will not be able to live their journey which importance should never be doubted or weakened. Thanks for your opinions!

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



### **My 83 year old Mother Remembers**

by [James Alewine](#) - Tuesday, May 15, 2018, 10:24 PM

How does one rectify so much information that comes from so many sources? This has been weighing heavy on me this last two weeks.

Since our last forum, I have been grappling with the fact that there are multiple views on “why America was in Vietnam in the first place”, “why America stayed so long”, and “what the end goal was to begin with”. I myself have tried to simply look at the facts, which is something I think George Herring has done a great job of, in just presenting facts, yet I’m sure there is some biased on his part as well.

Where this gets challenging, is reading or listening to the personal stories of our own soldiers. The complete terror that was accepted as reality on a daily basis. I had a tuff time getting through the film about those that had been captured, some endured the torturous conditions for 8 years. Now I spent one month in an American jail, which I’m sure it was like a kiddy day camp compared to what these men went through, yet they survived and when they got home everything they knew had changed. Mostly, they didn’t get a hero’s welcome which is unfair and unjust. Just last year during the presidential campaign, Donald Trump discredited John McCain publicly when he proclaimed that John McCain wasn’t a hero because he got caught. Ridiculous!

My mother is 83, she just went home to Tennessee after a month-long visit. I was able to have multiple conversations about the Vietnam War with her, while she was here. The one thing she kept saying about it, was how poorly the American soldiers were treated when they came home. She remembers it very well because of the television broadcast nightly. The craziest thing about her recollection, was she still didn’t know how or why America ended up there. Now, this is coming from a woman that was in her 30’s during that period, was a stay at home mother, and watched the news every night. So this raises a bigger concern.

How many Americans today, actually know the full story?

Was there such strong divisions in 1969 because Americans felt like they were being lied to by the government? I want to say yes, and the soldiers were symbol's of the war when they came home. Ignorance can be bliss, unless it's something you care about.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



### Re: My 83 year old Mother Remembers

by [Haonan Bai](#) - Sunday, May 20, 2018, 9:40 PM

I totally agree with your point of view. These veterans should be respected by people even though they have to participate in the Vietnam War. Although they killed many innocent people, it was a war after all. They might not want to participate in this war, but they are the soldiers. The duty of military is to obey the orders. They have no choice to avoid this war. Because they failed, they were rejected by people when they back home. What if they win this war? They still had the same treatment as this? What we really blame should not be these veterans. Just like you said about McCain, when he as a prisoner of war at Hanoi Hilton, he was tortured and whipped. Is that what he should suffer? No matter how these veterans are in the war, they came back right now, we should welcome their home just like the people did in the first video. If these veterans all died, will we be so concerned about what happened at that time? Do we not feel sorry for it?

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



### Epilogue Needed for the Stories Already Told

by [Jonathen Gray](#) - Wednesday, May 16, 2018, 6:50 PM

When it comes to including stories from the videos *Vietnam Veterans Never Expected This* and *Spitting on Vietnam Vets* into the Patriots textbook they would need some serious fleshing out of critical details and applicability for them to be included . *Vietnam Veterans Never Expected This* is essentially a remembrance and honoring with no real detail given that makes for compelling reasons to include in a book that is all about detailed perspectives. Furthermore, the book itself reads as the actions of the Vietnam War and not the decades that follows. Libraries could be filled with the accounts of soldiers post-war. I personally think Patriots would benefit from demonstrating the decades post war. Not just American soldiers but how the Vietnam War shaped Southeast Asia and the impacts of politics in America. With that said, I think it would be better represented in a book all its own.

While I get that each story was intentionally left short for brevity's sake and story structure but if we are looking at this as chronicling the events of the Vietnam then it is lacking post-war chronicles. In the Patriots textbook Harlan Pinkerton discussed his family's heritage, his life in the Air Force, and writing his name on a bomb for his uncle (Pinkerton pg. 209). However, there's no recollection of how he was treated post-war. Was this military man of a family of military men going back to the civil war spat on? Was he congratulated by everyday civilians?

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



### Re: Epilogue Needed for the Stories Already Told

by [James Alewine](#) - Friday, May 18, 2018, 7:28 AM

You're right, a complete novel could be filled with stories of the soldiers after their return.

But my issue is---when does the war end for the soldiers? When they get on the plane? When they get home? The treatment of the Veterans is part of the war, and when Christian Appy decided to title his book, "Patriots, the Vietnam War remembered from all sides", that is a pretty big part of their memory. The treatment they received when they got home, and the realization that the war they were fighting, many of the U.S. citizens disagreed, a country divided was their last memory.

It should have been included.

Also, PTSD was a big part of this conflict and was recognized after---some are still fighting the war.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



### Re: Epilogue Needed for the Stories Already Told

by [Parker Mann](#) - Sunday, May 20, 2018, 11:28 PM

This is a valid point that I honestly had not considered before. "when does the war end for the soldiers? When they get on the plane? When they get home?" Really got me thinking. Even though the physical battles in Vietnam ended, it is clear that many vets faced severe challenges related to the war when they got home. I was obviously aware of the severity of PTSD of Vietnam vets and the challenges they face just from driving around my hometown of Portland and seeing all the struggling Vets on the side of the road. I would honestly say that tales of PTSD would be more appropriate to include in the Appy book than tales of spitting on Vets. PTSD is a much more widespread and severe impact of the war on American society than spitting and disrespect of Vets ever was.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**History Shouldn't be Debate Class**by [Jonathan Haskell](#) - Wednesday, May 16, 2018, 10:39 PM

You need to put a warning before that first video. Wasn't expecting it to be emotion producing. Anyway, to the question should the video clips just watch be included in the Patriots textbook why or why not. Well the second one is out as I feel that is specific to our time and place. He even said he was making it for the entire purpose to let those of the younger generation who has interest to ask questions from a true Vietnam vet. So in regards to the question that's out. The first one could be re worked and included in the Patriots textbook, but like the textbook itself the video wasn't just one story but a brief summary of a collection of stories followed by a long overdue thank you. So as I think of the framework of the actual question I think my answer would have to be no. The second video is just out, and the first video clip as is wouldn't pass the parameters of being a single story told first hand. Now if you took all the guys included in the first video and interviewed them in full or just let them tell the story they wanted to tell then that would absolutely should make the cut for inclusion.

How can we in 2016 or 2018 even, STILL be arguing whether these events actually occurred? This is the question that baffles me a little. I mean if you just don't care to know like some then fine. I don't understand how people like Mr. Thompson from the other question who cares at least enough to google it and then take the time to send that note to the editor, could allow himself to be tarnished with ignorance when it in truth it is just laziness. If he really wished to know the truth and didn't just wish to see his name in print or argue his own intellectual superiority due to probably boredom, then the knowledge is out there.

I was never in doubt of the stories of what the veterans faced when they returned. I was told these stories by both my mother and father who were some of the ones giving the dirty faces and spitting. Well not spitting they had some decency and class but definitely dirty faces and head shakes. They had a complete misunderstanding of

the whole story of Vietnam so their liberal minds only saw the worst of the stories. The “baby killing” and “trama forced drug addictions” and the “mass” slaughtering of entire villages. My answer to the question is of how can we still be arguing it in 2018 is, because some choose due to disinterest choose not to know or care. If they do know or care about these stories do not believe them and just shrug it off as liberal or conservative propaganda depending on how they lean. One great thing about the technology age is the truth is out there. It might be hiding in a pile of lies, but the truth is there.

What happens to the historical record once all the living veterans have passed? The same thing that happens to history when the veterans of the civil war or the Crimean war passed. The stories are passed down in text or orally or documentary form or now on the information superhighway, so the historical record will be full and vibrant. A lot more so than those who may have fought in wars previous.

The last question of How do we rectify historical information is a bit more complex and not as simple as one might hope it might be. There is always going to be cause and effect. That is something that I think should be when looking backwards at history be sturdy and absolute. Devoid of opinion. Something happens, this is why it happened, and this is what happened after it happened. This is what should be in textbooks. The PBS documentary I thought was good and I enjoyed it and found it to be compelling television. Of course though and wouldn't expect less of them, to take the opinion of the financers into account or you would no longer have a project. The AIM video to me is like the showdown at high noon, it is the other group on the complete opposite end of the spectrum wanting to tell us how wrong their counterparts are. I hated those videos. One thing I learned from those videos though that is important were the actual demonstrations around the world against the PBS documentary. If Vietnamese people in large numbers are protesting your documentary about Vietnam you have a situation that needs fixing. We have opinions and we express our opinions, but facts don't have opinions and that is what should be in textbooks. After the facts are written down published and taught on a regular basis throughout the educational system then offer opinions and have in depth discussion about the ifs. History itself shouldn't lean right or left.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) 3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Re: History Shouldn't be Debate Class**by [James Alewine](#) - Friday, May 18, 2018, 8:03 AM

Well said Johnathan, I think the first video was a prime example of stories that belong in the Appy book, it's just part of the all-encompassing debacle that the Vietnam War was.

I think you are also correct about "History itself shouldn't lean right or left." It's just that politics are a major part of most wars, especially when a draft is involved. Ultimately, our politics is what makes this a great country to live in---education is key, and it's very important to observe and engage with the political system, so that we the people are informed on the decisions our leaders make. If we do that---we can avoid another Vietnam.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)**Sources and Manipulation**by [Daisy Burge](#) - Thursday, May 17, 2018, 10:30 PM

The first video seems to me to be a well-produced piece that is edited in a way to create a political and social message in support of American Vietnam veterans rather than a strictly factual account of the way that war veterans were treated immediately after and during the Vietnam war. The numerous jump cuts between different veterans speaking, the stock footage and American symbolism used, and the "emotional" music in the background all are conscious choices by the producer to create a socio-political message rather than a comprehensive and honest recounting of the war, and as such, I would not include it in a book like Appy's, which is focused more upon individuals recounting their honest experiences of the war and post-war experiences of veterans and activists on both sides of the war.

The second video seems to be more aligned with the format and content that would make it into a book like Appy's, but his story in print would most likely need to be extrapolated upon, as it lacks many details and context, though this is a common problem for many people who experienced the war both because of age and because trauma can profoundly affect one's memory.

Regarding the accuracy and viability of certain historical sources, all information

sources have some form of bias through the exclusion or inclusion of certain information, and in audio/visual forms of education like the first YouTube video and the PBS documentary series, editing of the footage with jump cuts, music, and clip inserts all contribute significantly to the emotions that the viewer feels regarding the information being presented them. Such videos usually draw from many sources rather than just one however, which helps to create a more holistic view of the overall situation of the war. While information from soldiers recounting their experiences singularly can be useful because they are not controlled or manipulated by these editing techniques, they are only singular experiences that cannot necessarily be considered the dominant war experience for veterans.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



### Re: Sources and Manipulation

by [James Alewine](#) - Friday, May 18, 2018, 7:45 AM

Yes, you are right about the first video, "all are conscious choices by the producer to create a socio-political message", that's just how you make a compelling argument for television.

But I disagree, that the is not "a comprehensive and honest recounting of the war". These are actual Vietnam Veterans---with a story that needs to be heard.

If someone typed up their story and put it in a book---does that constitute a comprehensive and honest recounting of the war? Of course not, there is a writer and editor that have the ability to twist words.

It's up to the audience to decipher fact from fiction. Luckily, in today's world, we have the power to seek out the truth.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



### Re: Internet Testimonies

by [Miles Arnold](#) - Thursday, May 17, 2018, 10:35 PM

You could absolutely include a few stories from the video titled "Vietnam Veterans Never Expected This" with the Appy stories. I especially like the idea of including the stories of soldiers who returned home to be "Yelled at" and "Spit on" with the interview of Nathan Houser, the American who moved to Canada while his Brother went to fight.

He describes the times his brother would come and visit when he got back from Vietnam saying, "he was always accepted among the draft resisters. I know there was

Vietnam saying, "He was always accepted among the draft resisters. I know there was animosity from soldiers towards protesters, but there wasn't much the other way around." He even goes on to say, "I think there was a certain sympathy for them." (pg. 339, Appy) This is a totally different tone than what we hear in the first video. It is the complete other side of what Houser is saying.

It would help the readers understand that there were many different experiences for both the civilians and troops returning home.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



### **Bulls-Hit, Jane Fonda, and "a bunch of crap".**

by [Kate Adkisson](#) - Friday, May 18, 2018, 8:28 PM

The youtube video about Bulls-Hit was not so much as informative rather than bashing the media, Jane Fonda, and documentaries. The only testimony relating to being spat on or how returning veterans were treated finally comes at 1:30 in. The man mentions that protesters tried to make themselves "feel goody-goody" by expressing discontent with the war but support for the soldiers. He passes this off as "a bunch of crap" and then goes on to describe his experience on his airplane ride home returning from the war. He describes a woman refusing to sit next to him then spitting right in his face and calls him a baby killer. Spitting and calling veterans baby killers seemed to be protesters go-to, in a lot of the testimonies we have been subjected to, which is a little suspicious to me. Setting that aside, right after his brief story a picture of Jane Fonda appears on the screen with digs at her personal life, with the caption reading, "Just goes to show you, marry a 'billionaire' and you can do anything in America without going to prison, even aid and comfort to the enemy". I found this little blurb completely unrelated to the topic of if whether Vietnam veterans were spat on or not, and doesn't improve my opinion on this man. Though he is a veteran, not everything he says is fact. Being in a war doesn't somehow make you absolved from expectations of others. While I have not lived in this man's shoes or ever been to war, I don't believe this video was put together thoughtfully and provided little useful information, in my opinion.

Near the beginning of the video, there is a quote from Richard Nixon, which reads "No event in American history is more misunderstood than the Vietnam War. It was misreported then, and it is being misremembered now". Soon after, the man remarks, "I'll guarantee you whatever you heard about it is a bunch of crap. Two-thirds of the Vietnam combat veterans are already dead, they've passed away. So you don't have too much time to ask too many questions from people". Mimicking Nixon, he puts blame on the media for misreporting. I have a problem with the idea of "misremembering". As I wasn't in the Vietnam war, I don't even have an opinion to remember, let alone misremember. My understanding of the war, as a student, comes from others, and relies on others completely. While events can be

misremembered, if they were significant they will be reported, documented. As a student, I rely heavily on documentation, as it is proof and adds weight to someone's memory. If there is any "misreports", I can always rely on the documented history, such as dates, places, and people. While I agree sort of with his sentiment that what I've heard about the war is "a bunch of crap", I disagree that modern understandings of the war are crap. He is confusing misremembering with different understandings. As time goes on, history will be re-evaluated through social, cultural, and political terms. The 21st century isn't rewriting history, it is examining it through the lens of the present.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1) 3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



**Re: Bulls-Hit, Jane Fonda, and "a bunch of crap".**

by [James Alewine](#) - Saturday, May 19, 2018, 5:45 PM

Well said Kate... This is an interesting take on the incident coming from Jane Fonda herself.

<https://www.janefonda.com/the-truth-about-my-trip-to-hanoi/>



*Listening to soldiers at a GI coffeehouse.*

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)

**Re: Bulls-Hit, Jane Fonda, and "a bunch of crap".**

by [Daisy Burge](#) - Sunday, May 20, 2018, 10:28 PM

I was just about to post something similar! I was also very interested in the pictures of Fonda that feature her on N. Vietnamese military equipment. I had no idea why she would willingly pose for a picture where it seems she's openly disrespecting American soldiers - the fact that she was told to pose for the photos and they were taken very quickly before she asked them to be deleted multiple times says a lot, not just about Fonda herself, but about how historical photographs can depict false or misleading information, even if they seem like objective evidence. Vietnam was one of the first majorly televised wars in the world at the time, and even that information could be easily manipulated by photographers and reporters asking soldiers, civilians, and police to "pose" and create a misleading image.

From Jane herself: *The cameras flashed. I got up, and as I started to walk back to the car with the translator, the implication of what had just happened hit me. "Oh my God. It's going to look like I was trying to shoot down U.S. planes." I pleaded with him, "You have to be sure those photographs are not published. Please, you can't let them be published."*



Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Video Two**by [Miles Arnold](#) - Saturday, May 19, 2018, 11:39 AM

In the Bulls-Hit video, what is he talking about when he says everything we've heard is a "bunch of crap?" People in the comment section say the same thing. They say they talked to their dad who served and that they know what "really happened." I think that when we study this war we have to be careful about how we take in information and certain accounts of the war like his. Although he is a Vet, it almost feels like because he was so mistreated when he returned and because the war got negative attention that he now has a ton of built up aggression. He feels that if you didn't fight or serve there, there is no way you could possibly know what really happened. That, to me, is not a source of historical information. How could ALL the information out there be wrong?

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)
**Bunch of Crap: What's really crap?**by [Kate Adkisson](#) - Sunday, May 20, 2018, 11:22 AM

I believe the Bulls-Hit guy is talking about a wide range of subjects that all fall under whether we won the war or not when he is talking about crap. Winning or losing is a major part of the American psyche. In Vietnam, they marked wins by the number of bodies. The number of people killed got transferred to the American public as our advancement of the war, of our success. I believe the "crap" he is concerned with is a common understanding that we "lost" the war. We didn't create a separate, "free" South Vietnam. We didn't stop evil communism. We didn't win. We may have won in terms of people lost, but is that really winning? We "saved" areas by absolutely obliterating them. We "liberated" by killing whatever moved, whether it was VC or a South Vietnamese elder. I agree with him that we have been fed a bunch of crap, but probably not in the terms, he's speaking about. The crap he mentions, I believe, has to do with the realities of what actually happened. The American people were fed crap from their leaders, time and time again being led to believe we were fighting a good fight, and fighting that fight successfully when in reality we were sending more troops and spending more money as each day passed. The American public was fed lies, cover-ups, and was omitted the truths of what our government was doing, such as Nixon's secret invasion of Cambodia and other operations. He feels it is "crap" because if he acknowledges that he participated in morally wrong behavior he wouldn't be able to live a normal, successful happy life. We will never know

everything that “really happened”, however, we do know what happened. We invaded a country we knew little about under false pretenses of freedom, then stayed in that country for a decade, bombing and murdering and losing lives that didn’t need to be lost. All in the name of freedom. I believe that is the biggest load of crap I’ve ever heard. Saving by destroying.

All of the information out there isn’t wrong, it just doesn’t fit into his worldview or his narrative.



Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

2

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



#### Question 4

by [Parker Mann](#) - Saturday, May 19, 2018, 11:48 AM

Because these sources are all somewhat bias, whether we realize it at the time or not, the only way we can rectify the information from these sources is to confirm their claims by comparing and contrasting sources, points of view, and information. As we learned while comparing the AIM videos to the PBS series is that there are discrepancies/differences in some of the information when compared to each other. To determine what source was more legitimate I compared the ‘facts’ from each videos to a somewhat 3<sup>rd</sup> party source which was the Herring Book, to see what facts matched up or seemed misleading. This allowed me to see which source was bias, misleading, presenting untrue information, or just presenting historically accurate information.

The problem with truly rectifying these sources is that there is so much information about the war out there from so many different perspectives and it is hard to determine which is legitimate because much of it is biased. You would think that the most legitimate info about what actually happened would come from people who actually took part in the war whether they were a soldier or politician. But really these people a lot of the time have strong bias because they were on a 'side'. This is apparent in the stories presented in the Appy book, in which stories are told by pro-war Americans, anti-war Americans, Communist Vietnamese, and Southern Vietnamese, in which they all tell different tales of their experiences.

It is especially hard to determine the truth in the case of videos. Some videos that are extremely low budget and have 'low' views could contain legitimate information, while others that have millions of views and a large budget could be just be all propaganda, and misleading. At the end of the day though, I believe comparing and contrasting sources is the best way to rectify information and determine which sources is legitimate.

Sum of ratings: 3 (1)

3

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



#### Re: Question 4

by [Jonathen Gray](#) - Saturday, May 19, 2018, 6:18 PM

"You would think that the most legitimate info about what actually happened would come from people who actually took part in the war whether they were a soldier or politician. But really these people a lot of the time have strong bias because they were on a 'side'."

Contextualized opinions are often a great source of information. A protester who has never seen a returning veteran spit on versus a returning veteran who was frequently spit on see two sides of a coin that the other does not. Both have something to contribute to the historical record but need to be examined in the context of what they experience.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1)

1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



#### Just a thought but...

by [Jonathen Gray](#) - Saturday, May 19, 2018, 6:19 PM

The Youtube comment section. You will never find a more wretched hive of scum and villainy. A place where such gems like "people who hated the vietnam war vets are just

ignorant babies who hid in the US not knowing what these vets experienced" from user Kiren Lataquin or "WE NEED TO ROUND UP ALL THE LITTLE LEFT WINGNUT LIBERAL BABY HYPOCRITES , AND SHIP EM ALL TO N. KOREA" from user Michael Nonya are in abundance.

But in all it's flaws and trolling you do seem to get the sense that the more personable the story the less the hate flows. "Vietnam Veterans never expected this" had a much higher incident rate of insults and bickering. In the first ten comments there were 2 instances of insults and going back further in time there were dozens possibly hundreds of disparaging remarks. With the Spitting on Vietnam Vets video there were zero insults in any direction in the first ten comments. Going back to the beginning of time with I could only find maybe a couple of loaded comments that could be interpreted as negative but few of which were implicitly insulting.

Sum of ratings: 1 (1) 1

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



### Welcome home for Vietnam veterans

by [Haonan Bai](#) - Sunday, May 20, 2018, 4:38 PM





After I watched the video called "Vietnam veterans never expected this", I feel like those Vietnam veterans shouldn't be treated like what they said in the video. They were being treated like a baby killer and people were against them. This is unfair for those veterans. Just like some veterans in the video said: they are soldiers, they have their own responsibilities, they had to execute the orders (Vietnam Veterans Never expected this, 0:54). I understand people discriminated against those Vietnam veterans because at that time many people were pursuing peace and they don't think it is necessary to attack Vietnam. When they saw the photos of the U.S. soldiers attacking Vietnam in the newspapers, they believed that those Vietnamese were innocent and caused the Americans to hate the soldier who had fought. They also related to media reports and magazines, and the photos in the magazines were bloody. Whoever saw it felt terrible, so some peace-loving people in the United States held a parade. That's why they hate the soldiers who fought on the battlefield. But the poorest were the soldiers. When they returned to their country, they thought they would be warmly welcomed, but on the contrary, when they came back, they were spit by the people who met at the airport. And people also use the most vicious language to abuse them.

No matter what happened in the Vietnam war, we should respect these veterans and welcome them home as we said in the video. Because they are also victims, they had bad experience about the war and they are the soldier who has to obey the orders.

Sum of ratings: 2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)



### **Hate the War, Love the Soldier**

by [Daisy Burge](#) - Sunday, May 20, 2018, 10:12 PM

One thing that struck me particularly with the veteran who ran the bullS-hit YouTube channel was his assertion that the anti-war protesters mantra of "Hate the War, Love the Soldier" was "a bunch of crap." The images that he then showed on screen were from Jane Fonda's controversial 1972 trip to North Vietnam where she met [American POWs](#) and was infamously photographed on a North Vietnamese anti-aircraft machine that was used to shoot down American aircraft. BullS-Hit captions the photo with the derisive nickname this earned Fonda - "Hanoi Jane."

The reason why I found Fonda's inclusion in the video so interesting is that it gave me some perspective as to the political motivations of the YouTube channel. While it is my general inclination to believe he is more pro-war than his political counterparts, this was reinforced by his examination of Fonda, whom he claims "aided and comforted the enemy." This claim is likely based on the right-wing conspiracy theory that Fonda gave

intelligence from [American POWs](#) to the N. Vietnamese, a claim that has been proven false by the POWs themselves. Fonda was one of the most well-known protesters of the war and used her fame as a platform to promote feminist, pro-black, and anti-war ideals. Honestly, if it was difficult to figure out the political biases of these videos, a little background research into the opinions of the video creator will make it pretty clear that the creator is primarily interested in promoting his own right-wing political agenda through taking shots at prominent anti-war activists and painting all anti-war protesters as disrespectful to the troops. Though instances of spitting and insulting veterans most likely took place and there's not much a reason for most vets to lie about their treatment, it seems clear to me that the speaker is primarily motivated to press his own political agenda rather than to truly educate the audience.

Sum of ratings:2 (1)

[Permalink](#) | [Show parent](#) | [Edit](#) | [Split](#) | [Delete](#) | [Reply](#)[Internet Testimonies](#) ►[i](#) [Moodle Docs for this page](#)You are logged in as [Joe Escobar](#) ([Log out](#))[HST 195 Sp18 \(Escobar 41945\)](#)