



University of Tennessee, Knoxville
**TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative
Exchange**

Chancellor's Honors Program Projects

Supervised Undergraduate Student Research
and Creative Work

5-2014

The Medal of Honor: Transcending Perceptions of U.S. Foreign Policy and War

Taylor A. Hathorn
University of Tennessee - Knoxville, thathorn@utk.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_chanhonoproj

Recommended Citation

Hathorn, Taylor A., "The Medal of Honor: Transcending Perceptions of U.S. Foreign Policy and War" (2014). *Chancellor's Honors Program Projects*.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_chanhonoproj/1696

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Supervised Undergraduate Student Research and Creative Work at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Chancellor's Honors Program Projects by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

The Medal of Honor: Transcending Perceptions of U.S.

Foreign Policy and War

by

Taylor Annese Hathorn

This thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the Chancellor's Honors Program with the degree of

Honors: Journalism and Electronic Media, Business Administration

The University of Tennessee

2014

Abstract

The purpose of this work is to show the way in which the Medal of Honor alters the media coverage of a war. Using media coverage as the basis for public perception and opinion this thesis will show the ways in which the Medal of Honor transcends the typical coverage of war and the role it plays in doing so for each specific action.

This thesis will attempt to answer the question: How does media coverage vary between battle coverage and the Medal of Honor coverage? Thus highlighting the ways in which the Medal of Honor transcends public perceptions of U.S. foreign policy and war. I will be arguing that this media coverage will ultimately alter public opinion, but I want to see if the coverage of the Medal of Honor acts to change public perception of those specific battles. The results were that the Medal of Honor does not act to change coverage, but to fall in line with the public sentiments of that war and the battles discussed.

If one were to take this further it would be beneficial for research to be done that looks at the implications of social media and television on coverage of war and the Medal of Honor as well, in the same way that I evaluated newspapers throughout World War II, the Vietnam War, and The War in Afghanistan.

Keywords:

The Medal of Honor, War, American Perceptions of War, Heroes, Soldiers, Media Coverage, Vietnam, World War II, Afghanistan

Dedication

To the brave men and women who proudly serve our country, we recognize and appreciate all that you sacrifice both at home and abroad.

“To hear that there is this hierarchy of Medals, and that this is the highest medal you can receive, I don’t know of any recipient that wears it form themselves. We wear it for those that are around us, those that we served with, and for this country. There is a strand, a fiber, in this [medal] for you right now. It is out resilience it is our character as Americans.”

-Staff Sgt. Salvatore Giunta, Medal of Honor Recipient

Acknowledgements

Thank you to Dr. Nick Geidner, Michael Wiseman, and The School of Journalism and Electronic Media for all of their help and encouragement throughout my time with the Medal of Honor Project.

Table of contents

ABSTRACT.....	1
KEYWORDS:	1
DEDICATION.....	1
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	3
INTRODUCTION	5
METHODOLOGY	8
RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....	10
CONCLUSION.....	35
BIBLIOGRAPHY	37
APPENDIX A: WORLD WAR II.....	38
APPENDIX B: VIETNAM.....	47
APPENDIX C: AFGHANISTAN	12

Introduction

Partisan blinders tend to shape the opinions American have of United States foreign policy and American-led wars. A commonality throughout the United States is that you are either in support of our government officials' implemented policies or against those decisions. Having a strong opinion either way is not the issue, after all this is the United States; opinions are welcomed. The problem is that a very narrowed view of a problem that is much broader than most treat it, leads to an unintentional inability for many Americans to change their opinion when new information arises, henceforth an evident blindness that persists. But where does this public blindness originate? My answer, and one that I intend to show throughout this thesis, is that it lies in the media and our dependency on media as a holistic truth.

For the purpose of this thesis I will focus specifically on print because of the constant nature of that medium throughout all three wars that I will be analyzing: WWII, Vietnam, and Afghanistan. Although I will touch briefly on the impact that film had on changing the landscape of the media during Vietnam, this thesis will focus predominantly on print and the impact that it had throughout multiple battles on American understanding of war.

My primary focus is to look at the way in which journalists shape the public perception of war in regards to their coverage and then how the Medal of Honor acts to alter or confirm those perceptions. Although society as a whole claims to not have confidence in the mass media and their ability to report the news fairly and accurately (Fig. 1), we tend to gather most of our news from those same sources. (Fig. 2)

In general, how much trust and confidence do you have in the mass media -- such as newspapers, TV, and radio -- when it comes to reporting the news fully, accurately, and fairly -- a great deal, a fair amount, not very much, or none at all?





Figure 1

Source: GALLUP Online

Digital News Surpasses Newspapers, Radio

Where did you get news yesterday?



PEW RESEARCH CENTER 2012 News Consumption Survey.

Figure 2

Source: Pew Research Center Online

Taking it a step further, not only do we gather our news from these media platforms we depend on and form our perceptions from it. The theory of media dependency, developed in 1976 by Sandra Ball-Rokeach and Melvin Defleur, states that the more dependent an individual is on the media for receiving his or her information, the more important the media will be to that person. Steven W. Hook reflects on the impact that media has on Americans perceptions of U.S. foreign policy and the way in which they use the news:

Because of the large scale of these political systems, most people do not participate directly in the political process. Instead, they learn what their government is doing primarily by following news reports in the electronic and print media. The public places even greater dependence on the news media when it comes to foreign policy issues, which commonly involve faraway and seldom-seen people and places. (Hook 252)

This dependency is not the public's fault. Throughout history, specifically in terms of U.S. foreign relations and war, the media are often the only segway that the public has into what is developing in other nations. Since the media has the access, people then use the media for their understanding of foreign policy and war, that coverage then allows the public to form an opinion, which may alter their perception of a war. My goal is to analyze the affect that print media has had during war and conclude whether that same impact is evident when the coverage of the awarding of a Medal of Honor is introduced.

This thesis will attempt to answer the question: How does media coverage vary between battle coverage and the Medal of Honor coverage? Arguing that this same media coverage will ultimately alter public opinion.

Methodology

Throughout this thesis I will be evaluating news coverage of individual battles during WW II, Vietnam, and Afghanistan we will call this “Time 1.” I will also be evaluating the coverage about the specific wars that has no relation to the Medal of Honor. I will then look at the coverage of the awarding of the Medal of Honor, in regards to those same battles, to determine if there is a change in the way journalists refer to the battles, this will be titled “Time 2.”

In order to reflect a variety all articles were randomly selected throughout a multitude of historical databases such as ProQuest Historical Newspapers including papers from: The Wall Street Journal, The Boston Globe, The Chicago Tribune, USA Today, The Washington Post, and The New York Times. The random selection was carried out through a series of search terms. For time 1 I included specific battle titles, war titles (relevant to the era I was studying), and soldiers. The filters of ‘article’ and ‘war news’ were always selected to provide consistency. I chose the top group of articles from the generated list. ProQuest Historical Databases show these as the articles with the highest relatable search to my keywords. This random selection, without me reading the articles prior to, is important to the research because no bias was used during selection. During WWII I used 10 articles, Vietnam 16 articles, Afghanistan 11 articles. The number of articles was selected by a fair amount in comparison to the number that showed up in the search that met my criterion.

My initial process was to compare the adjectives that were used throughout the articles, but I found that none of the journalists were that blatant in their descriptions. Thus, I began looking at the language and tone differences throughout the text. Using the phrases that journalists used from each era allowed me to use the media coverage as a reflection of public

opinion. By evaluating the tone from both time 1 and time 2 from several articles and newspapers this allowed me to see how the Medal of Honor transcends original perceptions of U.S. foreign policy and war, through both the eye of the public and the media, and the implications of such.

Results and Discussion

World War II

“WW II, we regard this as the last “good war.” It truly was good vs. evil. We were the good guys, the right guys. What happened with media, correspondents that were covering the war in Europe were essentially behind the lines, they were way back from the front. They were essentially just getting second hand information from leaders. The only guy who really went up to the front was a guy named Ernie Pyle, other than that most of the reporting was second hand. You would be back in the HQ and the information officer would come up and tell you stuff. The material Americans were getting back home was very censored, very carefully censored.”

- Dr. James Gilchrist, University of Tennessee, Political Science

This war was the difference between right (Allied Forces) and wrong (Axis Forces), a morality war if you will. After the embarrassment and defeat that Germany suffered during World War I, they needed to get back on their feet; the man for the job was Adolf Hitler. Although he seemed crazy to most, Hitler provided a plan that included stability for many Germans who were unemployed, starving, and searching for hope. After the signing of a neutrality agreement with Russia, allowing German forces into Poland without interference, the Allied forces started sensing great concern for a potential fascist and communistic take over. France and Britain were both forced to declare war against Hitler and the Nazi forces when they continued to advance their front. President Franklin D. Roosevelt felt that America was called to come to the aid of their allies of both France and Britain, regardless of the popular desire to stay out of war.

There was a sense of denial throughout the United States, the country was on the rise from the fatalities in World War I, wives had their husbands, and mothers had their sons. The country was also still on the mend from the Great Depression. “[William L. Shirer] he and other

reporters would send back their stories about German atrocities, only to find them shoved to the back of the newspaper or the bottom of the broadcast, if they were used at all.” (Willis 120) Once German aggression started heightening for all to see, Government officials knew the fear of a communist regime spread from the Axis forces could not be ignored. Committees across the United States like “The Committee to Defend America by Aiding the Allies” were formed and President Roosevelt told Americans to get ready for war. They were to become “the great arsenal of democracy.” President Roosevelt made a point to persuade American’s on why they should be on the side of the interventionists “a British defeat would mean German domination of Europe as well as Asia, Australia, Africa, and the seas.” (Willis 122) On December 7, 1941 the unprovoked attack on Pearl Harbor by Japanese forces pushed Americans over the edge. They were not going to stand for an attack on United States soil, and intended to prove to the communists exactly which power reigned supreme.

The following article reviews of both the battles of Iwo Jima and the Normandy Invasion, during World War II, reflect the sentiment of the war and perceptions of the American public at the time. Americans were angry and wanted revenge for the lives lost at Pearl Harbor, Propaganda filled the streets, and everyone was on board to spread democracy and stop the Axis forces from spreading any further. Unlike wars in the future, the wordings throughout the text of these articles are very uplifting and supportive. The loss of life is presented as heroism, which acts as a catalyst to sanitize the war and make the massive loss of life a reflection of the good and the duty that Americans have to defend democracy and this country. Films were made about the United States involvement in World War II, even throughout the time of loss.

“The photo of the flag-raising at Iwo Jima inspired Americans and made them even more grateful for the job their troops were doing overseas. As for the government, they saw in this single photo a chance to raise more funds through the sale of war bonds; enough money that might enable the country to bring a speedier end to the war in the Pacific.” (Willis 123)

Americans were proud of the fact that every dime given and everything their boys over seas did; helped the effort of the world, of the good guys. Even when there was bad news given, the public rallied, Americans were supporting the troops and the effort. The theme that I found throughout the articles that did not mention the Medal of Honor was the same theme that was reflected throughout the articles with mention of the Medal of Honor. There was a reflection of pride, a sense of duty, and a responsibility to a nation. This theme throughout the articles is conducive to the public sentiment during that time.

3/16/1945 “4,000 Marine Dead on Iwo Indicated: Admiral Turner Says Loss Was Less Than Fifth of Japanese Killed – Operation Praised”

- “Because of those who have conquered Iwo Jima, we bow our heads in humble appreciation to those who, never questioning their orders, have made Iwo Jima ours.”
- “I cannot help but express my wholehearted respect and admiration for those fighting troops of the Fifth Amphibious Corps, their steadfast courage is magnificent.”

3/17/1945 “Woman’s Plea to End Iwo Battle Revealed”

- “Having chosen to fight, we had then, and have now, no final means of winning battles except through the valor of the Marine or Army soldier who, with rifle and grenades, storms enemy positions, takes them and holds them. There is no short cut or easy way. I wish there were.”

3/18/1945 “Camera Man Hails Iwo Jima Marines”

- “Joe Rosenthal, Associated Press photographer, who saw Iwo Jima’s bloodiest fighting and took a famous picture, came home today humble, he said, before the gallantry of the marines.”
- “After looking at it, I think it is a good picture, I think it reflects credit on the marines. It symbolizes their gallant actions. That was the toughest fight they ever had.”

4/1/1945 “Twin Sons Named Iwo and Jima”

- “Mrs. Martha Johnson has named her twin sons Iwo and Jima. Their father, George, is in the Navy.”

Looking at the media as a driver of public opinion, the integration of the Medal of Honor proves no change in public opinion during this time period. American pride is just as strong, in fact even more fervent with medals and awards given. In World War II, the medal and recipients were seen as a beacon of hope, honor, and valor. These soldiers were heroes, symbols of the American spirit.

12/18/1944 “Home Town Greets Medal of Honor Man Who Slew 18 Nazis After Brother Was Killed”

- “A crowd of some 200 welcomers joined the hero soldier’s parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Ethlers, when an Army plane brought him to the municipal airport, ending a trip that began last Wednesday in France.”
- “He went immediately to the home of his parents, to whom he had written that he did not want to come home yet because ‘I have a score to settle with the Jerries in Berlin.’”
- “Other officials promised a parade in his honor and a celebration with speeches and everything.”

10/6/1945 “Top Medal Award is conferred on 14: The President Conferring Nation’s Highest Honor on War Heroes”

- “President Truman bestowed the highest award of a grateful nation, the Congressional Medal of Honor, on eleven marines and three other Navy heroes of Pacific fighting today and then called on all Americans to fight for a ‘peaceful world so that this war will not have been in vain.’”
- “The youngest man honored was the 17-year-old marine private Jacklyn H. Lucas. In the bloody battle for Iwo Jima he put the lives of his comrades above his own by falling on one Japanese grenade and pulling another under his belly to absorb the full impact of the explosion and came back to tell about it.”
- “His citation tells the story of Feb. 26 this year, the day he killed seventy-five Japanese to destroy sixteen enemy positions on Iwo. Armed with a bazooka gun, Corporal Jacobson charged into the Japanese fire and, in the worlds of the Marine Corps, ‘contributed to essentially the success of his division’s operations against that fanatically defended outpost of the Japanese empire.’”
- “Sout-hearted and indomitable in the face of extreme peril, Private Sigler effected the release of his besieged company from enemy fire and contributed essentially to its further advance against a savagely fighting enemy.”

6/15/1946 “The Commander in Chief Congratulating Medal of Honor Recipients”

- This article is important because of the photograph. Although no mention of the battles or citations; Shown are the five recipients laughing and joking with President Truman. This reflects the notion that these men were not even affected by the war, giving the public perception that all was good and well.

12/9/1947 “Ships to be Named For 8 War Heroes: General Officers and Winners of Medal of Honor Designated for Honors on Coast”

- “The names of deceased Army personnel will be given to eight ships as signed to the San Francisco Port. Four transports of the P-2 Class are to be renamed for distinguished general officers of World War II and four victory Class cargo ships will carry the names of Medal-of-Honor soldiers.”

6/26/1948 “Honored For Outstanding Heroism in World War II”

- “They won the nation’s highest tribute for risking their lives under intense German and Japanese fire. The presentation ceremonies were in the Rose Garden of the White House.”

- “The citation said his inspiring leadership was largely responsible for keeping the California in action during the attack.”

1/26/1955 “Medal of Honor Hero Trades Lieutenantcy For Sergeancy ‘to Get Back With Troops’”

- Caption: “Jake William Lindsey admires a master sergeant’s jacket. The 33-year-old former infantryman wears Medal of Honor.”
- “A rugged, 33 year old war hero who calls his wounds “nicks”-and doesn’t remember how many times he was ‘nicked’-gave up his second lieutenant’s bars in the Army for the stripes of a master sergeant yesterday.”
- “He gave as his reason for resigning his commission, ‘I want to get back with the troops.’”
- “I suppose once you’re a soldier, you’re always a soldier. I was a sergeant so long; it’s hard to get over it. My sergeant’s tactics don’t go as an officer. In battle, rank doesn’t matter very much.”
- “I’ve got thirteen years in and seventeen more to go. This being back in now as a master sergeant and being with my men is the greatest.”

The take away from this examination of the coverage of the battles of Iwo Jima and Normandy within World War II and the examination of the article mentions of the Medal of Honor is to show that the Medal of Honor does not combat the journalists intent for the emotion behind the text, but rather highlights it. Although media coverage does have the ability to alter public sentiment many times, such as this, it also reflects popular opinion. The Medal of Honor does not transcend any perceptions here because it again reflects the sentiment of the time and highlights the already preconceived opinions that the American public had.

Vietnam War

“We lost a lot of people [in Vietnam.] There was one battle that we lost... 155 dead, 125 wounded, in one day. No one wins in war, no one. You try to make the other guy lose so much that he wants to quit.” Lt. Col. Bruce P. Crandall, United States Army

Communism was yet again on the rise, this time in Vietnam. The world had already witnessed the largest loss of life of any war in history with World War II and this newer generation was still witnessing the recovery of that war through their parents. American's were made aware by Johnson that if they did not support the civilians in South Vietnam, this domino affect of a communist take over of South Vietnam was going to spread quickly. Congress voted to support President Lyndon B. Johnsons request for involvement, with the exception of two Senators. Initially this war was labeled a “conflict” and most were not concerned.

If everyone was on board, then when did tensions begin to get heated? Why were there so many protests throughout the Vietnamese conflict? How did the media play into America's support of Vietnam? The lack of fervent support from the public did not rise from nothing. The Vietnam War was a very costly war to Americans, but not just in terms of the 58,000 American lives lost. America lost faith in their leadership, their trust in the government's ability to be open and honest, and the press was helping that. “It became clear to the Johnson and Nixon administrations that the press was fueling public opinion about the war and that conducting the war under such intense media scrutiny was extremely hard.” (Willis 127)

The first wave of public disapproval was October of 1965 when the draft went from 3000 monthly to 33,000. If you could afford to wave your involvement in the draft, for example by going to college, you were left alone. Sadly, many of the poor working class Americans were not

afforded that luxury. The dissent of the war began to heat up during the Tet Offensive (Jan. 30, 1968). The Tet Offensive, which was the largest military attack/strategy used by either side up to that point, proved to be a defeat for the communists after the initial stunning of U.S. and South Vietnamese Forces. Yet, this is the turning point when Americans began to realize that they had not been given the entire picture of the loss of life that was occurring, in regards to both United States soldiers and Vietnamese civilians.

As part of this effort to guide the news media into buying into this theme, Johnson brought Westmoreland to Washington, D.C. to address a large gathering of journalists, reporting that America was winning the war and that the end was in sight. This speech was highly publicized, and it seemed for awhile as if much of America was buying the idea, until January 1968 when the North Vietnamese regular army and the Viet Cong launched an all-out offensive (called the "TET" or New Year offensive) against 100 cities in South Vietnam, including Saigon itself. The fury and magnitude of this attack convinced much of America that the war was not being won. (Willis 127)

The Tet Offensive proved that South Vietnam could not defend itself from the Communist north, even with the years of French and American aid; the American public began to question our involvement. The media played a huge role in the public opinion about Vietnam, this was the first conflict where they were given free reign to roam and report their own stories rather than stay with a military supervisor, this was very unlike the heavy censorship in World War II. This was also known as the first television war where Americans could really see the impact of what was taking place in Vietnam, rather than just look at words on paper. The government began to

see that the press were fueling the public opinion about their war. The press's ability to release all information made it very difficult to conduct wartime decisions with the public protesting at every turn. "... the press is a big determinant of the American public opinion, and this was certainly the case with the Vietnam War ... They became aware that what the government and military were saying, as opposed to what was happening before their eyes in Vietnam, were not one and the same." (Willis 128)

The inside information from the press, turned into an outcry of dissent which led to protests, but not just toward our government. Soldiers returning home began to serve as punching bags to the public's dissatisfaction of their government. "War leaves those who fought with scars, but the scars Vietnam veterans bear are different from those who fought in other wars for the United States. In no other conflict were those who fought in it scorned by their fellow Americans upon their return. The latest Gallup poll shows 72% of Americans believe that the people of the United States have not treated Vietnam veterans well in the years since the war." (Gillespie) The following article comparisons highlight the disapproval of American involvement in the war. I specifically looked at instances of Ia Drang and the Tet offensive. With a series of negative connotations underlying throughout the text you can see that this was the first time that the press became gutsy enough to raise questions, and the public answered. I have the following articles listed by date so that you can tell the advancement in press/public dissent throughout the progression in time of the war.

The following compare titles and a few statements from the text(s):

11/26/1965 “Death Struggle Seen in Highlands”

- “...Total Community Strength in the Highlands is believed to exceed the command allied strength. Even the most optimistic estimate holds that it takes five government or allied troops to counter each guerrilla in this kind of war.”
- “Despite the infusion of an American division into that section of the Annamese Cordillera, the Western position seems deteriorating because of more rapid North Vietnamese reinforcement and a heavy toll among government troops in intermittent clashes.”

11/11/1967 “Buildup in Ground Warfare Reflects Red Determination”

- “Initiative seems more important to the Communists than their casualties. ‘Our losses are not important. What was important at Loc Ninh was that we demonstrated we have the ability to attack, to gain the initiative when we want to.’”
- “This war cry has been made before, but never has the response been so evident.”
- “We know there are big clouds in the sky around here, but we don’t know where the rain will fall. That’s our problem with the communists.”

1/31/1968 “Washington Views Latest Red Assaults in Vietnam as Prelude to Peace Moves”

- “The Administration often before has displayed optimism only to see it proved unfounded, and of course the Administration constantly faces a temptation to put the best interpretation upon the worst news.”
- “Admittedly, Communist thinking actually may be headed in the opposite direction [of peace]. If Hanoi can muster the strength for a prolonged large-scale offensive, it could be aiming at stirring a big surge of end-the-war sentiment in the U.S. and, even if it’s aiming at early peace talks, it could be a long road to a peace agreement.”
- “The attacks proved that the seven-day truce the communists had [Tet] proclaimed was a hoax and a fraud.”
- “The military opinion that the attacks were primarily for purposes of harassment was bolstered by the size of the Vietcong forces used.”

2/1/1968 “Time for Decision in Vietnam”

- “Unless we are prepared to let the communists take over South Vietnam, we shall have to keep many more troops there than the 50,000 we now have in South Korea, more than 14 years after the armistice. There will be repeated humiliations of the United States in the South China Sea like the seizure of the Pueblo in the Sea of Japan, and there will be more Koreas, more Vietnams. Thailand, which we are committed to defend, is next on the communist ‘liberation’ program.”
- “Undoubtedly this spectacular show of strength was intended to paralyze the will of the United States for continued support of South Vietnam against communist aggression and create conditions for a negotiated settlement on the enemy’s terms.”

4/21/1968 “Security Procedure Criticized”

- “The Defense Department reacted quickly, as it does to any sign of dissent in its ranks.”
- “The patients supervisor will determine his fitness for duty. If he is fit, it means he no longer disagrees with U.S. policy. If he isn’t fit, then he must leave.”
- “He [the doctor] was prepared to give a verdict on the fit for duty question. The trouble about this is that a psychiatrist does not get paid if he does not reveal all the information requested by the Defense Department.”

8/12/1968 “Saigon: Off Stage Center and Uneasy”

- “A mood of unease and of anger seems to have descended on Americans here during the past few weeks, complementing the hot, humid summer that also is settling in.”
- “... the news here now is more implicit in the questions not being asked than in the answers not being given; the significance is more in the silences than the statements.”
- “Tens of thousands of homeless, destitute Vietnamese still crowd emergency refugee camps throughout the country, yet human misery has become a tiresome topic.”
- “Peace, after all, is not a very likely prospect and the hopes will fade. Perhaps peace pressures will produce an explosion here, another coup d’etat. If peace contacts fail, the war could sharply escalate.”

An interesting aspect of the reporting are the articles that are released that are direct quotes from the military. They carry an entirely different tone than those mainly written by the journalists. The tone is more uplifting throughout with a definite “America is in the right” prose. Especially the articles referencing the Tet Offensive, the military spokesperson acts as if America still has the upper hand, which is not reflective of the sentiment of the public.

11/20/1965 “Air Blows Smash North Viet Human Wave Assaults”

- “A U.S. Spokesperson said a Vietnamese paratrooper detachment heading south toward the valley ran into a stiff fight. He reported heavy fire from North Vietnamese regulars inflicted light casualties and help up the reinforcements.”
- “It was hand to hand combat, a real infantry action. So you can expect these casualties.”
- “...they took on a large force and did a great deal of damage.”
- “I would say they performed like you hoped green soldiers would perform. They all fought like pros, whether they were draftees or regulars.”
- “It renews your faith in man’s ability to stay alive.”
- “It was a risk to take. It worked beautifully.”

11/22/1965 “Home are the Heroes... Boys Now Men”

- “The brave young boys who left their youth behind in the fighting of Ia Drang Valley came home like men ...”
- “You met tough, professional, capable enemy troops and you gave them a mauling they will never forget.”
- “But there would be no empty tents for the battalion. Fresh replacements arrived Saturday and have been assigned to the cots of the fallen ... ‘Try not to wake them up,’ a captain said half-heartedly, ‘they just got here and they are tired.’”

2/2/1968 “Westmoreland: Foe’s Biggest Push To Come”

- “Not completely. I felt there would be fireworks during the Tet lunar New Year period.”
- “‘He apparently hoped the people would join his ranks,’ Westmoreland said. He said the ‘popular reactions seems to be one of outrage.’”
- “The next phase of this master plan we have seen unfold during the past several days. D-day for this plan was set at Tet despite the fact that the Communists had made quite a point that they would observed a cease-fire at Tet.”
- “The second phase of the campaign was a bold one. It was characterized by treachery and deceitfulness. It showed a callous disregard for human life and it brought about considerable disruption in a number of towns and cities. The enemy has paid dearly.”
- “There is, however, evidence to suggest that he’s about to run out of steam. On the other hand, he does still have some reserves that are yet to be committed. We are aware of these. I’m confident that nay further initiatives can be blunted.”
- “When he does attack, he will have to accept great risk because of the preparation we have made and the fire power available to us.”

8/12/1972 “Pride Worn Thin as Yanks Leave Viet”

- “Now as the last American infantrymen have stood down-with determination dissipated to boredom, pride worn thin.”
- “By then it was too late and the American public was aroused about the war. The military wanted to push the American troop level over the 600,000 mark. That attempt failed, and the stage was set for gradual withdrawal.”

Viewing the media as a driver of public opinion, the integration of the Medal of Honor into the conversation proves no change in public perception about the war or conflicts. American pride during this time is just as weak; the Medal does not act as sanitization of war or affirmation of pride and triumph. In fact, Medal of Honor recipients were not portrayed the same way that they were throughout World War II. Rather than heroes, these recipients were a reflection of the

battles and rigid nature of the conflict in Vietnam. They were not given the welcome home, the parade of pride and honor that they deserved; that the men of the Second World War received.

Lt. Col. Bruce P. Crandall, United States Army commented, “The way they [the American public] treated us when we came back from Vietnam was totally unacceptable, but today you see the troops in the airport; they’re in their uniforms and everyone is saying “Thank you for your service.” During our day we couldn’t come off of the military installation in uniform [for the potential of harassment.]”

The presentation of the Medal is transformed throughout the articles as the dissent of war grows over time. The recognition of the Medal and the recipients is strong in the first few years (mentions) but as the American public grows wary of the conflict and dissatisfied with the government, the praise begins to decrease.

*These articles were a random selection through multiple databases.

11/25/1965 “Charges Viet Foe To Show Way To Mates: Yank is Credited with 18 Killed”

- The article begins “I may as well go up and do it myself, I wouldn’t ask my men to do anything I wouldn’t do.”
- The illustration in the article is of Lt. Joe Marm with his mouth sewn shut showing a dedication of sacrifice courage and resilience.

6/24/1966 “Medal of Honor Awarded Fourteenth Veteran of Vietnam”

- The illustration of this article is President Lyndon B. Johnson holding the daughter of First Lieut. Charles Q. Williams out side of the White House following the Medal of Honor Ceremony, reflecting a sentiment of family and honor.
- There was a reflection of light humor throughout the article. The Lieut. Stated, “As President Eisenhower said, with all due respect to you, sir, and your duties, he would

rather have the Medal of Honor than be President of the United States. These are my sentiments.”

- “The lieutenant had words of praise for the members of the Army Special Forces group and the Navy Seabees.”
- “For our deceased comrades who are not with us today from Dongxoai, if I may offer some small condolence to loved ones, these brave and courageous men did not die in vain, but for a true and just cause which makes our great country what it is today.”
- “a patriot’s gift to his country.”

12/20/1966 “Lieutenant, Iadrang Hero, Wins the Medal of Honor”

- The illustration of this article is the parents of Lieut. Walter J. Marm Jr. after the Medal of Honor ceremony with their son smiling proudly at his Medal.
- “By your courage and skill, you have set an example which will bring new strength and resolution to all American fighting men.”
- This excerpt reflects the dedication that the military and the public initially had for those honored with the medal. “The Army provided a full honor ceremony with a 19- gun salute for the young officer from Washington, PA., who was wounded in the battle that brought him the Medal of Honor.”
- “Personal courage is a magnificent thing. The ability to lead other men in the face of extreme danger is a rare gift.”
- “... in a situation that demanded all a fighting man could give, he responded with total disregard for self.”

12/20/1966 “Hero Eager to Fight again”

- “... the nations newest congressional Medal of Honor winner, said today that he thinks “it’s about time” he went back to Vietnam.”
- “... he had decided to make the army his career and that he would like to go back to Vietnam. He was asked why, but, before he could reply, his mother Mrs. Dorothy Marm, cut in and said, only half in jest, ‘That’s what I’d like to know.’”

- “I’m a professional soldier and that’s how I can best fulfill my obligation, either by fighting or by training others.”
- “Then, despite wounds in the face and neck, he killed the remaining machine gunners with rifle fire.”

3/10/1967 “President Gives Medal of Honor to Medic: Paratrooper Hailed as a Selfless Hero in Vietnam War”

- “Ruffles, flourishes, honor guards and 21 salvos of salute-the kind normally offered only to visiting chiefs of state- were offered to the 39-year-old soldier who was the first medic to be so honored in Vietnam”
- “He heard himself praised for gallantry that saved the lives of many men and inspired the performance of many more.”

POST TET- OFFENSIVE: A reflection of the turning point in the war of American Public Opinion on Vietnam

11/19/1968 “Johnson To Present 5 Medals of Honor”

- This article is incredibly basic. It lists the soldiers citations, dates of actions, using no words of gallantry or heroism as in the last group of articles.

1/17/1969 “Johnson Awards Medal of Honor to Four Heroes of Vietnam War”

- The first fourth of this article is about the fact that this is President Johnsons last medal presentation while in office. The rest of the article just lists the citation and reflects upon the fact that two of the recipients are from the same hometown. The word hero is used in the article title, but there was no public display for these men as there was previously.

3/30/1969 “Medal of Honor Winner Enlists Again After Year”

- Unlike the display and full length article that Lieut. Joe Marm received prior to the change in American perception of the war, about the same thing that Sgt. Dolby is doing; Sgt. Dolby received an article two paragraphs long including a statement from the Sgt.
- “Sergeant Dolby of Suburban Oaks said he felt he was better suited to helping his fellow man in the army.”

War In Afghanistan

has become America's longest war, continuing over 12 years since our first entrance in 2001 following the attacks of September 11th. Gallup polls show that Americans were more supportive of our entrance into this war than any since World War II.

Four Wars: Timeline Until Plurality Said War Was a Mistake

	Mistake to be involved militarily	Not a mistake
	%	%
AFGHANISTAN		
Nov 8-11, 2001*	9	89
Feb 6-9, 2014**	49	48
IRAQ		
Mar 24-25, 2003*	23	75
Jun 21-23, 2004**	54	44
VIETNAM		
Aug 27-Sep 1, 1965*	24	60
Oct 6-11, 1967**	47	44
KOREA		
Aug 20-25, 1950*	20	65
Jan 1-5, 1951**	49	38

* First survey asking if military involvement was a mistake

** First survey in which a plurality said military involvement was a mistake

GALLUP

Figure 3

Source: Gallup Online

The War In Afghanistan is an entirely different beast than the Vietnam War. This difference is predominantly seen in the nature of the United States being on the defense after September 11th, much like America during World War II with the attacks on Pearl Harbor. Americans were already opinionated about war, which was evident from the remnants of Vietnam; they no longer blindly trusted the government. With the introduction of Internet, extremely fast technology, camera availability around every corner; nothing was kept under lock and key, including American perception and opinions of war. Americans, now more than ever,

have an opinion about everything and need not rely fully on the news anymore to form those. Although we do rely some on the interpretation, we are more wary to blindly trust the media due to their bias (Fig. 4).

“In many instances, journalists were acting too: doing reports which were based, not on any actual newsgathering, but on press releases and agency stories which had been read to them down the satellite phone from studios in London or Washington prior to their live pieces to camera. Yet if the media were guilty, as Air Marshal Burrige suggested, of turning war into ‘reality TV’ and ‘infotainment’ (The Telegraph, 7 April 2003), so too were the military.”

(Hammond)

Americans' Perceptions of Media Bias

In general, do you think the news media are -- [ROTATED: too liberal, just about right, or too conservative]?




Figure 4

Source: Gallup Online

Yet, because of this reflection of bias, the media seemed to truly reflect the perceptions of all Americans and argued both sides with the introduction of opinion segments on television and political leaning news networks such as Fox News and CNN. Because of the means and willingness of travel from foreign correspondents working in the multimillion dollar media companies, Americans were able to get a first hand view with consistent video, pictures, and

interpretation daily. “Despite the administrations’ best efforts to put a positive face on the war and to ask Americans for patience, the daily media reports focused mostly on the negative aspects of the war: the steady drumbeat of the dead and wounded U.S. troops, the increased fighting in the provinces, the toll on civilians, and the questionable results from all of it.” (Willis 133)

Although the visual facets of coverage are easier for the public to understand and conceptualize, the written interpretations were just as strong in Afghanistan coverage as they were in both World War II and the Vietnam War. The text speaking out about what happened in Afghanistan was now more detailed than ever before, American society was different. This was no longer the keep your head down and say nothing society of the past. Americans had a voice; soldiers had a voice. Although older generations reflected this sentiment as well, citizens during this era were very vocal about wanting to know what was really happening overseas and what their tax dollars and the sacrifice of their family and friends were going toward and they weren’t afraid to ask questions to get it.

It took eight years before the majority of Americans started questioning the involvement in Vietnam; with Afghanistan it took a matter of minutes. One can see the change in culture from the smallest textual comparisons. During WW II and Vietnam, many Medal of Honor recipients did not speak out about the medal or who they were wearing it for, now practically every recipient that has been given the medal takes a public stance on the fact that they are wearing the medal for their friends that they lost in conflict, that none of them like war, that no one should like war. This sentiment is reflected throughout the text below and furthermore in the articles listed in the Appendix. These are our heroes now; just as brave and gallant as those of the past conflicts, but with a generational change that is evident in more than the weaponry that they use.

The following text comparisons show yet another defense that public perception and media coverage go hand in hand, the only difference with this “new media” and “new war” is that all sides of an opinion are publicly reflected through coverage. An element of this new war, as reflected in the following text, shows that rather than just labeled as soldiers; they are now referred to as Americans throughout most of the media coverage. The new type of coverage allows us to put a face to the war and the loss, which no longer sanitizes the coverage of war.

8/14/2005 “Marines and Afghans Drive Against Rebels Tied to Deadly Attacks”

- “United States Marines and Afghan troops launched an offensive on Saturday to take from insurgents a remote mountain valley that was tied to the deadliest blow against American forces since the Taliban government was ousted nearly four years ago.”
- “The offensive came at the end of a deadly week for American forces in Afghanistan. Seven Americans have died.”
- “We want them running for their lives way up in the hills where they can’t attack polling stations. We want to isolate them from the community.”

2/24/2008 “Battle Company is Out There”

- “The counterinsurgency in Afghanistan’s Korengal Valley is one day after another of difficult decisions and bloody consequences. Hearts and minds are hardening.”
- “He had been in Iraq and told me he had gone emotionally dead there with all the dying and killing, and stayed that way until the birth of his son a year ago. His hardest day in Iraq was when a close friend, Rob Shaw, was severely wounded by an improvised explosive device that killed his first sergeant and a bunch of their friends – and the next thing he knew their colonel was asking Kearney to step in for Shaw and lead the company. But as hard as Iraq was, he said, nothing was as tough as the Korengal.”

- “‘My guys would tell me they didn’t know which houses they’re shooting from, and I’d tell them they can’t shoot back into the villages, they hated me.’ The insurgents were testing the new captain, he suspected, by deliberately shooting from homes.”
- “The insurgents regularly use civilians as shields, children as spotters and women as food suppliers, NATO killing civilians is great propaganda for the Taliban.”
- “It was a lot to ask of young soldiers; play killer, cultural anthropologist, hearts-and-minds winner, then kill again.”

10/31/08 “McCain and Obama Advisers Briefed on Deteriorating Afghan War”

- “The group was there to deliver a grim message: the situation in Afghanistan is getting worse.”
- “American intelligence officials believe that Taliban commanders are convinced that they are winning. Not only are they establishing themselves in larger swaths of the country, but their campaign of violence is shaking the will of European countries contributing troops to the NATO mission.”
- “Of more than 400 major tribal networks inside Afghanistan, the general said recently, most have been ‘traumatized by over 30 years of war, so a lot of that traditional tribal structure has broken down.’”

10/4/2009 “The Difference Between ‘We Must’ and ‘We Can’”

- “This summer, Mr. Obama described the effort in Afghanistan as “a war of necessity.” In such a war, you do whatever you need to do to win. But now, as criticism mounts from those who argue that we war in Afghanistan cannot, in fact, be won with more troops and a better strategy, the President is having second thoughts.”
- “The idea that American foreign policy must be founded upon a prudent recognition of the country’s capacities and limits, rather than its hopes and wishes, gained currency after World War II, possibly the last unequivocally necessary war in American history.”
- “Americans broadly agree that their government must at all costs prevent major attacks on American soil by Al Qaeda. But there the consensus ends, and their questions begin.”

- “What if the fall of Kabul would constitute not only an American abandonment of the Afghan people, but a major strategic and psychological triumph for Al Qaeda, and a recruiting tool of unparalleled value? ... In that case – and perhaps only in that case – Afghanistan really would be a war of necessity.”

The most interesting aspect of the new type of war that is fought is the way the Medal of Honor and its coverage ties in. For the first time throughout my research, the Medal is not simply a reflection of a public opinion, but serves to transcend and uphold a stronger symbol and example of valor and sacrifice, something that is long over due in terms of public perception and media coverage. Movies like ‘We were soldiers’ and ‘Medal of Honor’ highlights the sacrifice of these men and show the courage that they displayed. Every single text that I found showed the dedication of these men to their country. I have not figured out if it is because of our culture or because of the media coverage. At some point throughout history the men that received the Medal for actions during WW II and Vietnam were all recognized and honored, but never before have the Medal of Honor recipients served as such a beacon in the public eye. This is seen through every day facets of our society such as social media, public presence, and their openness about war.

11/14/2010 “In One Moment, Heroism and Heartbreak”

- “None of this had been part of the plan for Rock Avalanche, Battle Company’s six-day mission to tame the valley before the onset of winter. But then again, that is what war is, the mocking of plans. The reaction in those moments of mockery is why we have the Medal of Honor.”
- “And then Giunta said, “All my feelings are with my friends and they are getting smaller. I have sweat more, cried more, bled more in this country than in my own.””

- “On Tuesday Giunta will become the first living soldier to receive the Medal of Honor since Vietnam. He has said that if he is a hero then everyone who goes into the unknown is a hero. He has said he was angry to have a medal around his neck at the price of Brennan’s and Mendoza’s lives.”

11/17/2010 “Rare Honor for a Living Service Member”

- “In an emotional ceremony, President Obama on Tuesday awarded the Medal of Honor to an Army staff sergeant who placed himself in the line of fire in Afghanistan to try to save his squad mates and to protect and comfort a dying American soldier.”
- “By now, the East Room was so silent you could hear a rustle from across the room. One Army Officer took out a handkerchief and wiped his eyes.”
- “He crested a hill alone with no cover but the dust kicked up by the storm of bullets still biting into the ground.”
- “I lost two dear friends of mine, I would give this back in a second to have my friends with me right now.”

2/12/2014 “Obama awards Medal of Honor for valor in Afghan battle”

- “The investigation also found that Combat Outpost Keating ‘was tactically indefensible’ but that was what these soldiers were asked to do, defend the indefensible.”
- “He added: I accept this tremendous honor on behalf of all soldiers who have served with me that day. This award is for the eight soldiers that didn’t make it and for the rest of the team that fought valiantly and magnificently that day. I will forever be humbled by their bravery, their commitment to service and their loyalty to one another.”
- “That’s what these soldiers did for each other in sacrifice driven by pure love.”

8/26/2013 “Obama awards Medal of Honor to Staff Sgt. Ty Carter for heroism in Afghanistan”

- “... hopes to use the award to help others suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder.”
- “...absolutely critical to put an end to any stigma that prevents troops from getting treatment.”

- “Mace later died in surgery at a field hospital, and Carter blamed himself, believing that he had “failed” because he could not save the young specialist he had carried to safety.”
- “I’m hoping that I can help people through what I have to say, what I’ve experienced, to help them go seek help, or else we’re going to have more out there who self-medicate and end up taking their own lives.”

10/15/2013 “Former Army Capt. William Swenson receives Medal of Honor at White House”

- “Swenson’s path to the White House ceremony was a rocky one. After he criticized his army superiors, saying they failed to provide enough air and artillery support during the 2009 engagement, his medal nomination was delay for years. Army officials said his nomination packet was lost in a computer system for 19 months.”
- “It does not really belong to me; it belongs to that event and the people I stood with,” he said of the medal ... You could have told me it happened, and I wouldn’t have believed you. But it did, and it was captured on film. And it offered a glimpse of the humanity that does occur on battlefields.”

Conclusion

Throughout my analysis I have found that whether the Medal of Honor transcends American perceptions of US Foreign Policy and war is not the question. The way the public views the Medal of Honor is completely reflective of the current sentiments of the public opinion on that war and the public's direct relationship with the media.

Initially I expected to find that the mention of the Medal of Honor would act to change the perception of the war at hand, just like it changes the way that journalists write about the war in their articles. What I found is that although journalists change their language and voice when writing about the Medal of Honor, to that of more respect, that integration of the Medal into the war does not alter the overall public perception of that war.

To break it down:

In terms of World War II battles, the public was already in full support of the Allied Powers and their fight against the Axis Powers. Everything that took place in regards to battles about that war, American patriotism, consumption of steel, sacrifices the public made were in reflection with the public support of the involvement in World War II. Even during the mention of a negative situation, such as a mass loss of life, the underlying tone seemed to hint that although sad, the soldiers dying were not in vain because of the goal and mission of the war. Any mention of the Medal of Honor in the articles continued to build pride about America's involvement in the war. The Medal of Honor recipients were viewed as heroes and icons for younger soldiers and citizens alike to look up to.

Throughout Vietnam, the public sentiment of the war was not strong or encouraging. There was much dissent toward our involvement and many Americans did not see the point in sending so many to die for a cause that did not directly affect us. Due to, in part, the media coverage and the way in which it altered public opinion, any recognition of Medal of Honor recipients was not highlighted or given attention to like the soldiers of World War II that were so respected, admired, and labeled as American figure heads for the war.

Afghanistan's coverage was also reflective of both World War II and Vietnam's coverage in its unique way. The coverage was similar to World War II due to the public pride for the brave men that fight for us on a daily basis. In terms of the Vietnam War coverage similarities, public opinion is vocal and widely known and is reflected throughout the media and vice versa. Although many are proud of the Medal of Honor recipients, no one is jumping for joy over the recognition of the medals.

Throughout my research I have found that the mention of the Medal of Honor in the newspaper articles does not transcend public opinions about the war or individual battles mentioned. The recognition that the Medal of Honor receives and the tone in which it is mentioned is highly indicative of the current sentiment of the war that is reflected by the public in general.

Bibliography

- Gillespie, M. (2000, November 17). Americans Look Back at Vietnam War. *GALLUP*. Retrieved April 29, 2014, from <http://www.gallup.com/poll/2299/americans-look-back-vietnam-war.aspx>
- Hammond, P. (2007). The media war on terrorism. *Media, War & Postmodernity* (pp. 59-80). New York: Routledge.
- Hook, S. W. (2011). The Impact of Mass Communications. *U.S. Foreign Policy: The Paradox of World Power* (Third Edition ed., pp. 242-275). Washington, DC: CQ Press.
- Willis, J. (2007). Conducting War in the Media Age. *The media effect how the news influences politics and government* (pp. 117-135). Westport, Conn.: Praeger.

Appendix A: World War II

1 A

4,000 MARINE DEAD INDICATED: Admiral Turner Says Loss Was Less Than Fifth of Japanese Killed—Operation Praised

4,000 MARINE DEAD
ON TWO INDICATEDAdmiral Turner Says Loss Was
Less Than Fifth of Japanese
Killed—Operation Praised

By Wirephoto to The New York Times.
TWO ISLAND, March 15.—Vice Admiral Richmond K. Turner and Lieut. Gen. Holland M. Smith, two top commanders of the Iwo Jima operation, today explained the peculiar statement of crediting this struggle on the cresting of the Iwo Jima Marine Corps history.

Admiral Turner, who has overall command of the Iwo Jima operation, pointed out that marine death casualties were "less than one-fifth those of the defenders." This statement, he said, was "almost unbelievable and deserves the highest rank in military history; the economy of losses can reach no higher perfection."

Admiral Chester W. Nimitz, in a communique, previously estimated that 20,000 Japanese had been killed on Iwo. "But Admiral Turner's statement indicated that about 4,000 marines have been killed on the island. The associated press pointed out. An estimate of all marine casualties on Iwo gave a 5,000 total."

General Smith, who as head of the First Marine Force in the Pacific commanded all troops, said the cost had "no doubt" been considered beforehand.

Cost Carefully Weighed
"Capture of Iwo Jima, an outlying prefecture of Tokyo, was considered essential by those in whose hands the destiny of our nation lies," he declared. "The cost of winning this objective was no doubt weighed carefully against the importance of having this island as an operating base in speeding the ultimate defeat of Japan."

"When the capture of an enemy position is necessary to winning a war it is not within our province to evaluate the cost in money, time, equipment or, most of all, in human life. We are told that our objective is to be and we prepare to do the job, knowing that all evaluations have been considered by those who give us our orders."

Admiral Turner and General Smith both stressed that a direct frontal assault on a well-prepared position, which was bound to produce maximum casualties, was in Admiral Turner's words, "the only possible tactical method."

"Here," said Admiral Turner, "we cannot land where they want. We had to land where they were and accept the hazards."

Frontal Attack Only Way
"We knew we were faced with a formidable enemy who would fight tenaciously in defense of his homeland," said General Smith. "We knew we had only one way to attack—by frontal assault. We knew the Jap had had years to perfect his defenses. In doing so, he could register every available weapon on the only beaches possible every yard of ground that we would have to take before the island could be seized."

"Consequently we assembled a team that I feel is incomparable in all our history as to completeness—submarines, Army, Navy and Marine Corps fleet, battleships, cruisers, aircraft carriers, destroyers, transports and auxiliaries of all kinds. Our preparation for attack lasted for over two months. Starting on D-day minus three and continuing throughout the battle, naval gunfire and air support by carrier-based planes contributed in heroic measure to the accomplishment of our mission. Every effort was taken to accomplish our mission with as little loss of life as possible."

"We found after we had established our beachhead that the enemy had honeycombed the entire island with caves and tunnels, into which he crawled when our artillery bombing and naval gunfire were laying a barrage, only to reappear when the barrage lifted and other defenses against our advancing troops."

The Iwo operation was carefully planned and carried out by the most experienced commanders in the Pacific, General Smith and Admiral Turner agreed.

Generals Are Praised
"Especially to be commended," the Admiral said, "is the great tactical competence of the generals and all other ranks in the employment of their forces."

General Smith said that operation was entrusted to those whose experience in fighting the Jap is not exceeded.

"The commanding general of the Fifth Amphibious Corps (DEA), Gen. Harry Schmidt, has proved his ability at Roi-Namur, Saipan and Tinian," he added. "The generals of the three marine divisions as well as members of their staffs have outstanding backgrounds in World War I and many have demonstrated their ability in amphibious warfare against the Jap at Guadalcanal, Bougainville, Tarawa, Roi-Namur, Saipan, Tinian and Guam."

Both commanders paid the highest tribute to the courage of the Marines. Never in their 167-year history, said General Smith, has their nation's Marine Corps (always faithful) "been tried or challenged so greatly as in the capture of Iwo Jima."

"Because of those who have conquered Iwo Jima," he continued, "we bow our heads in humble appreciation to those who, never questioning their orders, have made Iwo Jima ours."

"I cannot help but express my wholehearted respect and admiration for those fighting troops of the Fifth Amphibious Corps. Admiral Turner said, "Their steadfast courage is magnificent."

The Admiral added "it must be understood that one sizable enemy group, snipers and small parties, remain on the island."

"These are well-armed and must be eliminated to permit us to proceed with the development of the base," he said. "This work will be tedious and perilous and may require weeks of patient effort."

Reprinted with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

2 A

WOMAN'S PLEA TO END IWO BATTLE REVEALED
New York Times (1923-Current file): Mar 17, 1945;
 ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)

pg. 7
**WOMAN'S PLEA TO END
 IWO BATTLE REVEALED**

WASHINGTON, March 15 (AP)—
 The Navy released today an exchange of correspondence between Secretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal and an unidentified woman who protested the heavy toll of life in the taking of Iwo Island. Said the Secretary: "There is no short cut or easy way. I wish there were."

Navy spokesmen said the letter it made public was typical of a number the department had received. It read:

"Please for God's sake stop sending our finest youth to be murdered on places like Iwo Jima. It is too much for boys to stand, too much for mothers and homes to take. It is driving some mothers crazy. Why can't objectives be accomplished some other way. It is most inhuman and awful—stop, stop."

Secretary Forrestal replied:

"On Dec. 7, 1941, the Axis confronted us with a simple choice: Fight or be overrun. There was then, and is now, no other possibility.

"Having chosen to fight, we had then, and have now, no final means of winning battles except through the valor of the Marine or Army soldier who, with rifle and grenades, storms enemy positions, takes them and holds them. There is no short cut or easy way. I wish there were."

Navy officials said it had no information whether the writer of the letter had a son or other close relative at Iwo Island. They declined to divulge her identity.

3 A

CAMERA MAN HAILS IWO JIMA MARINES; Rosenthal Turns Acclaim of His ...
 New York Times (1923-Current file); Mar 15, 1945;
 ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)

CAMERA MAN HAILS IWO JIMA MARINES

**Rosenthal Turns Acclaim of His
Flag-Raising Picture to
Tribute to Our Fighters**

SAN FRANCISCO, March 17 (AP)—Joe Rosenthal, Associated Press photographer, who saw Iwo Jima's bloodiest fighting and took a famous picture, came home today humble, he said, before the gallantry of the marines.

Mr. Rosenthal, member of the war-time still picture pool, made the historic picture of the marines raising the Stars and Stripes at the crater rim of Mount Suribachi. He had no chance to see the picture which he had taken of the flag raising or of the original landing operation. All films were sent undeveloped to a forward base.

When a radio message came from the base, "Fine pix flag raising," Mr. Rosenthal was pleased, but he thought the message referred to a picture which he had taken of the group of cheering marines under the flag. Several days afterward, at Guam, he learned that the flag raising picture was being acclaimed over the country.

"After looking at it, I think it is a good picture," he said. "I think it reflects credit on the marines. It symbolizes their gallant action. That was the toughest fight they ever had."

Mr. Rosenthal hit the beaches with the marines at Iwo Jima, as he had previously in other island assaults.

"On D-day plus 4," the photographer continued, "on the way back to the beach from the communication ship, a man pointed to the cliff of Suribachi. Marines, he said, were going up to plant the flag there. This was a very important strategic point, and it was most significant that it had been captured.

"So, ashore, I hiked through the casually marked mine fields. Near the base of the mountain I met two Marine Corps photographers, and the three of us started up."

Men were preparing to raise the six-foot banner with its twenty-foot staff, the symbol for which Americans died.

"I pushed over to the inner edge of the crater rim," Mr. Rosenthal said, "so as to get a full angle of the pole being raised. I put two large rocks together and placed a Jap sandbag on top, a place on which to stand so obstructions would be cleared.

"I waited and as the men swung the pole upward I took one shot at a fast exposure. As the pole straightened up I took another as the marines looked up at their accomplishment, and a third, of the full group gathered at the base, cheering."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

4 A

Twin Sons Named Iwo and Jima

New York Times (1923-Current file); Apr 1, 1945;

ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)

pg. 13

Twin Sons Named Iwo and Jima

WASHINGTON, March 31 (U.P)

—Mrs. Martha Johnson has named her twin sons Iwo and Jima. Their father, George, is in the Navy.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

5 A

Home Town Greets Medal-of-Honor Man Who Slew 18 Nazis After Brother Was Killed

*New York Times (1923-Current file); Dec 18, 1944;
ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)
pg. 7*

**Home Town Greets Medal-of-Honor Man
Who Slew 18 Nazis After Brother Was Killed**

MANHATTAN, Kan., Dec. 17 (AP)—Lieut. Walter Ehlers, aged 23, and winner of the Congressional Medal of Honor, came home today to spend a thirty-day leave from fighting on the western front.

A crowd of some 200 welcomers joined the hero soldier's parents, Mr. and Mrs. John Ehlers, when an Army plane brought him to the municipal airport, ending a trip that began last Wednesday in France.

He went immediately to the home of his parents, to whom he had written that he did not want to come home yet because "I have a score to settle with the Jerries" in Berlin.

His brother, Sgt. Roland A. Ehlers, 26, was fatally wounded storming the beaches of Normandy June 6.

Mayor R. E. Busenbark said there would be a public welcoming ceremony tomorrow when "the lieutenant has had time to rest up

a bit." Other officials promised a parade in his honor and a celebration with "speeches and everything."

Lieutenant Ehlers was decorated with the country's highest military award in Paris Dec. 11 by another Kansan, Lieut. Gen. John C. H. Lee, for his feats near Caumont, France, June 9-10, when he cleaned out two machine-gun nests, silenced two mortar positions, killed four Germans with his bayonet and accounted for "at least eighteen altogether." Then a sergeant, he was wounded by a sniper, killed the German as he fell, rescued a companion and covered a withdrawal of his unit.

Lieutenant Ehlers was cited Dec. 6 by another Kansan, Gen. Clarence Huebner, commander of the First Infantry Division, who dedicated the six months' anniversary observance of D-day to Lieutenant Ehlers and the men living and dead who had tried to follow his example.

6 A

TOP MEDAL AWARD IS CONFERRED ON 14; THE PRESIDENT CONFERRING NATION'S HIGHEST HONOR ON WAR HEROES
Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.
New York Times (1923-Current file); Oct 6, 1945;
ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)
pg. 5

TOP MEDAL AWARD IS CONFERRED ON 14

Eleven Marines, Heroes of War in Pacific Are in Navy Group Honored by President

BOYINGTON IS DECORATED

Others Include Veterans of Iwo and Okinawa Battles, One a Youth of 17 Years

WASHINGTON, Oct. 5.—President Truman bestowed the highest award of a grateful nation, the Congressional Medal of Honor, on eleven marines and three other Navy heroes of Pacific fighting today and then called on all Americans to fight for peace and world, so that this war will not have been in vain.

Many of the men had won their awards for their part in the bloody fighting on Okinawa and Iwo Jima and most of them had been wounded several times. Their combined citations told a story of valor and heroism beyond the call of duty.

Several of the men decorated by the President on the South Lawn of the White House looked across and listened when the President extended his hand to each and extended his hand and grimed back at the Chief Executive.

Recipients of the Award

Following are the men honored today:

Lieut. Col. Gregory Boyington, 32, of Okanogan, Wash.
Comdr. George Levick Street 3d, 32, of Norfolk, Va.
Maj. Louis H. Wilson Jr., 25, of Bradenton, Mich.
Capt. Joseph J. McCarthy, 34, of Ironwood, Mich.
Second Lieut. Arthur Junior Jackson, 30, of Portland, Ore.
Sgt. William G. Harrell, 23, of Mercedes, Tex.
Pneumoniologist's Mate George E. Wablen, 21, of Ogden, Utah.
Robert E. Bush, 18, hospital apprentice of Tacoma, Wash.
Corp. Richard E. Bush, 21, of Glasgow, Ky.
Corp. Douglas T. Jacobson, 20, of Fort Washington, Pa.
Corp. Herahel Woodrow Williams, 20, of Palmyra, N. Y.
Pvt. Franklin E. Sigler, 20, of Little Falls, N. J.
Pvt. Wilson D. Watson, 24, of East, Ark.
Pvt. Jacklyn H. Lucas, 17, of Belhaven, N. C.

Truman Stresses Peace Fight

At the end of the ceremony a microphone was handed to the President. He faced the small gathering of military and naval officers, Senators, Cabinet members and relatives and friends of the heroes and said:

"We have won two great victories. And we face another fight, a fight for a peaceful world. This fight for peace is necessary so that we won't have to go to war again, so that we won't have to maintain the lives of our young men and bury them. Now let us go forward and win that fight. We have won these two victories, and this war will not have been in vain."

Battle fatigue was still visible on the faces of some of the Marine guard of honor, many of whom had been recently returned to this country. Three of its members remained during the forty-minute ceremony. Physical treatment was given and all returned to ranks.

The President was visibly moved when Sergeant Harrell's name was called and the Truman approached the Chief Executive to hear his citation read by Vice Admiral Louis R. Denfeld, Chief of Navy Personnel. As the sergeant came to a snappy salute, the President told it that he wore hooded when his hands were used to be. The decoration was hung around his neck and Mr. Truman gripped his right arm at the elbow and shook it warmly.

The youngest man honored was the 17-year-old marine Private Jacklyn H. Lucas. In the bloody battle for Iwo Jima he put the lives of his comrades above his own by falling on one Japanese grenade and pulling another under his belly to absorb the full impact of the explosion and came back to tell about it.

Reason for Youth From Hero

WASHINGTON, Oct. 5 (AP)—The names of Pvt. Franklin Sigler of Little Falls, N. J., and Corp. Douglas Jacobson of Fort Washington, N. Y., saw the young marines receive the Congressional Medal of Honor today. Jacobson, son of Mr. and Mrs. Hattie Jacobson, had been overseas for two and one-half years when he came home Sept. 15, 1943.

His citation tells the story of Feb. 26, this year, the day he killed seventy-five Japanese to destroy sixteen enemy positions on Iwo. Armed with a bazooka gun, Corporal Jacobson charged into Japanese fire and in the words of the Marine Corps, "contributed essentially to the success of his division's operations against that fanatically defended outpost of the Japanese Empire."


His mother was weeping a little as her son's name was called. She said later that Douglas was to go back to high school and from there through college.

Mr. and Mrs. George Sigler and Misses Melvin and Douglas Sigler, who wear an Army discharge button, were there to see Franklin get his decoration. A third son, George, Jr., is still in the Army, and a fourth was killed in action. Franklin got a special handshake from his Marine Corps commander, Gen. Alexander Vandergent. From back from Japan on Tuesday, he was still a little surprised at "all this fuss."

The citation said Franklin won the Medal of Honor for leading a bold charge against a Japanese gun position on Iwo, then going ahead on his own in "a furious, one-man assault."

"That he acted and indomitable in the face of extreme peril," it continued, "Private Sigler effected the release of his besieged company from enemy fire and contributed essentially to its further advance against a savagely fighting enemy."

THE PRESIDENT CONFERRING NATION'S HIGHEST HONOR ON WAR HEROES



Mr. Truman placing the Congressional Medal of Honor on Comdr. George Levick Street 3d of Norfolk, Va., during ceremony on White House lawn in which he also decorated thirteen other Navy and Marine heroes. The Washington Monument can be seen in the background. Associated Press Wirephoto.

7 A

THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF CONGRATULATING MEDAL' OF HONOR RECIPIENTS

Associated Press WirephotoSpecial to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

New York Times (1923-Current file); Jun 15, 1946;

ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)

pg. 6

THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF CONGRATULATING MEDAL' OF HONOR RECIPIENTS



Left to right: Sgt. Alejandro R. Ruiz, Sgt. Beauford T. Anderson, Pfc. Dirk J. Vlug, President Truman, Sgt. John Meagher and Lieut. John H. Leims after ceremony in Washington in which the Chief Executive decorated the five heroes of fighting in Pacific theatre.

Associated Press Wirephoto

Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.
WASHINGTON, June 14—President Truman bestowed the Congressional Medal of Honor today upon five war heroes in a ceremony on the White House lawn

attended by their relatives and by high military and Government officials.

The recipients were First Lieut. John H. Leims of Chicago, who distinguished himself in a night

attack by Marines on Iwo Jima, and the following Army enlisted men who were cited for bravery on Okinawa and Leyte: Tech. Sgts. Beauford T. Anderson of Soldiers Grove, Wis., and John

Meagher of Jersey City, N. J.; Sgt. Alejandro R. Ruiz of Bartstow, Tex., and Pfc. Dirk J. Vlug of Grand Rapids, Mich.

Among those at the ceremony were Generals Eisenhower and Vandegrift and Admiral Nimitz.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

8 A

SHIPS TO BE NAMED FOR 8 WAR HEROES: General Officers and Winners of ...
 Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.
 New York Times (1923-Current file), Dec 9, 1947.
 ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)
 pg. 39

SHIPS TO BE NAMED FOR 8 WAR HEROES

General Officers and Winners
of Medal of Honor Designated
for Honors on Coast

Special to THE NEW YORK TIMES.

SAN FRANCISCO, Dec. 8—The names of deceased Army personnel will be given to eight ships assigned to the San Francisco Port of Embarkation. Four transports of the P-2 Class are to be renamed for distinguished general officers of World War II and four Victory Class cargo ships will carry the names of Medal-of-Honor soldiers.

Brig. Gen. N. H. McKay, commander of the port, said that rechristening ceremonies would be held for each of the vessels when they next visited this port. The four to be renamed for Army officers are undergoing conversion at Newport News, Va., to make them "the finest and most comfortable transports afloat," and are expected to go back into service in the spring.

The Port of Embarkation issued the following data on the ships:

Admiral E. W. Eberle—renamed USAT Gen. Simon B. Buckner, honoring the Commanding General of the Tenth Army, killed in action on Okinawa in 1945.

Admiral C. F. Hughes—renamed USAT Gen. Edwin D. Patrick, honoring the Commanding General of the Sixth Infantry Division, who died of wounds on Luzon in 1945.

Admiral W. S. Benson—Renamed USAT Gen. Daniel I. Sultan, honoring the former commanding general of the China-Burma theatre who died while serving as inspector general of the Army.

Admiral W. L. Capps—Renamed USAT Gen. Hugh J. Gaffey, honoring the former commanding general of the Fourth Armored Division, killed in an airplane accident in 1946.

Waterville Victory—Renamed USAT Lieut. George W. G. Boyce, honoring a Highland Falls, N. Y., cavalryman in whose honor the Medal of Honor was awarded posthumously for bravery in action in New Guinea in 1945.

Stetson Victory—Renamed USAT Sgt. Sylvester Antolach, honoring a St. Clairsville, Ohio, soldier who received the Medal of Honor posthumously for bravery in action in Italy in 1944.

Radcliffe Victory—Renamed USAT Sgt. Andrew Miller, honoring a Manitowoc, Wis., infantryman who won the Medal of Honor posthumously for bravery in action in Germany in 1944.


Appleton Victory—Renamed USAT Pvt. John R. Towle, honoring a Cleveland soldier to whom the Medal of Honor was awarded posthumously for bravery in action in Holland in 1944.

9 A

HONORED FOR OUTSTANDING HEROISM IN WORLD WAR II*New York Times (1923-Current file); Jun 26, 1948;*

ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)

pg. 4

HONORED FOR OUTSTANDING HEROISM IN WORLD WAR II

Mr. Truman placing the Congressional Medal of Honor on Francis J. Pierce, former Pharmacist's Mate, at ceremony at the White House yesterday. Looking on are the other recipients, Lieut. Comdr. Jackson Charles Pharris and Sgt. John R. Crews.

The New York Times (by Hoertel)

WASHINGTON, June 25 (UP)—President Truman today presented Congressional Medals of Honor to three heroes of World War II. They won the nation's highest tribute for risking their lives under intense German and Japanese fire.

The presentation ceremonies were in the Rose Garden of the White House.

The names of the three heroes, along with a brief résumé of their deeds that won the medals for them, follows:

Former S/Sgt. John R. Crews

of Golden, Okla.—During the fighting in Germany in April, 1945, he rushed single-handedly a German machine-gun position near Lobenbacherhof, disposed of the gun crew with point-blank rifle fire and then, although seriously wounded, charged and silenced an emplaced automatic rifle.

Pharmacist Mate 1/C Francis J. Pierce of Earlville, Iowa — He pulled wounded marines out of rifle range of Japanese defenders on Iwo Jima. Wounded and exhausted he was hailed by his com-

manding officers for "suicidal" valor.

Lieut. Comdr. Jackson C. Pharris, USN (retired) of Columbus, Ga.—When the battleship California was hit by a Japanese torpedo at Pearl Harbor he was seriously wounded but he set up a hand-supply train for his anti-aircraft gun. Repeatedly risked his life entering flooded compartments to carry unconscious shipmates to safety. The citation said his "inspiring leadership" was "largely responsible" for keeping the California in action during the attack.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

10 A

Medal of Honor Hero Trades Lieutenantcy For Sergeancy 'to Get Back With Troops'
New York Times (1923-Current file); Jan 26, 1955;
 ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)
 pg. 11

Medal of Honor Hero Trades Lieutenantcy For Sergeancy 'to Get Back With Troops'



The New York Times
Jake William Lindsey admires a master sergeant's jacket. The 33-year-old former infantryman wears Medal of Honor.

A rugged, 33-year-old war hero who calls his wounds "nicks"—and doesn't remember how many times he was "nicked"—gave up his second lieutenant's bars in the Army for the stripes of a master sergeant yesterday.

He gave as his reason for resigning his commission, "I want to get back with the troops."

Jake William Lindsey of Shubuta, Miss., the 100th infantryman to win the Medal of Honor during World War II, explained it this way at the recruiting station at 39 Whitehall Street: "I still talk like a sergeant, and these bars just don't seem right on me. I'm just a soldier at heart."

Mr. Lindsey, married and the father of two children, won the nation's highest award for action in Germany in 1944. While wounded, he killed twenty Germans, wounded many more, captured three others and destroyed a machine-gun nest.

For his nicks, many of which he said he never reported, he wears the Purple Heart with three clusters. In June, 1952, he won his officer's bars with a battlefield commission in Korea.

"Somehow they just never fit me," he said. "I suppose once you're a soldier, you're always a soldier. I was a sergeant so long, it's hard to get over it. My sergeant's tactics don't go as an officer. In battle, rank doesn't matter very much."

A slight hitch developed in the war hero's re-enlistment when a physician found excessive sugar in Mr. Lindsey's system. For a time it appeared he would have to go to the hospital at Fort Jay,

Governors Island, for rest and the re-enlistment ceremony would have to be postponed.

But a recruiting sergeant discovered a regulation on enlistment that waives physical disqualification incurred while on active duty in the service. Shortly thereafter Mr. Lindsey was repeating the oath of enlistment to Capt. Willard E. Oliver.

During World War II Mr. Lindsey saw action in Africa, Sicily, Normandy and Germany. In Korea grenade explosions wounded both his hands—"just flesh wounds, you understand," he said.

For a year and a half after the end of World War II, he said, he was out of the Army.

"That was long enough to be out," he said. "I had to get back in. The Army has security. I've got thirteen years in and seventeen more to go. This being back in now as a master sergeant and being with my men is the greatest."

His hope in the future is to be a paratrooper just as he was in Korea. The next step in his life will be taken at the First Army Reception Center, Fort Dix, N. J., where he will be assigned to duty in the airborne branch.

Appendix B: VIETNAM

1 B

Death Struggle Seen in Highlands

Wheeler, John
Boston Globe (1960-1982); Nov 26, 1965; ProQuest Historical Newspapers: Boston Globe (1872-1982)
Pg. 4



AREA OF DECISION—The central highlands of South Viet Nam (shaded area) a death trap for anti-Communist troops, has deteriorated despite the infusion of an American division into the region. (AP)

Death Struggle Seen in Highlands

By JOHN T. WHEELER
SAIGON, Viet Nam (AP)—A death struggle seems to be in the making in Viet Nam's Central Highlands, where reinforcements are arriving daily for an estimated 22,000 Viet Cong and North Vietnamese regularly roaming the area.

Despite the infusion of an American division into that section of the Annamese Cordillera, the Western position seems deteriorating because of more rapid North Vietnamese reinforcement and a heavy toll among government troops in intermittent clashes.

The Ia Drang Valley, where the bloodiest battle of the war was fought last week, is in the highlands, an area of jungled hills, mountains and plateaus blanketing 18,600 square miles.

The Annamese chain extends all the way from the upper section of the Mekong Delta to Red China. But military interest centers in a half dozen central provinces ranging about 175 miles Northward from Ban Me Thuot, itself 160 miles Northeast of Saigon.

Hoping to cut the country in two, Hanoi apparently believes the highlands are the key to South Viet Nam. Not all U.S. strategists accept this military theory.

This is the picture today based on the best available information:

Up to 11 Communist regiments, perhaps 22,000 North Vietnamese regulars and Viet Cong, roam the area. Thousands more in battalion and company units also are in the highlands and the Coastal Lowlands to the East.

Much of the Communist strength arrived in recent months while heavy fighting took an increasing toll of government troops.

President Johnson sent the 16,000-man U.S. 1st Air Cavalry Division to the An

Khe area, 250 miles Northeast of Saigon. Things looked up at that time.

The true level of the North Vietnamese regular force invasion was unknown but Hanoi reportedly decided to up the number of troops from 1000 to 2500 sent monthly into South Viet Nam.

The allied side also has thrown in a Korean Marine brigade and U.S. 101st Airborne units near Qui Nhon on the coast, but it seems clear Hanoi is reinforcing faster than the allies and that the balance of military power is worsening for the Saigon side.

Battle casualties and sickness such as malaria have seriously undermined some of the 1st Cavalry's units since they arrived in Viet Nam in September.

Two of its battalions were cut up in the Ia Drang Valley fighting North Vietnamese losses also were high, with a 1207 body count reported by the U.S. command.

Replacements already are in the works for the 1st Cavalry but some military circles believe more major American units must be rushed to this area where several crack French units met their death. Several Vietnamese disasters have occurred there in the present war.

Nearly all the North Vietnamese regulars involved are in the Allied 2d Army Corps which includes the Highlands. There seems at least the possibility entire divisions may be launched down the Ho Chi Minh trail from North Viet Nam through Laos in coming months.

Total Communist strength in the Highlands is believed to exceed the command allied strength. Even the most optimistic estimate holds that it takes five government or allied troops to counter each guerrilla in this kind of war.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

2 B

Buildup in Ground Warfare Reflects Red Determination

Arnett, Peter
Boston Globe (1960-1982); Nov 11, 1967; ProQuest Historical Newspapers: Boston Globe (1872-1982)
 pg. 4

Determination

(What is the significance of the resurgence of fighting in Vietnam associated with a press writer who has been covering the war more than five years appraises the situation in his report.)

By PETER ARNETT

SAIGON — November has always been the bloodiest month on the Vietnam war calendar. This year is no exception, but the rash of battles erupting across the face of the country lately has some unusual aspects.

Experienced observers see these portents:

—The Communists are still capable of seizing the initiative.

—For the first time they have been able to coordinate military activity on a nationwide scale.

—Infiltration of enemy troops and supplies continues despite air raids against North Vietnam and the Ho Chi Minh trail, and the intensified border surveillance in South Vietnam.

—The new fighting posture of the Communists is straining United States troop resources. If the current level of enemy military action continues much longer, the all-important pacification program, already foundering in the northern 1st Corps area, may start deteriorating elsewhere.

—The Communists still profess to believe that by making inroads against the allied war machine in South Vietnam, they can win political capitulation by the United States a la French Indochina.

The pendulum seems to have swung from the position a year ago when U.S. forces gained the initiative by striking hard into War Zone C northwest of Saigon. Operation Atleboro and blocked an enemy attempt at major infiltration into the DMZ. Operation Hastings. The Communists grabbed the initiative late 1965 with their campaign

against them Plei Me Special Forces camp in the highlands that climaxed the Ia Drang Valley battle, where 310 Americans and 1130 foes were killed.

Initiative seems more important to the Communists than their casualties. A senior member of the National Liberation Front (Viet Cong) said in Cambodia a few days ago. "Our losses are not important. What was important at Loc Ninh was that we demonstrated we have the ability to attack, to gain the initiative when we want to."

The current campaign apparently was planned by the Central Committee of the Front several weeks ago. After that, Radio Hanoi and the Viet Cong radio exhorted forces to "attack and continue to attack; destroy."

This war cry has been made before, but never has the response been so evident.

—Tactics some write now resemble those used in a successful campaign against French posts along the Chinese border in 1951, particularly at Lang Son. Anti-French forces laid down heavy mortar and artillery barrages, moved up under machine-gun fire, and then stormed fortifications in human-wave attacks.

This tactic was favored by Peking's defense minister, Lin Piao, who earlier led Communist forces against the Nationalist troops of Chiang Kai-shek.

—Most recent Communist

attacks, including massive assaults against the Loc Ninh district headquarters, were beaten back. But increasing quantities of heavy mortars and rockets seem to be moving down the Ho Chi Minh trail.

—Roads laboriously carved through eastern Laos for that supply-line complex apparently have improved the North Vietnamese capacity to infiltrate.

—Whereas in 1965 most infiltrators moved South in groups of 100 or 200, intelligence officers believe they now come South in battalion sized formations or 400 or 500 men.

Allied commanders have faced a crucial question: What percentage of available manpower should be deployed against the major enemy forces, and what percentage should continue with pacification?

This may become academic if the North Vietnamese keep the pressure on. By constantly hammering at the DMZ this year, the Communist forced the U.S. Marine Corps to deploy forces away from pacification to basically static defense.

One American intelligence officer, asked to appraise the enemy's capabilities and intentions in this region said:

"We know there are big clouds in the sky around here, but we don't know where the rain will fall. That's our problem with the Communists."

3 B

Washington Views Latest Red Assaults In Vietnam as Prelude to Peace Moves

By HENRY GEMMILL Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

Wall Street Journal (1923 - Current file); Jan 31, 1968;

ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The Wall Street Journal (1889-1996)

pg. 3

Washington Views Latest Red Assaults In Vietnam as Prelude to Peace Moves

By HENRY GEMMILL

Staff Reporter of THE WALL STREET JOURNAL

WASHINGTON—Surprisingly, a mood of approaching satisfaction prevailed among President Johnson's Vietnam advisers during a night and day when war bulletins poured into Washington.

It was surprising because these dispatches unfolded the story of the most aggressive, most far-flung and best coordinated Communist assault of the entire war. The Reds smashed into more than half a dozen provincial capitals, shelled and swept into Saigon, and wrought heavy destruction at major U.S. airfields. Furthermore, all this was viewed here as a probable prelude to another major assault, far from the urban centers, aimed at chewing up American ground forces guarding South Vietnam's northern frontier, around Khe Sanh.

So inevitably the atmosphere yesterday among the men in Washington who shape Vietnam policy had its decidedly grim tinge, and forecasts of the outcome were guarded. Yet the remarkable element of their attitude was that stubborn strain of satisfaction.

It was founded on this thought: The Vietnam Reds may well be trying to head for genuine peace talks—and, as a prelude, attempting to improve their bargaining position.

No one here claimed to have hard and fast evidence that this is the true direction in which events are moving. Declared one highly placed analyst, "What you can say is this: If Hanoi is maneuvering toward peace negotiations, this sort of military spectacular is exactly what you'd expect them to engage in."

Some Evidence Available
Many here will find this idea easy to brush aside as wishful thinking, and perhaps it will turn out to be that. The Administration often before has displayed optimism only to see it proved unfounded, and of course the Administration constantly faces a temptation to put the best interpretation upon the worst news. Yet at least some evidence can be cited to fit the argument.

As always, there are statistics available to show the Reds are "hurting"; their casualties were again said to be heavy in the assaults of recent hours. And it's true a new sound recently has crept into Hanoi's statements; it now says it "will" talk if the U.S. agrees to end the bombing of North Vietnam. The U.S., for its part, has seemed to be easing its terms for doing that—indicating the U.S. would permit the Reds to engage in "normal" movement of supplies to guerrillas in South Vietnam during such a bombing pause. Britain's Prime Minister Wilson, just back from Moscow, asserted yesterday that only a "very narrow bridge" remains to be crossed to open Vietnam peace negotiations.

Actually, though, such optimism as is found among officials here seems to place less stress upon military calculations or diplomatic straw-in-the-wind than upon a line of logic that has to do with politics.

U.S. Picture Changed

A few months ago, it's argued, the Viet Reds could, with good reason, figure they should keep their war going until after this fall's U.S. Presidential election—counting on the unmaking of LBJ by a "dove," followed by a Yankee withdrawal under conditions highly favorable to the Communists. But by now, it's contended, the Reds have reason to reverse their political appraisal.

Sen. McCarthy's challenge to Mr. Johnson for the Democratic nomination hasn't got off the ground; Sen. Robert Kennedy has made no move to try to grab it. Among republican candidates, Gov. Romney's critical attitude toward fighting in Vietnam appears to have un-

dermined his chances. So, the argument runs, Hanoi can currently calculate that if it waits till after the U.S. election to do its peace dickering it likely will confront either a "hawk-like" Republican President or a President Johnson whose resolution has been stiffened by popular mandate. Hence, this line of logic concludes, Hanoi's optimum time for talking peace is before the election, at a time when LBJ also will be especially eager for peace to bolster his ballot prospects.

To argue thus, analysts obviously must assume that Hanoi has considerable sophistication about U.S. politics. They do assume it. It's contended Vietnamese Reds receive able and urgent tutelage from European Communists—not just the Russians, but the Poles, Czechs and Hungarians. And assertedly the politics of South Vietnam reinforce the picture North Vietnam gets of U.S. politics. Though the Saigon regime isn't any dream of democracy, or even honesty, it has gained legitimacy by its own election processes and is seen as making progress. It's figured the Reds can get nothing to gain by waiting.

Admittedly, Communist thinking actually may be headed in the opposite direction. If Hanoi can muster the strength for a prolonged large-scale offensive, it could be aiming at stirring a big surge of end-the-war sentiment in the U.S. and, even if it's aiming at early peace talks, it could be a long road to a peace agreement.

Infiltration Stepped Up

Though Washington now would be willing to permit a "normal" flow of Red guerrilla supplies to move down from North Vietnam during negotiations, it would resume bombing of the North (and thus break up the talking) if the Communists maintained their recent pace, which has seen two whole divisions move down rapidly into South Vietnam.

Beyond that, the two sides are far apart on possible settlement terms. Hanoi wants to give South Vietnam a "coalition" government, with key posts handed over immediately to Vietcong men. What the U.S. has in mind is merely an

amnesty that would permit rebels of the south to take part in the political process gradually—voicing first in village elections, eventually in national ones. In any case, Washington thinks it would be extremely difficult to get the Saigon government to agree to more than that. By the estimate of officials here, however, one purpose of the current heavy Red assaults is to undermine such South Vietnamese resolve.

Psychological Impact Cited

The military opinion here was that the dramatic Red attacks primarily were designed for their psychological impact—to show the South Vietnamese that the Vietcong could hit at will anywhere in the country anytime; many of the cities hit hadn't been bothered for months. U.S. military men flatly rejected Hanoi's claim that the attacks were in retaliation for U.S. cancellation of the Tet ceasefire in the Northern tier of the country. American military men said it

took days and even weeks to plan such coordinated attacks and that they obviously had been scheduled before the lunar holiday began. In Saigon, Gen. William C. Westmoreland, commander of U.S. troops in Vietnam, said the attacks proved that the seven-day truce the Communists had proclaimed was a "hoax and a fraud."

The military opinion that the attacks were primarily for purposes of harassment was bolstered by the size of the Vietcong forces used.

In most places the assaults were by no more than a few hundred men. Noting that several cities hit—such as Da Nang, South Vietnam's second-largest city, and Nha Trang, a coastal city of 60,000—had large contingents of U.S., Vietnamese and Korean troops, one U.S. officer commented: "If you hit these places with less than a regiment, you just got to be fooling."

4 B

TIME FOR DECISION IN VIET NAM
Chicago Tribune (DUGL Current Hist), Feb 1, 1968.
ProQuest Historical Newspapers Chicago Tribune (1849-1998)
Pg. 22

of the United States in the South China
| sea like the seizure of the Pueblo in the
| Sea of Japan, and there will be more
| Korea, more Viet Nam, Thailand, which
| we are committed to defend, is next on
| the communist "liberation" program.

TIME FOR DECISION IN VIET NAM

The Communists observed the lunar new year (Tet) truce in Viet Nam, to which they were committed, by launching their biggest coordinated offensive of the war. The Viet guerrillas struck with mortars, rockets, and terrorist raids in Saigon, Da Nang, and other major cities from one end of the country to the other, attacked a dozen American air fields, and seized and temporarily held the United States embassy, all with coordination and precision that evidenced weeks of advance planning.

Undoubtedly this spectacular show of strength was intended to paralyze the will of the United States for continued support of South Viet Nam against communist aggression and create conditions for a negotiated settlement on the enemy's terms. In a top secret letter to the communist high command in South Viet Nam, which was captured by American troops, Le Duan, first secretary and boss of North Viet Nam's Communist party, discussed the possibility of negotiations with the United States. He said the time might come when it would be expedient to "fight and negotiate." This is orthodox communist doctrine, which regards "negotiating" as the continuation of war by other means. Le Duan recalled that the "fight and negotiate" strategy was used successfully by the Communists against the United States in the Korean war and against France at the time of the 1954 Geneva conference on Indo-China.

While the Communists were demonstrating their defiance and contempt of the United States and their characteristic perfidy by lashing out in all directions, in violation of a holiday truce, Washington was preoccupied with speculation about the possibility that President Johnson will order an end of the bombing in North Viet Nam and discuss a cease-fire if the enemy will continue only "normal" movement of troops and munitions into South Viet Nam.

When Clark Clifford, President Johnson's nominee for secretary of defense, was asked by senators what this meant, he recalled President Johnson's "San Antonio formula," which "assumes" that the Communists would not "take advantage" of such a unilateral stopping of half of the war by the United States.

"Their military activity will continue in South Viet Nam, I assume, until there is a cease-fire agreed upon," Clifford said. "I assume they will continue to transport the normal amount of goods, munitions, men, to South Viet Nam . . . So what I am suggesting is, in the language of the President, that he would insist that they not take advantage of the suspension of the bombing."

Under this construction of the President's terms, just about anything the Communists did to support their war operations in the south on the present scale would qualify as "normal." In recent months they have sent four full divisions into the northwestern part of South Viet Nam, thus escalating infiltration to the level of invasion. They have introduced weapons far more sophisticated than are normally used in guerrilla warfare, including 122 mm. rockets, 122 mm. guns, and even tanks. Under the Johnson formula as construed by Mr. Clifford, who was an adviser to President Truman, author of America's tragic retreat from victory in the Korean war, even this buildup for the slaughter of American and allied troops would presumably continue as "normal."

Our bombing has increased the difficulties and costs, but it has not reduced the scale, of North Viet Nam's operations in the south. This is because we have not interdicted North Viet Nam's supplies at the ports where they arrive. The heavy weapons and most of the other munitions used by the enemy come from the Soviet Union and its eastern European satellites. The only way to stop this traffic and end the war by winning it is to close North Viet Nam's ports, particularly Haiphong, by bombing and mining if possible or by a naval blockade if necessary.

If we fail to do this, the consequences will be far worse than in the Korean debacle, which Gen. Mark Clark described as "a war we were not permitted to win." Unless we are prepared to let the Communists take over South Viet Nam, we shall have to keep many more troops there than the 50,000 we now have in South Korea, more than 34 years after the armistice. There will be repeated humiliations

5 B

Security Procedure Criticized
 McCRYSTAL (2-11-68)
 Boston Globe (1968-1982), Apr. 21, 1968; Post-Quest Historical Newspapers: Boston Globe (1872-1982)
 p. 81

By GAL McCRYSTAL

L.A. Times-Washington Post

NEW YORK — A civilian employee of the joint chiefs of staff in Washington sent this postcard to his boss: "Add another notch to your gun handle. My brother killed at X De Sahn."

The Defense Department reacted quickly, as it does to any sign of dissent in its ranks. It sent the man, who is the father of three children, to a psychiatrist. He was told that refusal to submit to examination would mean loss of his job.

It is now a fact of life that any civil servant in the Defense Department who criticizes U.S. policy in Vietnam—or elsewhere, for that matter—stands to lose not only his job but a reasonable chance of getting another one.

First of all he must be examined by a psychiatrist on whose report the patient's supervisor will determine his fitness for duty. If he is fit, it means he no longer disagrees with U.S. policy. If he isn't fit, then he must leave. And on his record permanently is the fact that he received psychiatric treatment as a result of which he was declared unfit for duty.

In the case just quoted, the victim went to a psychiatrist who refused to cooperate fully with the Defense Department. The psychiatrist said that Medical records were something which should not be seen by anyone except the doctor and patient. He was prepared only to give a verdict on the fit for duty question. The trouble about this is that a psychiatrist does not get paid if he does not reveal all the information requested by the Defense Department.

The man whose brother was killed in Vietnam was allowed to resume his duties only because the case came to the attention of Sen Samuel Ervin, chairman of the Senate's Constitutional Rights Subcommittee. Ervin delivered a wrathful letter to Defense Secretary Clark Clifford, who decided to investigate.

However, as recently as Thursday, a young girl made a tearful visit to the office of the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee and her story did not indicate that the Defense Department had radically revised its policy. She is 22 and was employed by the Defense Department to inspect the quality of film material. She was due for promotion.

To obtain that promotion, she submitted to a two and one-half-hour interview followed by a lie detector test. Every intimate detail of her sex life was checked. The truth came out: she had, for a time, lived with a man to whom she was not married. Her superiors showed her affidavits sworn by her apartment neighbors. One neighbor testified to seeing a man opening the girl's apartment door with a key.

As a result of the interview, she lost her clearance because, they were told, she was immoral. This, they told her, would be on her record for 100 years. Promotion was out of the question.

Many complaints, similar to and worse than these, have been received by the Constitutional Rights Subcommittee. Last year, Sen. Ervin introduced a bill designed to protect civil servants from invasion of privacy. The Senate passed the bill by 80 yeas to four, the four being also on the C.I.A. watchdog committee. The bill went over to the House of Representatives where it has lain untouched since last September.

In his letter to Clifford, Sen. Ervin said the natural consequences of an employee's getting a psychiatric record constituted "penalties of the most oppressive type."

"Our hearings and studies have revealed grave injustices," he said. "We find that supervisors far too often take advantage of their discretion to order fitness-for-duty examinations of a psychiatric nature to threaten or penalize employees who disagree with them or who have personality clashes in a bad office situation."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

6 B

Saigon: Off Stage Center and Uneasy

By PETER R. KANN

Wall Street Journal (1923 - Current file); Apr 12, 1968;

ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The Wall Street Journal (1889-1996)

pg. 8

Saigon: Off Stage Center and Uneasy

By PETER R. KANN

SAIGON—A mood of unease and of languor seems to have descended on Americans here during the past few weeks, complementing the hot, humid summer that also is setting in.

Reporters are equipped to deal with facts and figures, not moods and states of mind, but the news here now is more implicit in the questions not being asked than in the answers not being given; the significance is more in the silences than the statements.

There seems to be a spreading sense here that Saigon has been shifted off the center of the world stage, a vaguely discomfiting feeling that major events for once are being shaped not in Vietnam—not in the jungled hills of the DMZ, nor in the pacification projects of coastal hamlets, nor in the political maneuverings at the presidential palace—but in Washington and Chicago, Moscow and Hanoi, and maybe Geneva.

The unease reflects not only the prospects of peace talks, though that is surely a part of it. It also reflects the gathering momentum of American politics, the sudden death of Martin Luther King, and the fires that burned in American cities. All are too distant to be fully comprehended here except as larger, more ominous events overshadowing Khe Sanh and a second wave, post-Tet recovery and the Thieu-Ky conflict, at Saigon's cocktail parties and in its private conversations.

Reports and Rumors

The malaise is found among embassy officials, U.S. aid officers, Saigon soldiers and among fellow correspondents and other Saigon fixtures. People begin conversations with the latest war report or political rumor and end up swapping information on the U.S. political campaign from week-old newspapers that have just arrived. They talk about black riots and white backlash and then stop and wonder if they have been away from home too long to know how deep the racial divisions have become. They discuss peace prospects and realize they know nothing more than they hear from radio announcements out of Washington and other "world capitals."

Saigon had a taste of this last summer. Newark and Detroit temporarily overshadowed the war and the Vietnamese election campaign. Then, as now, there was the irony of combat soldiers writing worried letters home to their endangered families. The Midwest war, too, was a topic of conversation here for several days. Arab jokes were in fashion briefly and Americans spoke wistfully

of winnable wars that could be plotted on a map.

Those, however, were diversions; the present mood seems different and somehow deeper. Even the jokes fall flat: President Johnson is asking General William Westmoreland for more troops, the Marines have opened route one from Washington to Baltimore, the U.S. is 68% pacified.

No one here really believes the war is over. The daily press briefings continue as usual with reports of bombing raids and meters of bunker destroyed, meeting engagements and casualty counts. But the maps, diagrams and statistics all seem further from reality than usual. Even this week's relief of Khe Sanh, focus of world attention for so many months, has caused few ripples here. In part this may reflect the anticlimactic ease with which the relief column reached the base, but even the reasons for the enemy pull-back are going largely undebated in this mecca of military analysts.

Tens of thousands of homeless, destitute Vietnamese still crowd emergency refugee camps throughout the country, yet human misery has become a tiresome topic. Pacification chief Robert Komer bubbles with new confidence, and maybe even some new ideas, for pushing his programs back into the countryside. But not even the skeptics and the cynics respond. Saigon seems all but immune to enthusiasm these days.

Before Tet Mr. Komer's computerized hamlet evaluation system was a topic of much controversy. For several weeks after the Tet offensive correspondents badgered Mr. Komer's office for the latest computer survey. None has been issued in the 2½ months since Tet. Few, if any, correspondents seem to care.

Gen. Westmoreland announced in Washington this week that "militarily we have never been in a better relative position in South Vietnam." The judgment is shared by few officials or other observers here. A month ago the statement would have prompted a spirited, maybe bitter, Saigon debate. Yet this week the statement was greeted with more yawns than yelps.

President Thieu's government has been highly active the past several weeks, calling reservists, drafting teenagers, replacing province chiefs and centralizing administration. These are reforms American officials have relentlessly pressed for several years. Yet there is little touting of the triumphs in official U.S. circles now. It's as if they had

waited too long for a much-advertised meal, and meanwhile lost their appetites.

Saigon always has been a city divorced from its own country, yet it has nearly constantly been a center for the world's attention. For a few brief days at Tet Saigon truly became the war-torn capital of a war-ravaged nation. On one of those now-memorable days, while firefights flared across the city, then-Defense Secretary Robert McNamara was quoted as saying that Saigon was no more dangerous than Washington, where his daughter had been accosted by a purse-snatcher. Saigon laughed.

Outwardly Normal

The Secretary has emerged as something of a prophet. While Washington burned last weekend, Saigon was safe and secure—outwardly back to normal. Pretty Vietnamese girls in white ao dais strolled in the park, shielding themselves from the sun with painted parasols. Tang, an orphaned ten-year-old tour guide, led groups of camera-clicking GIs around the shabby Saigon zoo. On honky-tonk Tu Do Street the pornography peddlers and money changers plied their trades. At the Cercle Sportif, the local country club, French businessmen exchanged misfortunes, while American diplomats and Vietnamese functionaries played lazy sets of tennis.

The 8 p.m. curfew remains a minor annoyance, as does the presidential order shutting down all bars, but most Saigon-based soldiers know by now which ones stay open as secret all-night speakeasies. Civilians plan little curfew parties to which they take air mattresses and toothbrushes so they can spend the evening together on rooftop terraces, sipping cocktails and watching the flares light up the sky over the airport.

The conversation switches awkwardly from Vietnam to black riots to U.S. politics to peace and back to Vietnam. The riots in American cities will soon be over and the summer, after all, could be a quiet one at home. The election campaign in the states will focus more and more on events taking place in Vietnam. Peace, after all, is not a very likely prospect and the hopes will fade. Perhaps peace pressures will produce an explosion here, another coup d'etat. If peace contacts fail, the war could sharply escalate. Maybe the enemy will launch its second-wave attack. So the comments run here, and some or many may prove true. But, for the moment, American Saigon waits uneasily in the summer heat.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

7 B

Air Blows Smash North Viet Human Wave Assaults

Mannock, Robin

Boston Globe (1960-1982); Nov 20, 1965; ProQuest Historical Newspapers: Boston Globe (1872-1982)

pg. 2

By ROBIN P. MANNOCK
PLEIKU Nam (AP)—
South Vietnamese paratroopers and Hanoi regulars clashed Friday night in an action broadening the sweep of the U.S. cavalrymen are waging the stiffest American ground action of the war.

Shooting raged in the north-west near the Cambodian frontier. A U.S. spokesman said a Vietnamese paratroop detachment heading south toward the valley ran into a stiff fight, reported heavy fire from Vietnamese regulars in-

and they were heavy," he said. "It was hand-to-hand combat, a real infantry action. So you can expect these casualties."

In the field 35 miles south of Pleiku the commander of the American detachment, Lt. Col Robert A. McDade, 43, of New York, declined to comment.

"I am not going to discuss who said what," McDade said. But he praised his men, telling a reporter they "took on a large force and did a great deal of damage."

"I would say they performed like you hoped green soldiers would perform," said the all-beepstaked officer, who himself rose from the ranks after enlisting in World War II. "They all fought like pros, whether they were draftees or regulars."

McDade said about 350 enemy bodies were counted. Dozens of his men were killed. Some of the wounded were captured.

McDade said Vietnamese dragoons or two wounded sergeants, one of whom had been shot through an eye, and kicked and beaten them. But both escaped in the darkness that night and made their way back to the American lines.

"It renews your faith in man's ability to stay alive," McDade said.

McDade said most of the American casualties came from the initial Vietnamese attack as he maneuvered his force on the edge of a clearing. Snipers fired from treetops and Communist squads opened up from camouflaged positions on anthills in the elephant grass.

Two strikes smashed attempts by the Vietnamese to overwhelm the American positions with napalm.

McDade said one raid blasted flaming napalm within 75 feet of his men.

"It was a risk to take," he said. "It worked beautifully."

He said helicopters broke the back of a flank attack, spraying rockets into the ranks of communist troops.

Still unexplained was a lag in communications concerning American casualties in the battle set off Wednesday by the Communist ambush of a cavalry battalion on the march of the Ia Drang River.

Gen. Richard T. Knowles, deputy commander of the division, told newsmen at brigade headquarters in Pleiku Thursday night that his information 18 hours after the battle began was still that American losses were light.

"It was only by late Thursday that we got a better view of the extent of the casualties

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

8 B

Home Are the Heroes... Boys Now Men: Hardest-Hit GI Unit Returns From Death Valley Battle

Mulligan, Hugh

Boston Globe (1960-1982); Nov 22, 1965; ProQuest Historical Newspapers: Boston Globe (1872-1982)

pg. 3

Boys Now Men

Hardest-Hit GI Unit Returns From Death Valley Battle

By HUGH MULLIGAN

AN KHE, Viet Nam (AP)—The brave young boys who left their youth behind in fighting of Ia Drang Valley came like men to First Cavalry Division base camp Sunday night.

2d Battalion of 7th Regiment, which bore brunt of fighting and suffered heaviest casualties rolled in triumph to cheers in muddy streets of division's tent city.

Battle-weary cavalrymen waved their rifles and shouted victory oaths as their truck convoy proceeded to little parade-ground, fringed with banana trees, where division band and entire 3d Brigade waited to welcome them.

Band played "Garry Owen," which has been 7th Regiment marching song since a dashing young colonel named George Custer commanded outfit in Indian wars.

Color guard dipped division flag in salute to Col Robert A. McDade, a Brooklyn boy who took over battalion two weeks ago and led it into some of worst fighting so far for U.S. troops in Viet Nam.

"Your country is proud of you," said Brig Gen John M. Wright on behalf of division commander Maj Gen Harry W. Kinnard, who was still in battle area.

"You met tough, professional, capable enemy troops and you gave them a mauling they will never forget."

Darkness had fallen so rest of ceremony had to

be held by light of Jeep headlights.

Their faces still etched with mud and rain of battle, men of 2d Battalion stood Ramrod straight, their packs at their feet, throughout

general's emotional speech. When it was over, someone shouted, "Where's that bugle?" Whole battalion took cry for their favorite instrument.

It was an old French army

bugle, found in a crater on battlefield. It was a reminder that men had been fighting and dying in highlands only a little more than a decade ago.

Bugle was battered and rusted, and sergeant who played it would never have rated a musicians' union card, but to men sweeter music never sounded through mist-shrouded valley. He was playing their song.

File by ammunition container and turn in your explosives," someone ordered.

Then came from a more popular decree:

"Free beer for everyone on mess sergeant."

There was drinking and laughing and hell-raising in 2d Battalion all night—and tears, too.

Tears for buddies left behind in elephant grass at Ia Drang valley.

Tears for comrades wrapped up in rubber body bags and already on their long journey.

But there would be no empty tents for battalion. Fresh replacements arrived Saturday and have been assigned to cots of fallen.

"Try not to wake them up," a captain said half-heartedly. "They just got here and they're tired."

Men of 2d Battalion laughed and gave a laugh of battle-hardened veterans to poor, dumb rookies.



THE AGONY IN VIET NAM (UPI)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

9 B

WESTMORELAND: FOE'S BIGGEST PUSH TO COME: General
Chicago Tribune (1963-Current file): Feb 2, 1968;
 ProQuest Historical Newspapers: Chicago Tribune (1849-1990)
 pg. 1

WESTMORELAND: FOE'S BIGGEST PUSH TO COME

General

(Map on back page)

SAIGON, Viet Nam, Feb. 1 (AP) —Gen. William C. Westmoreland predicted today that the Communists will follow up their current campaign against key cities of South Viet Nam and "go for broke" with their biggest offensive of the war, a



Gen. William Westmoreland

drive in the northern end of the country.

It will be the enemy's "main effort," said the commander of United States forces in South Viet Nam, and "it could come at any time."

The four star general said at a press conference this would be the third phase of a three-phase plan hatched in Hanoi last September by North Vietnamese leaders.

Not Fully Surprised

Asked if he was surprised by the sudden, widespread offensive, Westmoreland replied: "Not completely. I felt there would be fireworks during the Tet lunar new year period."

In anticipation of this, Westmoreland said, allied troops were redeployed in certain populated areas.

In response to a reporter's question, Westmoreland said "the enemy was counting on a general uprising" of the population.

Reaction: One of Anger

"He apparently hoped the people would join his ranks," Westmoreland said. He said the popular reaction seems to be one of outrage.

Following is a partial text of
 [Continued on page 2, col. 5]

10 B

Pride Worn Thin as Yanks Leave Viet

Arnett, Peter

Chicago Tribune (1963-Current file); Aug 12, 1972;

ProQuest Historical Newspapers: Chicago Tribune (1849-1990)

pg. N6

Pride Worn Thin as Yanks Leave Viet

BY PETER ARNETT

SAIGON, Viet Nam, Aug. 11 [AP]—The first American combat troops came to Viet Nam bearing their weapons proudly and speaking of a grim determination to win the war. Now the last American infantrymen have stood down—with determination dissipated to boredom, pride worn thin.

The 7½ years that spanned arrival and departure generated debate that seems likely to continue as long as there are military analysts.

Many thousands of Americans remain in Viet Nam in advisory and technical roles. The war remains unresolved.

Relief of Departure

But there is a clear path leading from the hopes of those first U. S. Marines wading ashore thru the Da Nang surf in March, 1965, to the U. S. infantrymen throwing away their ammunition with relief on the eve of their departure home.

The war went sour in 1966 when North Viet Nam sent troops down the Ho Chi Minh trail to save Viet Cong guerrillas from destruction at American hands. The hopes of a "limited war" and a clean vic-

tory drowned in the monsoon battles of the Central Highlands and the demilitarized zone.

The conflict claimed more than 45,000 American lives. No soldier wanted to be the last American to die. The last battalion to stand down yesterday, the 3d of the 21st Infantry, was the same unit whose Company A made headlines by refusing an order to fight in August, 1969.

How Idealism Faded

The last GIs, complaining of boredom and saying their duty was pointless, are an indication of how early idealism deteriorated.

From the first the American Command sought to keep the troops happy. Veterans described the U. S. trooper in Viet Nam as the most pampered in military history with his one-year tour of duty, liberal periods for rest, steam baths, swimming pools, and ice cream.

These luxuries hardly compensated for the war's peculiar pitfalls. Motivated to "fight Communists," the average GI was incapable of adequately distinguishing the

good guys from the bad ones. Lack of communication with the Vietnamese ultimately led to My Lai.

Respect and Scorn

Walled inside armed headquarters camps and fire bases, or roaming in battalions at the edge of nowhere, the Americans balanced their respect for Hanoi troops' ability with ill-concealed scorn for South Vietnamese allies. The 1968 Tet offensive, when the foe sneaked between the Americans and the Saigon troops, showed how far apart they were.

By then it was too late and the American public was aroused about the war. The military wanted to push the American troop level over the 600,000 mark. That attempt failed, and the stage was set for gradual withdrawal.

Short Tour Hurts

The American troops who believed in what they were doing in Viet Nam may have lacked the knowledge for this new kind of war, but they didn't lack guts and endurance. The bravery and sacrifice at Ia Drang Valley, Khe Sanh, and elsewhere were right out of the pages of American tradition. There have been dozens of Medals of Honor to prove it.

The one-year tour helped morale but hurt performance because soldiers went home just when they had begun figuring out Viet Nam. Expertise wasn't passed on.

By the late 1960s the Army in Viet Nam began to mirror the strife then plaguing American society—race problems, drugs. Soldiers began "fragging" their officers with grenades. Heroin seeped down from Laos. Club scandals rocked the military. But at least the troops were going home.

By earlier this year, with ground troops down to a few brigades, the U. S. Command could report that they had accomplished some of their mission. The North Vietnamese army had been pushed back into Cambodia and Laos, and the Viet Cong were underground and relatively harmless. Vietnamization seemed to be working.

But then came the Communist offensive and the war was right back inside South Viet Nam again. The old threat loomed at Da Nang, but the last combat troops stood down anyway.

The war is still on for the Vietnamese, but for American ground troops it is all over, at last.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

11 B

CHARGES VIET FOE TO SHOW WAY TO MATES: Yank Is Credited with 18 Killed
Chicago Tribune (1963 Current file); Nov. 25, 1965;
 Project: Historical Newspapers: Chicago Tribune (1849-1990)
 File No.

CHARGES VIET FOE TO SHOW WAY TO MATES

Yank Is Credited with 18 Killed

Valley Forge, Pa., Nov. 24 (AP) — "I may as well go up and do it myself. I wouldn't ask my men to do anything I wouldn't do."

So reasoned Lt. Joe Marm, 24, medal of honor nominee, who said he stormed an enemy machine gun bunker in Viet Nam because it was getting late and he wanted to get the job over with.

Parents Join Him

Marm, a patient in the Valley Forge army hospital, told newsmen yesterday how he charged the bunker in Ia Drang valley and killed 18 North Vietnamese.

The wounded platoon leader was reunited with his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter J. Marm, of Washington, Pa., in the hospital.

Marm, just eight months out of officers' candidate school,



Lt. Joe Marm

spoke with some difficulty because his jaw is wired. He was shot in the jaw and neck during the battle last week.

"It was getting late," he said, "and they [the communist machine gunners] seemed to be holding everyone up. So I went ahead.

The first thing I did was fire a grenade launcher at the bunker. Then I took two grenades and an M16 rifle and went straight up."

Lobs In a Grenade

The enemy kept firing back, he said, and he told his men to hold their fire while he advanced on the bunker.

"I pulled the pin of a grenade and just lobbed it over. After it went off I went around to the left, saw some movements and fired. I fired six times, but didn't know then how many there were. They told me there were 18, but I didn't know."

Then, he said, he told the men of the two companies behind him to "come ahead, it's getting late."

12 B

Medal of Honor Awarded Fourth Veteran of Vietnam
New York Times (1923-Current file); Jun 24, 1966;
 ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)
 pg. 3

Medal of Honor Awarded Fourth Veteran of Vietnam



Associated Press Wirephoto

President Johnson, First Lieut. Charles Q. Williams and daughter Shannon outside the White House following the ceremony at which he received the Medal of Honor.

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 23— President Johnson awarded today the Medal of Honor, the nation's highest military decoration, to an Army first lieutenant who said he would rather have it than be President.

Lieut. Charles Q. Williams received the medal for heroism in South Vietnam.

A tough, wiry, taciturn professional soldier, Lieutenant Williams spoke briefly at the ceremony in the East Room of the White House.

Addressing Mr. Johnson, he said:

"As President Eisenhower said, with all due respect to you, sir, and your duties, he would rather have the Medal of Honor than be President of the United States. These are my sentiments."

The lieutenant had words of praise for the members of the Army Special Forces

group and the Navy Seabees who were with him at Dongxoi in South Vietnam on June 9 and 10, 1965. Several of the Special Forces men were present for the ceremony.

Five Americans were killed in the action and Lieutenant Williams recalled them with these words:

"For our deceased comrades who are not with us today from Dongxoi, if I may offer some small condolence to loved ones, these brave and courageous men did not die in vain, but for a true and just cause which makes our great country what it is today."

Lieutenant Williams received the medal for directing the defense of a Special Forces camp at Dongxoi against a 14-hour attack by the Vietcong, who outnumbered his men by five to one.

He was wounded but never-

theless managed to direct an evacuation by helicopter.

The lieutenant was the fourth to win the Medal of Honor in Vietnam. Two were awarded it posthumously.

Mrs. Williams stood by her husband as Army Secretary Stanley R. Resor read the citation. The Williams's four children were there, too, with Lieutenant Williams's mother, Mrs. Izora Hill of Vance, S. C.

In remarks at the ceremony, the President called Lieutenant Williams's act "a patriot's gift to his country."

He introduced Brig. Gen. John T. Kennedy, 81, Columbia, S. C., one of the oldest living holders of the Medal of Honor. General Kennedy was awarded the medal for heroism in action against insurgent Moros in the Philippines in 1909.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Lieutenant, Iadrang Hero, Wins the Medal of Honor

New York Times (1923-Current file); Dec 20, 1966;
ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)

pg. 6

Lieutenant, Iadrang Hero, Wins the Medal of Honor



United Press International Telephoto

Mr. and Mrs. Walter J. Marm with son, Lieut. Walter J. Marm Jr., after the ceremony

WASHINGTON, Dec. 19 (AP) — In a numbing wind outside the Pentagon, 1st Lieut. Walter J. Marm Jr. of the Army received today the military prize of a lifetime — the nation's Medal of Honor — for action in Vietnam.

Secretary of the Army Stanley R. Resor draped the medal around the neck of the 25-year-old Pennsylvania native and said:

"By your courage and skill, you have set an example which will bring new strength and resolution to all American fighting men."

Lieutenant Marm is the seventh United States serviceman in the Vietnam War to receive the award. He received it for courage during the battle of Iadrang Valley in November, 1965.

The Army provided a full honor ceremony with a 19-gun salute for the young officer from Washington, Pa., who was wounded in the battle that brought him the Medal of Honor. He is credited with killing 18 North Vietnamese soldiers who were firing on his platoon.

Those attending the cere-

mony included Lieutenant Marm's parents, Mr. and Mrs. Walter J. Marm of Washington, Pa.; several other relatives, and top military and civilian officials.

"Personal courage is a magnificent thing. The ability to lead other men in the face of extreme danger is a rare gift," Secretary Resor said.

Lieutenant Marm, he continued, met the test of combat early in his military career and "in a situation that demanded all a fighting man could give, he responded with total disregard for self."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Hero Eager to Fight Again

Farrar, Fred

Chicago Tribune (1963-Current file): Dec 20, 1966:

ProQuest Historical Newspapers: Chicago Tribune (1849-1990)

pg. 5

Hero Eager to Fight Again

BY FRED FARRAR*(Chicago Tribune Press Service)*

Washington, Dec. 19.—Army Lt. Walter J. Marm Jr., the nation's newest congressional medal of honor winner, said today that he thinks "it's about time" he went back to Viet Nam.

In saying so, he risked, and received, a maternal chiding.

Marm, 25, of Washington, Pa., made the statement at a press conference after ceremonies in front of the Pentagon. In the ceremonies, Stanley B. Resor, secretary of the army, presented the nation's highest award for gallantry to Marm on behalf of the President.

Joined as Enlisted Man

Ten medals of honor have been awarded in the Vietnamese war. This was the first not presented by President Johnson, who is at his Texas ranch for the holiday season.


At the press conference, Marm, who joined the army as an enlisted man in June, 1964, said that he had decided to make the army his career and that he would like to go back to Viet Nam.

He was asked why, but, before he could reply, his mother, Mrs. Dorothy Marm, cut in and said, only half in jest, "That's what I'd like to know."

"I'm a professional soldier," the young officer said, "and that's how I can best fulfill my obligation, either by fighting or by training others."

In Training for Year

"I've been training for a year now, and it's about time I went back," either as a platoon leader or company commander.

Asked what she thought about

Secretary of the Army Stanley Resor presents medal of honor to Lt. Walter J. Marm Jr., of Washington, Pa., for valor in Viet Nam.

[AP Wirephoto]

her son wanting to go back, his mother said:

"I'm not too happy about it, to tell the truth. I would like him to come home."

Marm is an instructor in the infantry school at Fort Benning, Ga.

The lieutenant was decorated for heroism displayed Nov. 16, 1965, in the Ia Drang valley battle.

Kills Four Reds

Marm was in command of a platoon of the 1st air cavalry division. The platoon was assigned to go to the aid of another platoon surrounded by a communist regiment.

When heavy enemy fire forced them to take cover,

Marm braved enemy fire to kill four Reds moving into position to fire upon them.

By that time, his platoon had begun to draw fire from a concealed machine gun. So Marm deliberately exposed himself to its fire in a successful attempt to pinpoint the gun's position.

He attempted to silence it with an anti-tank weapon. But when it continued to fire, he charged more than 30 yards thru heavy fire to attack the position with hand grenades, killing some of the eight-man crew.

Then, despite wounds in the face and neck, he killed the remaining machine gunners with rifle fire.

President Gives Medal of Honor to Medic: Paratrooper Hailed as a Selfless Hero in Vietnam War

Special to The New York Times

New York Times (1923-Current file); Mar 10, 1967;

ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)

pg. 20

President Gives Medal of Honor to Medic

Paratrooper Hailed as a Selfless Hero in Vietnam War

Special to The New York Times
WASHINGTON, March 9—President Johnson today draped the Medal of Honor around Specialist 6 Lawrence Joel, a paratrooper medic, and remarked that the soldier's heroism in Vietnam "indicates as nothing else could the willingness of his country to sacrifice, to stand and to persist in freedom's cause."

Mr. Johnson moved slowly through that sentence in his brief prepared address. It was to make that point and to reinforce his message that he had arranged an elaborate military ceremony on the White House lawn.

Ruffles, flourishes, honor guards and 21 salvos of salute—the kind normally offered only to visiting chiefs of state—were offered to the 39-year-old soldier who was the first medic to be so honored in Vietnam.

Specialist Joel is one of 10 children of a family in Winston-Salem, N. C.

At the age of 8, he was delivered by his parents, Mr. and Mrs. Trenton Joel, who were too poor to care for him, to foster parents, Mr. and Mrs. Clayton Samuel, who had five daughters but no son.

After high school, in 1946, he enlisted for three years, then tried civilian life for four years, and re-enlisted in 1953.

Today, after service in Germany as well as Vietnam, Specialist Joel stood at the White House beside his wife, in a mink cape, and the President and Vice President of the United States. He heard himself praised for gallantry that saved the lives of many men and inspired the performance of many more.

Behind him walked a 16-year-old son, Tremaine Cornelius, who wants to go to West Point and follow his father into the Army, a 14-year-old daughter, Deborah Louise, his foster parents, six sisters, a brother, in-laws, nephews, aunts, a dozen friends and his pastor, the Rev. Aaron Johnson of Fayetteville, N. C.

Specialist Joel, a husky six-footer, quivered a bit and his hand trembled while he saluted. But the features behind his



Specialist 6 Lawrence Joel and his wife flank President Johnson at White House ceremony at which the 39-year-old medic received the Medal of Honor for heroism in Vietnam.

horn-rimmed glasses were composed by the time Army Secretary Stanley R. Resor read the following citation for the nation's highest award:

"On Nov. 8, 1965, while serving as a medical aidman . . . Specialist Joel demonstrated indomitable courage, determination and professional skill when a numerically superior and well-concealed Vietcong element launched a vicious attack which wounded or killed nearly every man in the lead squad of the company.

"After treating the men wounded by the initial burst of gun fire, he bravely moved forward to assist others . . . he was struck in the right leg by machine gun fire . . . bandaged his own wound and self-administered morphine . . . to continue . . .

"After being struck a second

time and with a bullet lodged in his thigh, he dragged himself over the battlefield and succeeded in treating 13 more men before his medical supplies ran out . . . he saved the life of one man by placing a plastic bag over a severe chest wound to congeal the blood . . .

"With a new stock of medical supplies, Specialist Joel

again shouted words of encouragement as he crawled through an intense hail of gun fire . . . after the 24-hour battle subsided and the Vietcong dead numbered 410, snipers continued to harass the company . . . Specialist Joel never lost sight of his mission . . . and continued to comfort and treat the wounded."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

16 B

JOHNSON TO PRESENT 5 MEDALS OF HONOR
New York Times (1923-Current file): Nov 19, 1968;
ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)
pg. 9

JOHNSON TO PRESENT 5 MEDALS OF HONOR

WASHINGTON, Nov. 18 (UPI)—President Johnson will award Medals of Honor tomorrow to five Army men, including the first chaplain to receive one for extraordinary heroism in Vietnam.

The chaplain, Capt. Angelo J. Liteky, 37-year-old Roman Catholic from Washington, D. C., will receive the nation's highest award for valor for helping to save wounded servicemen.

Sgt. Sammy L. Davis, 22, of Martinsville, Ind., will be honored for single handedly manning a howitzer and firing it into enemy positions, then after being wounded joining another howitzer crew until the enemy force retired.

Capt. James A. Taylor, 31, of Fort Knox, Ky., will be honored for rescuing five wounded men from a burning assault vehicle despite heavy Communist fire and exploding ammunition within the vehicle.

Specialist 5 Dwight H. Johnson, 21, of Detroit, who killed several Communist soldiers with a pistol and submachinegun after he was forced to abandon his disabled tank, will also get a medal.


The fifth to be honored is Specialist 4 Gary G. Weizel, 21, of Oak Creek, Wis., who rescued wounded members of his helicopter crew and then fought off Communist soldiers after his arm had been blown off by a rocket explosion.

17 B

Johnson Awards Medal of Honor to Four Heroes of the Vietnam War

New York Times (1923-Current file); Jan 17, 1969;
ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)
pg. 3

Johnson Awards Medal of Honor to Four Heroes of the Vietnam War



Associated Press

Army S. Sgt. Drew D. Dix of Pueblo, Colo., shaking hands with President Johnson yesterday after he received the Medal of Honor at White House. Other servicemen hon-

ored are, from left, Navy Lieut. Clyde E. Lassen of Fort Myers, Fla.; Marine Maj. Stephen W. Pless of Newman, Ga., and Air Force Lieut. Col. Joe M. Jackson, also of Newman.

WASHINGTON, Jan. 16 (AP) — President Johnson gave Medals of Honor to four Vietnam war heroes today at the White House.

The medals went to men from each of the armed services, two of them from Newman, Ga., where Mr. Johnson noted their families were friends.

All four won the nation's highest honor for heroism in rescue operations at different places and times in Vietnam.

From Newman were Lieut. Col. Joe M. Jackson, 45 years old, of the Air Force and Maj. Stephen W. Pless, 29, of the Marine Corps. The others were S. Sgt. Drew D. Dix, 24, of the Army and West Point, N.Y., and Lieut. Clyde E. Lassen, 26, a naval officer from Fort Myers Fla.

Members of their families and their Congressmen were

present for the awards, as were Mr. Johnson's daughters, Mrs. Charles S. Robb and Mrs. Patrick J. Nugent, whose husbands are serving in Vietnam.

The medals brought to 70 the number Mr. Johnson has presented personally in the last five years.

"For a final time during my Presidency," he said, "this house is graced by the company of heroes who have scaled heights known only to the bravest of men."

With a smile, the President added he did not know what there was in the Georgia water. He said he did not know of any other town with a population under 5,000 that had produced two medal winners.

After the ceremony, he insisted on special pictures with the Georgians.

Mr. Johnson said that the

four men shared one distinction.

"Each man heard the call of duty in an hour of hard challenge and each man answered that call beyond duty," he said. "Their deeds will live forever in the records of battle."

Gen. William C. Westmoreland, former United States commander in Vietnam and now Army Chief of Staff, was present, along with the other Joint Chiefs. The Secretaries of the Army, Navy and Air Force read the citations for the medals before Mr. Johnson hung them with their blue ribbons around the necks of the men.

Sergeant Drew got his award for heroism in action at Chauhu Jan. 31 and Feb. 1 of 1968. The citation said that time and again he led rescue missions that resulted in the saving

of 14 civilians, the capture of 20 of the enemy and the killing of at least 14 enemy and possibly 25 more.

Major Pless landed a helicopter under intense enemy fire and evacuated four American soldiers who had been bayoneted and beaten by the Vietcong on a beach near Quangnai Aug. 19, 1967.

Lieutenant Lassen saved two downed American fliers during a midnight helicopter rescue mission to a steep, tree-covered hill last June 19. It took two attempts, and Lieutenant Lassen had only five minutes of fuel left when he landed aboard the U.S.S. Jouett.

Colonel Jackson was cited for rescuing a three-man Air Force combat control team from an overrun Army Special Forces camp at last May 12.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

18 B

Medal of Honor Winner Enlists Again After Year

New York Times (1923-Current file); Mar 30, 1969;
 ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)
 pg. 2

**Medal of Honor Winner
Enlists Again After Year**

PHILADELPHIA, March 28 (UPI)—Sgt. David C. Dolby, a 22-year-old Medal of Honor winner, re-enlisted yesterday after a year in civilian life and asked for reassignment to Vietnam.

Sergeant Dolby of Suburban Oaks said he felt he was better suited to helping his fellow man in the Army. He said after signing for a three-year hitch that friends advised him against

it because it was pushing his luck.

Sergeant Dolby, who has spent the last year working in the construction trade and attending colleges, said he would not be "reckless."

"I never was," he said. "I just tried to do my job."

He received the Medal of Honor Sept. 28, 1967, for action on May 21, 1966, when he took command of a 50-man unit whose leaders were dying, and rallied it in the face of heavy enemy fire.

Appendix C: AFGHANISTAN

1 C

Marines and Afghans Drive Against Rebels Tied to Deadly Attacks*New York Times (1923-Current file); Aug 14, 2005;*

ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)

pg. 13

Attacks

KANDAGAL, Afghanistan, Aug. 13 — United States and Afghan forces launched an offensive on Saturday to take from insurgents a remote mountain valley that was the scene of a blow to American forces since the Taliban government was ousted nearly four years ago.

The operation is the biggest yet aimed at a group who are believed to be responsible for twin attacks that killed 19 American troops in June. Three members of the Navy Seals were killed in an ambush, and all 16 soldiers on a helicopter sent to rescue them died when it was hit by a rocket-propelled grenade.

The offensive came at the end of a week for American forces in Afghanistan. Seven Americans have died along with dozens of militants and civilians, reinforcing concerns that crucial legislative elections next month could be threatened by a surge in violence.

United States and Afghan commanders said militants in the Korengal Valley, in eastern Kunar province near the Pakistani border, were intent on disrupting voting. They said the valley held hundreds of fighters as well as extremists from Pakistan, Saudi Arabia and Chechnya.

"We want them running for their lives way up in the hills where they can't attack polling stations," said Capt. John Mochane of the Second Battalion, Third Marine Regiment, based in Hawaii. "we want to isolate them from the community."

Hundreds of American special forces started moving into position at one end of the valley on Thursday, about 120 miles east of the capital, Kabul.

Responding quickly, the rebels fired rockets at a nearby American post and a troop convoy but did not hit anything.

American and Afghan forces hiked into the rugged mountains on Friday and Saturday, many leading lines of donkeys laden with food and water. A-10 attack planes circled high above.


The operation was expected to last at least two weeks, Captain Mochane said. One of the main objectives is breaking up a network of militants led by a local Taliban officer, Ahmad Shah, also known as Ismail, who claimed responsibility for the June 28 attacks, said Kirimat Tanhah, a commander in the American-trained and financed Afghan Special Forces.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.


2 C

Battle Company Is Out There

Rubin, Elizabeth
New York Times (1923-Current file); Feb 24, 2008;
ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)
pg. M38



**The
counterinsurgency
in Afghanistan's
Korengal Valley
one day after
another of difficult
decisions and bloody
consequences.
Hearts and minds
are hardening.**



By Elizabeth Rubin
Photographs by Lynsey Addario

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

3 C

McCain and Obama Advisers Briefed on Deteriorating Afghan War

Mazzetti, Mark; Schmitt, Eric

New York Times (1923-Current file); Oct 31, 2008;

ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)

pg. A11

and

Afghan War

By MARK MAZZETTI
and ERIC SCHMITT

WASHINGTON — Two weeks ago, senior Bush administration officials gathered in secret with Afghanist experts from NATO and the United Nations at an exclusive Washington club a few blocks from the White House. The group was there to deliver a grim message: the situation in Afghanistan is getting worse.

Their audience: [redacted] from the presidential campaigns of John [redacted] and Barack [redacted]

Over two days, according to participants in the discussions, the experts laid bare Afghanistan's most pressing issues. They sought to make clear that the next president needed to have a plan for Afghanistan before he took office [redacted] Jan. 20. Otherwise, they said, it could be too late.

With American casualties [redacted] the rise and Taliban militias gaining new strength, experts [redacted] Afghanistan say the next president will need to decide swiftly if he intends to send more troops there, because even after deployment orders are issued, it could take weeks or months for American forces to arrive.

The next president will also face what could be politically fraught decisions about how aggressively to pursue a campaign against militants taking shelter in Pakistan's tribal areas and whether to embrace negotiations under way in Afghanistan aimed

Thom Shanker and Peter Baker contributed reporting.

at getting elements of the Taliban to lay down their arms. The discussions were started earlier this month in Saudi Arabia, and talks among Afghan officials and Taliban representatives have continued in Kabul at the request of President Hamid Karzai of Afghanistan.

The Bush administration has been wary of these talks, [redacted] the grounds that they could involve fighters who have killed American troops, and in the belief that senior Taliban leaders have no interest in serious negotiations. But some senior American officials, including William B. Wood, the American ambassador in Kabul, are said to have pressed the White House to at least consider flexibility in its position.

The briefing [redacted] Afghanistan appears to have been the most extensive that Bush administration officials have provided [redacted] any issue to both presidential campaigns. It was organized by Barnett R. Rubin, an Afghanistan expert and a professor at New York University, and included John K. Wood, the senior Afghanistan director at the National Security Council; Lt. Gen. Karl W. Eikenberry, a former American commander in Afghanistan who is now at NATO headquarters; and Kai Eide, the United Nations representative in Afghanistan, according to some participants.

"The intent was to ensure that everyone understand that the situation is very fast-moving, and if the new administration spends three months trying to figure out what to do, it's too late," said one



Afghan elders in the Korengal Valley met [redacted] Thursday with military officials from Afghanistan and the United States.

administration official who participated in the discussion.

The [redacted] campaign sent Jonah Blank, a foreign policy specialist for Senator Joseph R. Biden Jr., and Craig Mullaney, another Afghanistan [redacted] or Mr. [redacted] participants said. They said the [redacted] campaign was represented by Lisa Curtis and Kori Schake, two former State Department officials.

The sessions were unclassified, but the participants agreed not to discuss their briefings or the contents of their discussions publicly.

The briefing was part of an effort by the departing Bush administration to ease the transition to the next team in a time of war and economic dislocation

and allowed officials to try to have some influence over the next administration's plans.

Both Mr. [redacted] and Mr. McCain have promised to increase the number of American troops in Afghanistan. Many in Washington are awaiting the results of a review to be led by Gen. David H. Petraeus, who takes over command of all United States forces in Iraq and Afghanistan at Central Command [redacted] Friday.

American intelligence officials believe that Taliban commanders are convinced that they are winning. Not only are they establishing themselves in larger swaths of the country, but their campaign of violence is shaking the will of European countries contributing troops to the NATO

mission.

General Petraeus's review will ultimately make recommendations about whether additional troops are needed in Afghanistan and, if so, how many. Gen. David D. McKiernan, the top American commander in Afghanistan, has requested three additional brigade combat teams for the mission, above the one extra Army brigade and one Marine Corps battalion already approved by President Bush.

General McKiernan's request, if approved, would be expected to add more than 15,000 combat and support troops to the mission, beyond the 8,000 or so scheduled to arrive in January under the orders issued by Mr. Bush.

American commanders have also spoken of the importance of better engaging Afghan tribes as a weapon against Taliban encroachment. Some have suggested using the model of the "tribal awakening" that occurred in Iraq, when the American military teamed with some former Sunni insurgents to try to drive out Al Qaeda in Mesopotamia.

But General McKiernan has cited significant differences in the history and culture of Afghanistan, as well as a greater complexity in the Afghan tribal system, as reasons why the Iraqi model does not directly apply in Afghanistan. Of the more than 400 major tribal networks inside Afghanistan, the general said recently, most have been "traumatized by over 30 years of war, so a lot of that traditional tribal structure has broken down."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The Distance Between 'We Must' and 'We Can'

Traub, James

New York Times (1923-Current file); Oct 4, 2009;

ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)

pg. WK1



and

On Afghanistan, a classic debate: on one side an imperative for victory, on other risks of overreach.

By JAMES TRAUB

OVER the next few weeks, Barack Obama will make his most difficult decision of his presidency to date: whether or not to send up to 40,000 more troops to Afghanistan, as his commanding general there, Stanley McChrystal, has reportedly proposed. This summer, Mr. Obama described the effort in Afghanistan as "a war of necessity." In such a war, you do whatever you need to do to win. But now, as criticism mounts from those who argue that the war in Afghanistan not, in fact, be won with more troops and a better strategy, President is having second thoughts.

A war of necessity is presumably one that is "fundamental to the defense of our people," as Mr. Obama has said about Afghanistan. But if such a war is unwinnable, then perhaps you should reconsider your sense of its necessity

and choose a more modest policy instead.

conservative pundit George Will suggested as much in a recent column in which he argued for a reduced, rather than enhanced, American presence in Afghanistan. Mr. Will cited the testimony of George Kennan, a diplomat and scholar, to a Senate Foreign Relations Committee hearing on Vietnam in 1956: "Our country should not be asked, and should not ask of itself, to shoulder the main burden of determining the political realities in any other country. . . . This is not only not our business, but I don't think we can do it successfully."

Mr. Kennan's astringent counsel has become piercingly relevant today, as Americans discover, time and again, their inability to shape the world as they would wish. Indeed, George W. Bush's tenure looks in retrospect like an inadvertent proof of the wisdom of restraint, for his ambitious policy to transform the Middle East through regime change and democracy promotion largely ended in failure.

The irony is that Mr. Obama, who as a candidate reassured conservative critics that

Continued on Page 4



Tough Terrain Americans on a break from patrolling Korengal Valley last April.

TYLER HICKEY / NEW YORK TIMES

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

5C

Afghan War: In One Moment, Heroism and Heartbreak The first Medal of ...

Rubin, Elizabeth
New York Times (1923-Current file); Nov 14, 2010;
 ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)
 pg. WK3



View of Battle Sgt. Salvatore Giunta, center, before the fight in which Sgt. Joshua Brennan, far left, and Spec. Hugo Mendoza, far right, would die. Below, a helicopter's downdraft.

and

The first Medal of Honor to be presented to a living American since Vietnam reveals a lot about the Afghanistan

By ELIZABETH RUBIN

THREE years and three weeks ago, dusk was falling fast on the Korengal Valley. We were crouched on a "shoulder" plateau some 8,000 feet up the mountains. The soldiers were exhausted and cold. We'd been sleeping in ditches for five nights. Insurgents were everywhere. We could hear those insurgents on the radios saying things like: "They are all the way on the end of the top sitting there." Pfc. Michael Cunningham, a deadpan Texan, said, "That is so us." Actually, it was much of Battle Company of the 173d Airborne Brigade, which was spread across the mountains — First Platoon around Honcho Hill, watching over Second Platoon in a village below called Landgial, and the Taliban were trying to hit us again.

None of this had been part of the plan for Rock Avalanche, Battle Company's six-day mission to tame the valley before the onset of winter. But then again, that is what we do, the mocking of plans. The reaction to those of mock-cry is why we have Medals of Honor but no medals for the men who die in the defining events. The reaction to those of mock-cry is why we have Medals of Honor but no medals for the men who die in the defining events. The reaction to those of mock-cry is why we have Medals of Honor but no medals for the men who die in the defining events.

Two days earlier, the Taliban had ambushed Battle Company in the forests and spurs of the Abas Ghar ridge. At stunningly close range, they had shot and killed Sgt. Larry Rougle, one of Battle Company's best, toughest and coolest. They had wounded Sgt. Kevin Rice and Spec. Carl Vandenberg, two of Battle Company's biggest. And they had stolen night vision goggles and machine guns. That's why, on this night, Dan Kearney, the 27-year-old captain, had sent Second Platoon into Landgial — to demand their stuff back from the villagers, who played dumb.

For a day or two everyone had been in shock and mourning and out for blood. Now the fear was palpable. "If they can get Rougle, they can get any of us," said Sgt. John Chirard.

I was with Captain Kearney and his command group on the plateau and soon we were helicoptered, five minutes, to the Korengal Outpost. But First and Second Platoons had to trek back through ambush country, under a full moon.

As our Black Hawk left us off, rockets and machine-gun fire echoed off the valley's walls. First Platoon on Honcho Hill was getting hit. I heard

Lt. Brad Wynn on the radio, shouting. His boys needed help. Five were down, Captain Kearney radioed commands to his other platoon. "Drop everything, cross that river, help your brothers."

Snippets of information hung in the air. "Urgent wounded Josh Brennan." "Six exit wounds." "Needs a ventilator." Kearney cursed and threw down his radio. "Eckrode leg. Valles leg." "Who is the K.I.A.?" "I think it's Mendoza."

Spec. Hugo Mendoza was a medic from El Paso and Arizona. Sgt. Joshua Brennan a combat Gary Cooper type from Wisconsin. "We are contact again. Enemy K.I.A. in custody. Over."

Kearney radioed back: "Keep bringing it on them," and "Slasher is coming." Someone radioed they could see a man making off with Brennan's rucksack and his M4. "Name Slasher, the AC-119, and the rucksack guy was dead." Captain Kearney took a breath and told First Sgt. La Monte Caldwell: "Brennan's probably going to die. I would go and hold his hand and pray with him." Which is what Caldwell did.

As airpower took over, thunder and lightning lit up the sky while the two platoons forded the river and climbed up to the Korengal Outpost.

They were drenched. Their eyes bulging and bloodshot. Their faces stained black. Near everyone.

First Platoon had a bullet hole in his vest or helmet. Sgt. Chris Shelton dropped the belongings of a corpse named Mohammad Tall. Sgt. Salvatore Giunta had shot him as he was dragging off Brennan. "His face looked like a Hulkovian muck," Shelton said. "No brains. I got them all over my hands. I have to wash them."

The only reason they didn't take more casualties, he said, was Giunta and Gallardo.

Hunched over, elbow on his knee, head resting on his palm, Captain Kearney began calling the families of the dead.

The next morning I found Sgt. Erick Gallardo outside and Sergeant Giunta on guard duty. At just 24, Gallardo was the eldest in his squad and felt like the father. "Best thing is for us to be a

The Korengal Valley was not destined to be tamed by American fighting men and their weaponry.

family, take care of each other," he said. "It's five months and we have five K.I.A.s, couple platoons worth of Purple Hearts. Not one person in my squad got out without a bullet round. It doesn't feel good at all."

And they told what had happened. The platoon had waited until dark when the Apaches were overhead before heading out, single file, Brennan in the lead. Brennan was always the lead, without protest. Even after he'd been shot

the calf two months earlier when their patrol was ambushed. He'd do anything for his friends. Not 300 meters on, they fell into the ambush. Gallardo remembered running forward to get control of the fight, R.P.G.'s landing in front of him, bullets hitting the dirt, and then eventually whacked him.

"When I fell, Giunta thought I was hit. He tried to pull me back to cover and got shot and hit the chest." But body armor saved both of them. Gallardo got Giunta and two other men and said, "On 3 we are going to get Brennan and Eckrode." They threw grenades, dropped down, prepped the second round, and Gallardo shouted, "Throw them as far as you can." They found Spec. Franklin Eckrode wounded but trying to fix his weapon. Gallardo began dressing his leg and suddenly heard Giunta yelling back: "Sergeant G, they are taking Brennan away."

Giunta told me: "I just kept on running up the trail," he said. "It was cloudy. I was running and I saw dudes plural and I was, like, 'Who the hell is up here?' I saw two of them trying to carry Brennan away and I started shooting at them. They dropped him and when I looked at him, he was still conscious. He was missing the bottom part of his jaw. He was breathing and moving and I pulled him back to the ditch."

His voice broke. Everyone in the small observation post was failing to hold back tears. "He was coming to and asking for morphine and I said, 'You'll get out and tell your hero stories and come visit us in Florence,' and he was, like, 'I will, I will.'" Out of the sky dropped a hoist and a medic and they gave him a trachea tube and Giunta kept squeezing the bag to keep him breathing. There was silence and fidgeting.

And then Giunta said, "All my feelings are with my friends and they are getting smaller. I have sweat more, cried more, bled more in this country than my own."

"These people," he said, meaning the "won't leave this valley. They have been here far before I could fathom an Afghanistan."

"I ran to the front because that is where he was," Giunta said, talking of Brennan. "I didn't try to be a hero and save everyone."

On Tuesday Giunta will become the first living soldier to receive the Medal of Honor since Vietnam. He has said that if he is a hero then everyone who goes into the unknown is a hero. He has said he was angry to have a medal around his neck at the price of Brennan's and Mendoza's lives. It took three years for the Pentagon to finalize the award. And it is puzzling to many soldiers and families why the military brass has been so stingy with this medal during the last decade of unceasing warfare.

As for the Korengal Valley, Giunta was right. The Korengalis would never leave or give up.


Last April, after three more years of killing and dying in that valley, the Americans decided to leave the place to the locals.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

6C

Rare Honor for a Living Service Member

Cooper, Helene
New York Times (1923-Current file); Nov 17, 2010;
 ProQuest Historical Newspapers: The New York Times (1851-2010)
 pg. A21



Staff Sgt. Salvatore A. Giunta received the Medal of [redacted] from President Obama on Tuesday.

a

By HELENE COOPER

WASHINGTON — In an emotional ceremony, President Obama on Tuesday awarded the Medal of [redacted] to an Army staff sergeant who placed himself in the line of fire in Afghanistan to try to save his squad mates and to protect and comfort a dying American soldier.

The young staff sergeant, Salvatore A. Giunta, now 25, of Hiawatha, Iowa, was an Army specialist when he took part in the firefight in eastern Afghanistan three years ago. He is the first [redacted] to receive the medal of [redacted] the military's most prestigious award, [redacted] action in any war since Vietnam.

Sergeant Giunta and the other soldiers of Company B, Second Battalion (Airborne), 503rd Infantry Regiment, were part of a campaign to provide food, winter clothing and medical care to Afghans in remote villages. They were ambushed in the Korengal Valley in a coordinated attack from three sides.

In a packed ceremony in the East Room before Sergeant Giunta's family, squad mates and the parents of two soldiers who were killed in the ambush, Mr. Obama recounted the events on the night of Oct. 25, 2007.

"The moon was full; the light it cast was enough to travel by

without using their night-vision goggles," Mr. Obama said, with Sergeant Giunta standing at his side, looking straight ahead. "They hadn't traveled a quarter-mile before the silence was shattered. It was an ambush so close that the cracks of the guns and the whizzes of the bullets were simultaneous."

The two lead squad men went down. So did a third who was struck in the helmet. Sergeant Giunta charged into the wall of

An award not given to the [redacted] since the Vietnam War.

bullets to pull him to safety, Mr. Obama said. Sergeant Giunta was hit twice, but was protected by his body armor.

The sergeant could see the other two wounded Americans, Mr. Obama recounted.

By now, the East Room was so silent you could hear a rustle from across the room. One Army officer took out a handkerchief and wiped his eyes.

Sergeant Giunta looked down as the president described how he and his squad mates threw grenades, which they used as cover to run toward the wounded soldiers. All this, they did under

constant fire, Mr. Obama said. Finally, they reached one of the men. As other soldiers tended to him, Sergeant Giunta sprinted ahead.

"He crested a hill alone with no cover but the dust kicked up by the storm of bullets still biting into the ground," Mr. Obama said.

And there Sergeant Giunta saw "a chilling sight" — the silhouettes of two insurgents carrying away the other wounded American — his friend, Sgt. Joshua C. Brennan. Sergeant Giunta leaped forward, and fatally shot one insurgent while wounding the other. Then he rushed to his friend. He dragged him to cover, and stayed with him, trying to stop the bleeding [redacted] 30 minutes, until help arrived.

Sergeant Brennan died later of his wounds. So did Specialist Hugo V. Mendoza, the platoon medic. Five others were wounded.

Speaking to reporters after receiving the award, Sergeant Giunta said the [redacted] was "bittersweet."

"I lost two dear friends of mine," he said. "I would give this back in a second to have my friends with me right now."

The outposts in the Korengal Valley were disbanded this spring after months of patrols that cost the American military dearly. Forces were moved to provide security to larger population centers.

7 C

Obama awards Medal of Honor for valor in Afghan battle

David Jackson, USA TODAY 4:04 p.m. EST February 12, 2013

Clinton Romesha led a battle to defend a U.S. outpost in rural Afghanistan in 2009.

President Obama awarded the nation's highest military honor Monday to a U.S. soldier who led a counterattack in Afghanistan after he and his comrades were asked to "defend the indefensible."

Clinton Romesha, a former Army staff sergeant, earned the Medal of Honor for leading the defense of a plywood-and-concrete outpost dangerously placed in a valley of the Afghanistan mountains, and staffed by only 53 American troops.

More than 300 Taliban fighters attacked Combat Outpost Keating from above on Oct. 3, 2009. Throughout a day-long firefight, Romesha led efforts to beat back the Taliban after some of its fighters penetrated the camp.

The outpost "sat at the bottom of a steep valley," Obama said, and a later investigation determined that the surrounding mountain terrain "gave ideal cover for insurgents to attack."

That investigation also found that Combat Outpost Keating "was tactically indefensible," Obama said. "But that's what these soldiers were asked to do, defend the indefensible."

Eight soldiers died in the battle and 22 were wounded, including Romesha. CNN anchor Jake Tapper wrote about the attack in his book, *The Outpost: An Untold Story of American Valor*.

Romesha, 31, who sustained shrapnel wounds, cited the "loss of our battle buddies" in a statement to reporters after the Medal of Honor ceremony, saying he has "mixed emotions of both joy and sadness," and is "feeling conflicted with this medal I now wear."

He added: "I accept this tremendous honor on behalf of all soldiers who have served with me that day. This award is for the eight soldiers that didn't make it and for the rest of the team that fought valiantly and magnificently that day. I will forever be humbled by their bravery, their commitment to service and their loyalty to one another."

At the White House ceremony, Obama described Romesha as "a pretty humble guy" who was born in Lake City, Calif., a town of less than 100 people. No longer in the military, Romesha works in the oil fields of North Dakota.

This is not even the biggest event of Romesha's week, Obama joked, as he and his wife celebrate their 13th wedding anniversary.

In describing why Romesha deserves the Medal of Honor, Obama said he "gathered up his guys" after the Taliban invaded the outpost, "and they began to fight their way back -- storming one building and then another, pushing the enemy back, having to actually shoot up at the enemy in

the mountains above."

Amid fire and smoke, Obama said, "Clint stood in the doorway calling in airstrikes that shook the earth all around them."

In saluting all of the Americans at Combat Outpost Keating, Obama repeated that one of the lessons "is that our troops should not -- ever -- be put in a position where they have to defend the indefensible."

He added: "That's what these soldiers did for each other in sacrifice driven by pure love."

8 C

Obama awards Medal of Honor to Staff Sgt. Ty Carter for heroism in Afghanistan

By [William Branigin](#), Published: August 26, 2013

President Obama on Monday awarded the Medal of Honor to Army Staff Sgt. Ty M. Carter, who hopes to use the award to help others suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder.

Carter, 33, has struggled with PTSD since a 2009 battle in eastern Afghanistan that cost eight fellow soldiers their lives. The Washington state resident is the fifth living recipient of the nation's highest military honor for heroic actions in Iraq or Afghanistan.

In bestowing the medal at the White House, Obama hailed Carter's gallantry in combat and "his courage in the other battle he has fought" — a reference to coping with PTSD. Obama said it was "absolutely critical . . . to put an end to any stigma" that prevents troops from getting treatment.

Carter, then a specialist, distinguished himself when more than 300 Afghan insurgents launched a coordinated attack at dawn on Oct. 3, 2009, in an effort to overrun [Combat Outpost Keating](#), a vulnerable position surrounded by peaks of the Hindu Kush mountains in the remote Kamdesh district of Afghanistan's Nuristan province. Of his 53 fellow 4th Infantry Division soldiers who [defended the outpost](#) that day, eight were killed and more than 25 were injured, according to the Army.

"Without regard to his own safety, Spc. Ty Michael Carter . . . resupplied ammunition to fighting positions, provided first aid to a battle buddy, killed enemy troops, and valiantly risked his own life to save a fellow Soldier who was injured and pinned down by overwhelming enemy fire," the Army said in its medal [citation](#).

Carter, who was wounded in the fighting, became the second survivor of that battle to receive the Medal of Honor. In February, Obama awarded the medal to [Staff Sgt. Clinton L. Romesha](#) for actions in another part of the outpost. It was the first battle to produce two living Medal of Honor recipients since the 1967 Battle of Ap Bac during the Vietnam War.

What became known as the Battle of Kamdesh exposed flaws in the military's counterinsurgency strategy and failures in addressing an increasingly untenable situation for isolated U.S. troops near the Pakistani border. A Pentagon review found that the outpost, which was closed immediately after the attack, should never have been established because it was too difficult to defend.

Carter braved fire from insurgents armed with recoilless rifles, rocket-propelled grenades, anti-aircraft machine guns, mortars, sniper rifles and small arms as he repeatedly ran across open ground to deliver ammunition to comrades and to rescue a badly wounded soldier, Spec. Stephan

L. Mace, 21, of Lovettsville.

Carter ran into “the blizzard of bullets and steel” not once or twice, “but perhaps 10 times,” Obama said.

Mace later died in surgery at a field hospital, and Carter blamed himself, believing that he had “failed” because he could not save the young specialist he had carried to safety.

Obama noted Monday that another survivor of the battle who struggled with PTSD, Spec. Edward W. Faulkner Jr., “eventually lost his own life back home.” Faulkner, 27, of Burlington, N.C., died in 2010 of an accidental methadone overdose, with PTSD a “contributing” condition, according to his death certificate.

Carter’s experiences led him to become active in helping veterans of the Iraq and Afghanistan wars deal with PTSD. He is now stationed with the 7th Infantry Division at Joint Base Lewis-McChord, in his home state.

In [an article](#) published on the Army’s Web site, Carter said that until the battle at Combat Outpost Keating, he believed “myths” that PTSD was not a real disorder but was “a reason for soldiers to get out of work.”

Now, he said, “I’m hoping that I can help people through what I have to say, what I’ve experienced, to help them go seek help, or else we’re going to have more out there who self-medicate and end up taking their own lives.”

© The Washington Post Company

9 C

Former Army Capt. William Swenson receives Medal of Honor at White House

By [David Nakamura](#), Published: October 15, 2013

It was a tender moment that demonstrated the brotherhood of the U.S. servicemen who fought for their lives in a remote Afghanistan province four years ago. In the heat of battle, Army Capt. William Swenson leaned in and kissed the head of a severely wounded comrade while loading him into an evacuation helicopter.

On Tuesday, President Obama cited that moment — captured in [a video taken by a medevac crewman](#) — as he presented Swenson, 34, with the Medal of Honor for heroic service in the Ganjgal valley in eastern Afghanistan. Swenson, who has since left the military, is credited with risking his life to help save other U.S. troops and Afghan allies and retrieve the bodies of four Americans who were killed Sept. 8, 2009.

“Amidst the whipping wind and the deafening roar of the helicopter blades, he does something unexpected. He leans in and kisses the wounded soldier on the head — a simple act of compassion and loyalty to a brother in arms,” Obama said of Swenson during a ceremony attended by 250 guests, including Vice President Biden, Defense Secretary Chuck Hagel, first lady Michelle Obama and several previous medal recipients.

Obama said that the nation has awarded the Medal of Honor, its highest military decoration, nearly 3,500 times, and that the video of Swenson “may be the first time that we can actually bear witness to a small fraction of those actions for ourselves.”

Swenson, who lives in Seattle, did not speak during the White House ceremony. Afterward, an Army spokesman confirmed that Swenson had asked to return to active duty more than two years after he left the service. “We are currently reviewing his request and processing it within established policy,” said the spokesman, George Wright. Swenson would have to undergo a routine drug test and background check.

A return to active service would be a remarkable turnabout.

Swenson’s path to the White House ceremony was [a rocky one](#). After he criticized his Army superiors, saying they failed to provide enough air and artillery support during the 2009 engagement, his medal nomination was delayed for years. Army officials said his nomination packet was lost in a computer system for 19 months.

Swenson became the second service member to be awarded the Medal of Honor for the Ganjgal battle. The other recipient, former Marine Cpl. Dakota Meyer, who accepted the award in 2011, was not in attendance Tuesday. Swenson has expressed skepticism about the accuracy of Meyer’s account of the battle.

Two other Marines — Ademola Fabayo and Juan Rodriguez-Chavez, who helped Swenson and Meyer in the rescue effort — attended Tuesday’s ceremony. They both have received the Navy Cross for their actions.

During an interview with The Washington Post, Swenson said he would accept the medal to honor fellow soldiers and Marines and the family members of those who died. “It does not really belong to me; it belongs to that event and the people I stood with,” he said of the medal.

In the interview, he said he had no memory of kissing the head of Sgt. 1st Class Kenneth Westbrook, who had been shot in the cheek and shoulder, until he saw the video this year. “You could have told me it happened, and I wouldn’t have believed you,” he said. “But it did, and it was captured on film. And it offered a glimpse of the humanity that does occur on battlefields.”

Westbrook, the father of three, died about a month after the battle of complications from a blood transfusion. His wife, Charlene Westbrook, was in the audience at the White House on Tuesday. “Charlene will always be grateful for the final days she was able to spend with her husband,” Obama said.

Swenson and Westbrook had been working for a year as embedded trainers with the Afghan Border Police in Kunar province in eastern Afghanistan near the Pakistani border. They were trying to prepare the Afghan forces to patrol remote tribal areas often teeming with insurgents and beyond the control of the Afghan national government.

On the day of the battle, about 11 U.S. trainers and 80 Afghan troops set out to meet with town elders. As soon as they reached the valley, they were ambushed by Taliban fighters hidden on the higher terrain that ringed the valley on three sides. Five Americans, 10 Afghan troops and an Afghan interpreter were slain.

Looking back on his last moments with Westbrook, Swenson said of the video: “To see him and to see me in that situation gives me comfort. . . . I would trade anything for that not to be our last moment, but that was our last moment, and I’ll always have that now.”

