

Last Days In Vietnam Documentary Analysis

Posted on October 4, 2019

View this essay online:

<https://academic-master.com/last-days-in-vietnam-documentary-analysis/>

Introduction

Rory Kennedy's documentary *Last Days in Vietnam* examines the final weeks of the [Vietnam War](#) in April 1975, when North Vietnamese forces advanced rapidly toward Saigon and the South Vietnamese government began to collapse. By that point, ordinary U.S. combat troops had already departed under the 1973 Paris Peace Accords, so the crisis was not a choice between continuing the entire war and simply going home. American diplomats, military personnel, intelligence officers, contractors, Marines, and civilians still in South Vietnam had to decide how to evacuate U.S. citizens while also confronting obligations to South Vietnamese colleagues and families who feared imprisonment, reeducation, retaliation, or forced separation. Kennedy builds the film around this narrowing window of choice. The result is both an evacuation narrative and an ethical study of responsibility after intervention. Its power comes from showing how delayed policy decisions became immediate personal decisions at embassies, airports, ships, and crowded gates (Kennedy, 2014; Public Broadcasting Service, 2015; Herring, 2014).

Collapse Before the Evacuation

The documentary's historical setting is a rapid military collapse that outran many official expectations. North Vietnamese forces captured major cities, South Vietnamese units retreated, refugees moved toward Saigon, and the possibility of an orderly transition disappeared. President Gerald Ford's administration understood that Americans would need to leave, but a large, visible evacuation of South Vietnamese allies was politically and logistically sensitive. Ambassador Graham Martin resisted early preparations partly because he feared that open planning would intensify panic and signal that the United States had abandoned South Vietnam. Kennedy presents this delay as a crucial failure of judgment. Preparation did not require certainty that Saigon would fall; it required recognizing the consequences if it did. Thousands of Vietnamese had worked with Americans as interpreters, soldiers, officials, employees, and family members, making them especially vulnerable after a communist victory. The film therefore shows optimism becoming dangerous when leaders allow hope for stability to substitute for contingency planning and clear communication (Asselin, 2018; Herring, 2014; Kennedy, 2014).

Orders, Loyalty, and Moral Scarcity

The strongest moral conflict in *Last Days in Vietnam* concerns the gap between formal orders and personal obligations. American personnel knew Vietnamese friends, coworkers, spouses, children, employees, and military partners whose lives could be transformed by the approaching takeover. Official priorities initially focused on U.S. citizens and designated dependents, while the number of endangered South Vietnamese people far exceeded available transport and time. Some Americans responded by arranging unauthorized or loosely authorized departures, creating passenger lists, moving families secretly, and using aircraft or ships in ways that exceeded the narrowest interpretation of policy. Kennedy frames many of these choices sympathetically, but the ethical issue is more complex than simple obedience versus heroism. Every additional person placed on transport meant someone else might remain behind, and improvised rescue could create security or logistical risks. The documentary is most persuasive when it shows moral responsibility under scarcity: people had to act without enough time, capacity, or reliable guidance to save everyone to whom they felt accountable (Kennedy, 2014).

Operation Frequent Wind and the USS Kirk

Operation Frequent Wind began on April 29, 1975, after attacks on Tan Son Nhut airport made fixed-wing evacuation increasingly dangerous. Helicopters carried evacuees from Saigon to U.S. Navy ships offshore while crowds gathered at the embassy and other pickup points. Crews on ships pushed some South Vietnamese helicopters into the sea after their passengers landed because deck space was urgently needed for additional aircraft. These scenes combine rescue with visible evidence of collapse. The operation moved thousands of people to safety, yet many Vietnamese who expected or had been promised evacuation remained behind when flights ended. The USS *Kirk* sequence broadens the film beyond the embassy by showing South Vietnamese pilots, sailors, officers, parents, and civilians making their own dangerous decisions. They are not merely passive recipients of American assistance. Their actions demonstrate agency during state collapse and complicate a narrative centered only on U.S. rescuers. The evacuation was therefore an extraordinary logistical achievement embedded within a larger political and humanitarian failure (Kennedy, 2014; Public Broadcasting Service, 2015).

The Longer War Behind April 1975

The documentary also becomes clearer when the 1975 crisis is placed within the longer history of French colonialism, Vietnamese nationalism, civil conflict, and Cold War intervention. Ho Chi Minh and the Viet Minh fought French colonial rule before Vietnam became a major arena of U.S.-Soviet-Chinese competition. The 1954 French defeat at Dien Bien Phu and the Geneva settlement temporarily divided Vietnam, after which the United States increasingly supported the anti-communist

South while the Soviet Union and China aided the communist North. These outside powers mattered greatly, but Vietnamese actors pursued their own political goals rather than functioning merely as proxies. The South also experienced coups, authoritarian rule, factional conflict, and questions of legitimacy. By 1975, Nguyễn Văn Thiệu—not former emperor Bảo Đại—had been the dominant South Vietnamese president during the final phase. This wider context prevents the evacuation from becoming a self-contained American drama and explains why the fall of Saigon carried radically different meanings for communists, refugees, veterans, and South Vietnamese civilians (Asselin, 2018; Herring, 2014).

Documentary Perspective and Historical Limits

Kennedy's filmmaking is effective precisely because it is selective. Archival footage, maps, interviews, photographs, and rapid editing make the shrinking evacuation window feel immediate, while participant testimony turns strategy into memory and moral burden. The film includes important South Vietnamese voices, yet its narrative structure still centers Americans deciding whom they can help. It gives less sustained attention to ordinary North Vietnamese soldiers and civilians, antiwar South Vietnamese perspectives, people who stayed in Saigon, or those who interpreted communist victory as national reunification. That imbalance does not invalidate the documentary; it defines its scope. A film about evacuation cannot simultaneously become a complete history of colonialism, bombing, revolution, state repression, and Vietnamese civil society. Viewers gain the most from the documentary when they treat it as one perspective among several and compare its memories with Vietnamese, American, and international scholarship. Its strongest historical lesson is that military withdrawal does not erase relationships, promises, or risks created by a long intervention (Kennedy, 2014; Asselin, 2018).

Conclusion

Last Days in Vietnam succeeds as both documentary history and moral inquiry because it presents the fall of Saigon through decisions made under rapidly disappearing options. The film shows delayed preparation, collapsing military conditions, improvised rescue, and the painful fact that evacuation capacity could never match the number of people in danger. Operation Frequent Wind and the USS *Kirk* reveal courage and adaptability, but they do not transform the end of the war into an uncomplicated success. The broader history also matters: French colonialism, Vietnamese nationalism, Cold War intervention, South Vietnamese political instability, and U.S. strategic choices shaped the crisis long before April 1975. Kennedy's American-centered perspective should therefore be supplemented rather than dismissed. Its enduring contribution is to show that the end of a war creates responsibilities of its own. Withdrawal may terminate a military mission, but it cannot instantly dissolve the human relationships and political consequences created during intervention. In that sense, the final evacuation becomes a test of how states and individuals understand obligation after strategy has failed (Herring, 2014; Kennedy, 2014).

References

Kennedy, R. (Director). (2014). *Last Days in Vietnam* [Film]. Moxie Firecracker Films.

Public Broadcasting Service. (2015). *Last Days in Vietnam*. American Experience.

Asselin, P. (2018). *Vietnam's American war: A history*. Cambridge University Press.

Herring, G. C. (2014). *America's longest war* (5th ed.). McGraw-Hill.