

# We win even when we lose critical analysis essays example

[Law](#), [Evidence](#)



In many of the crises arising in the global perspective, America always takes the position of the good agent who seeks out the good of all. This is based on the American belief in democracy where they believe that the good of everyone should be considered in every situation. They argue that there should be neither human suffering nor abuse of human rights. Espiritu (2006) argues that from this perspective, it might seem like the US is a friend of the universe; the big brother who seeks to make sure that the others are kept under check. However, Espiritu (2006) argues that the reality might be on the inverse. In this paper, I take the position that the US does not consider a loss because in every situation the country is involved in, there is a concern for the greater good; and this cause is always achieved even if not in the short term.

In order to get a better grip on my position, it is important to have a closer analysis at the American's involvement in the world crises. According to Espiritu's argument, the nation only cares for its own good. This can be seen in its involvement in the world wars, the war in Iraq, and the anti-terrorism campaigns that it often propagates. It is clearly evident that this is a nation that seeks its own good; and can turn any of its wrong-doings to seem like it did the right thing. This is the same case with the involvement of the war in Vietnam. The fall of Saigon was a clear indication of the failure of the US to keep up its democratization efforts. This is a war in which the US should not have been involved. Even the soldiers who served in the war wondered why they were in Saigon, arguing that they were not afraid to fight, but needed to know why they had to fight (Hickman, 2012). Espiritu (2006) captures this very well through the recounting on the Vietnamese war and the fall of

Saigon. Espiritu's argument has it that the US just takes its interests to heart and never backs down from its pride, even when it is utterly wrong; it always keeps the winning attitude so as to maintain its ego. However, a critical analysis tends to counter Espiritu's argument.

First of all, Espiritu (2006) indicates that immediately after the war, the American veterans were unwanted in the US. This is because of the havoc that they had caused in the land. As a matter of fact, many of the Americans complained that the war just brought them unnecessary pains and suffering (American Experience, 2005). A lot of resources, both financial and human, were unnecessarily dispensed in the war. Espiritu (2006) further indicates that at the time, the American military was greatly despised by the people who ranked it only higher than sanitary workers. This shows that the war was not a success. Not only did it strip America of its military prowess; it also took away its ego and high opinionism. This forms a good ground for the argument about the Americans' high opinionated approach. However, Espiritu (2006) also indicates that later, with the influence of the media, the American veterans who were initially seen as the agents of destruction and moral corruption were turned around to seem like the agents of peace and goodwill.

This evidence supports my argument that Americans get involved in the world cruises for the greater good. In this case, the war in Vietnam was not an American war. However, the nation could not sit by and watch as cruel regimes took over the world. This is the reason as to why it got into the war so as to safeguard the interests of the weak. The evidence given by Espirit (2006) about the soldiers' and American disappointment at the war supports

this position; it indicates that the Americans knew that this was not just their war; it was a global war.

In a rush to criminalize the war, Espiritu (2006) gave evidence that could be used against his argument. For instance, he argues that some American soldiers, such as Nodel (Espiritu, 2006) might have been in Saigon to spread the good. However, these were just cases of isolation. It is, therefore, not acceptable that the American media could recreate the story of the war based on the acts of a minority. There is no need in painting a good picture of the American military while in the real sense; it acted as an agent of destruction in Vietnam. This argument might support Espiritu's argument, but also gives ground from which the same argument can be questioned.

There are also pieces of evidence that supports Espiritu's argument and also support my position. Such is the description of the fall of Saigon. Espiritu (2006) argues that the at the time of the evacuation, the American soldiers left behind many Vietnamese men, women and children in the hands of the very aggressors they had come to protect them against. Heroic stories of the rescue are told, but no recollections of the suffering of the Vietnamese are highlighted. Espiritu (2006) is justified in wondering where the American media gets the heroism aspect from. Why should the American soldiers and veterans be seen as the victims whereas the real victims remained in Saigon? I agree with this position. However, I also note that these happenings took place at the heat of the war. The pain and suffering that the natives of Saigon went through does not disregard any heroic treatment that the American veterans might have received. It is worth remembering the pain and suffering that the American soldiers also went through. They are

often described as the innocent boys whose innocence was lost in Saigon, and the victims who suffered from PTSD as a result of the war. This indicates that the soldiers suffered just as much as the natives did.

Finally, in order to give a balanced opinion on the war, there is need to look at both sides of the story. Espiritu (2006) focused so much on the negative and forgot there was also the good side of the American activities. According to Brihji (2010), many of the Amerasians (American Asians) living in Ho Chi Minh City (formerly Saigon) have painful recollections of the war. It is so unfortunate that they are unwanted in the US, as evidenced by the strict immigration laws, and they remain irrelevant in the city as the war is long gone and nobody wants any association with it. However, there are also the immigrants who happily live in the US and whose lives were completely changed by the war. Having these considerations in mind, it is evident that there are always the two sides of a story. Espiritu (2006) gave the dark side, completely omitting the positive. This is quite unfair to the history of American and the Americans. Their good deeds should not be overridden by a few mistakes. It is always good to look at the bigger picture.

## References

American Experience. (2005). Vietnam - The Fall of Saigon.

Brihji, M. (2010). The Fall of Saigon, My Amerasian Experience. Retrieved on 18th Nov. 2013 from <http://ireport.cnn.com/docs/DOC-438563>

Espiritsu, Y. L. (2006). The " We-Win-Even-When-We-Lose" Syndrome: US Press Coverage of the Twenty-Fifth Anniversary of the " Fall of Saigon." American Quarterly, Vol. 58(2), pp. 329.

Hickman, K. (2010). Vietnam War: Fall of Saigon. New York, NY: Prentice Hall.

<https://assignbuster.com/we-win-even-when-we-lose-critical-analysis-essays-example/>