crashed. All was not lost, however, because the helicopters were able to show their versatility and take the wounded pilot and other crew members to the hospital.

It was a rather disastrous day for McNamara. After he left us he went aboard an aircraft carrier which was involved in another accident. A plane about to land on the carrier lost one of its bombs which came loose. It skidded along the deck, narrowly missing the secretary. One of the whiz kids reportedly quipped that he should get combat pay for attending military demonstrations.

The Howze Board tests were a lot of fun, but they also involved a lot of hard work. We not only had to write and execute the tests, but had umpires evaluate them. Unfortunately, the tests were conducted in the days before there were video cameras. Nevertheless, we documented the tests with still and moving pictures. We then critiqued the tests and wrote our final reports. Based on these reports General Howze and his board of officers wrote their conclusions and made recommendations to the Secretary of the Army. As a result of these recommendations an air assault division was subsequently formed to take its place in the Vietnam War.

## Chief, Army Concept Team, Vietnam

Q: Ambassador Rowny, after the Howze Board tests were finished, where did you go from there?

A: While the Howze Board was putting together its final report, I was elated to learn I had been selected for a second star. I was assigned to Korea to become the commanding general of the 1st Cavalry Division. I was particularly pleased on two counts. First, that I had been selected for promotion after having been a brigadier general for only a year. Second, that I would be allowed to put on my two stars and command the division while waiting for my number to come up on the promotion list.

I wound up my work with the Howze Board on a Friday afternoon and drove up to Washington on Saturday. The moving van would arrive on Sunday and begin unloading our household goods on Monday morning. Early Monday I was awaiting the moving van when a limousine drove up. The driver said he had a note for me from Cyrus R. Vance, Secretary of the Army. The note said that the secretary had tried to get in touch with me over the weekend but couldn't do so because my phone was not hooked up. He asked me to get into his limousine and come have breakfast with him. You can imagine that my decision to do so was not a very popular one with my wife.

Vance said he was quite impressed with what he had seen of the Howze Board tests and said he was thinking about sending some helicopters to Vietnam to act in a counterinsurgency role. You will recall that this was still 1962 and the U.S. role in Vietnam was limited to providing advice and logistical support to the Vietnamese. He asked me to describe to him in detail how I thought helicopters could be used in Vietnam. For the next two hours I did so. I told him that helicopters could be used for command and control purposes, that is, ferrying commanders about the battlefield where they could meet face-to-face with subordinates, explain orders to them, and see how they were doing. Helicopters could also be used to pick up wounded, much as they did in Korea in bringing the wounded soldiers back to MASH hospitals. I told Vance what he already knew about the great value of getting wounded rapidly to places where they could be operated on and given blood transfusions. Before Korea, 90 percent of all soldiers with head and belly wounds died. During Korea, 90 percent of all such casualties survived. Helicopters could also be used to ferry critically needed supplies of ammunition, radios, and f ood to units needing them. But the greatest use of helicopters, I thought, was to arm them with rockets and machine guns so they could perform armed reconnaissance and offer highly discriminating fire power to troops in rounding up or fighting guerrillas. I told Vance I hoped he would assign some helicopters to me in Korea where I could experiment further along the lines of the Howze Board tests.

Vance thanked me and asked me who I thought should be put in charge of taking armed helicopters to Vietnam. I said that any one of a number of officers on the Howze Board could do the job and gave him the name of one officer I thought was particularly qualified. I left the meeting quite pleased, especially at the thought of getting some helicopters to experiment with in Korea.

On Tuesday morning Vance's limousine showed up again, asking if I would come have breakfast with him. By this time my wife was becoming more than a little annoyed. Our furniture had arrived and she was left by herself to tell the movers where to place it and also to mind our four children. Time was running short since I was due to leave for Korea on Wednesday.

Vance told me that the general I had recommended did not want to leave his family and had been asked to resign. He said he had talked to Senator Henry 'Scoop" Jackson and the chief of staff of the Army and had decided that I was the one who should take the helicopters to Vietnam. He told me to draft up a charter and tell him who I wanted for my staff. The idea was that I would assemble about 25 Army officers-and a few Navy and Air Force officers to act as liaison-and about 25 scientists from think tanks working for the Army. I would, he said, take armed helicopters to Vietnam and experiment with ways to use them to fight counterinsurgency operations. The officers and scientists would help me devise

schemes and test them under conditions of actual combat.

Vance also told me that this new assignment would mean that my promotion would be put on hold. He said there were two reasons for this. First, the idea of arming helicopters and giving the Army a role in close tie support from the air was highly contested by the Air Force and Navy. Keeping me at a one-star rank would help to promote a low profile approach. Second, General Joseph Stilwell (my former boss at Benning, whom we had nicknamed "Cider Joe" because he was not up to his father's reputation as "Vinegar Joe") was in charge of Army support for the Vietnamese in Saigon. It would be difficult if I were promoted to two stars, to work under Stilwell, who was a one-star general.

Incidentally, I had sent my uniforms to Korea to have them retailored and to have the large yellow 1st Cavalry patches sewn on them. It was not until more than a year later, after I had returned home from Vietnam, that my uniforms were shipped back to me. The 1st Cavalry Division had sent them to the Deceased Effects Bureau of the Army, who forwarded them on to me after they established that I was, in fact, still alive.

I was quite disappointed at the notion of having my promotion delayed. I had set my heart on commanding the 1st Cavalry Division and now the opportunity was being snatched away. But I had to admit that taking armed helicopters to Vietnam and experimenting with them in combat was a fascinating challenge. In the end I simply licked my wounds and accepted my new job as a matter of fate.

I spent the next week writing my charter and getting my staff lined up. I was very fortunate in getting Colonel Frank Clay assigned as my deputy. I had known Clay as a highly principled man who would fight my battles vigorously with the other services over roles and missions. My idea was to establish Clay in the Pentagon as my liaison man. The fact that Clay was highly respected as an armor officer would help me, especially since I knew I would get most of my opposition in the Army from armored officers. Clay was also on good terms with General Creighton Abrams, then a deputy in the Army's office of force development, ACSFOR, [assistant chief of staff, force development]. As it later turned out, Abrams played a critical role in keeping my efforts in Vietnam from going under.

I was also fortunate in getting assigned to my staff the Army's best writer. Colonel Robert Kinkor. He and Clay helped me pick officers to serve on my staff. One outstanding officer we picked was Colonel William Tyrell, a man of uncommon moral courage. They, in turn, helped me choose outstanding civilian scientists, some of whom I had met through my work on the Army's Scientific Advisory Board.

Having chosen the staff, I next turned to finding a name for the group. I came up with the acronym ACTIV, which stood for Army Concept Team in Vietnam. ACTIV had a catchy ring to it and helped advertise the image that we were a highly motivated, can-do group. I got the name from reading about a Soviet elite group with the same name.

My next step was to call upon Admiral Harry D. Felt, who commanded the Pacific theater of operations. As soon as I began briefing Admiral Felt I realized that I was walking into a buzz saw. He told me straight away that he thought arming helicopters was a bad idea. In the first place, he didn't like helicopters. Second, and more importantly, he believed strongly that if the Army armed helicopters and supported ground troops with fire power from air platforms, it would adversely affect the Navy's roles and missions. Felt commanded all U.S. forces in Vietnam and had not received any orders from the Joint Chiefs of Staff to support ACTIV.

Meanwhile, the machine guns and rockets that we were to attach to the helicopters and the helicopters had been shipped to Manila. I as well went to Manila and from there spent a lot of time on the phone with Vance and Colonel Clay. Vance was encountering difficulty getting General Wheeler to issue orders to Admiral Felt to allow me to proceed with the helicopters to Vietnam. Vance had to go to Secretary of Defense McNamara to get an order issued to the Joint Chiefs of Staff which, in turn, would be transmitted to CINCPAC [Commander in Chief, Pacific (Admiral Felt)]. I had worked for McNamara in 1959 when I was a member of the chairman's staff group and drew up plans for the buildup of U.S. forces in Europe during_ the second Berlin crisis. McNamara thought the Army's air mobility concept had merit and backed Vance. In the end, McNamara prevailed upon Wheeler to issue the necessary orders to allow me to proceed to Vietnam.

However, I was not well received in Saigon. The headquarters commandant in Saigon was a Marine Corps officer, who told me he had received no orders to support my experiments. Unable to get a separate office, I moved into an Army installation several blocks away from the MACV Military Assistance Command, Vietnam]. One morning shortly after moving into my newly established office, I arrived to find the desks, tables, file cabinets, and typewriters out in the street. I had been dispossessed by the Saigon headquarters commandant who said that I had no authority to occupy the building the Army had assigned me. While standing on the street with my office equipment around me, Brigadier General Robert "Buck" Anthis drove up. I had come to know Anthis when we were classmates at the National War College. He thought I was being treated shamefully and, even though the Air Force was opposed to the air mobility concept in principle, Anthis invited me to establish an office in his headquarters. He had some temporary partitions and I was able to operate from his headquarters until I straightened out things with the headquarters commandant and moved into my own building. I have

always been grateful to General Anthis. His magnanimous support for my effort was one more proof of the great value of the personal relationships established at the National War College.

At about this time an officer arrived in Saigon to join my staff who had been our headquarters commandant in Paris when I was the secretary of the general staff there. Colonel Jack Hertzog was the most outstanding can-do officer I have ever known. He was the kind of an officer who would complain to me if I had not assigned him an "impossible task" that day. In Paris he had accomplished difficult tasks like getting a new roof for our headquarters when there was no money for one. He also produced an air conditioner on 24-hour notice over a 4th of July holiday when General Norstad thought that General De Gaulle should have one in his office.

Hertzog found a burned-out building in Saigon and somehow or other got the Army Corps of Engineers to send him lumber, plumbing and electrical supplies. In about a month I had a more modem office than General Paul D. Harkins who commanded MACV. Hertzog even had the walls covered with silk wallpaper. I was nervous about this because General Alden K. Sibley had been reprimanded for having the bathroom in his St. Louis office covered with silk wallpaper. But Hertzog was very careful not to get me implicated and always covered his own tracks. When the office was ready for occupancy, complete with a large kidney shaped desk, I joked with Hertzog that a comer of my office looked rather bare. I told him it needed some "junk" to spruce it up. The next day, Hertzog brought in a beautiful 10-foot model of a Chinese junk. He had taken me literally. From then on I never joked with Hertzog about sprucing up my office.

As soon as we moved into our new office building we went into high gear and developed about 30 to 40 experiments. These were of two types: how to assist the Vietnamese nation-building concept and how to help counterinsurgency operations.

In the first category we dug deep wells for water supply, helped establish pig farms, dug large ponds for growing fish, helped fishermen get boats and nets, and implemented a half dozen other such projects. Most of the money for these endeavors came from charitable organizations in the United States and Europe. Germany contributed the largest share of the money for these nation-building projects.

Another one of our projects was to stimulate ways of improving rice production. The Japanese had, in the days before World War II, experimented with ways of getting more rice per square meter of rice paddy. They tried different spacings of rice seedlings, different types of fertilizers, and different planting schedules. As

a result of these basic experiments they introduced new techniques into Korea which doubled their harvest. We sent for these studies and attempted to introduce some of the same techniques in Vietnam. It was difficult, however, because in the first place, communication was a problem. Second, traveling about the countryside was dangerous. Third, there was great resistance to changing centuries-old habits. As a net result, we did not accomplish any revolutionary changes. But we were able to make a dent. One of the project's biggest values was that it raised the morale of a number of village and hamlet chiefs.

Q: What about your second mission, that of experimenting in the military field?

A: Although arming helicopters was our main task, it was by no means our only effort. For example, we placed single artillery pieces in villages where local militiamen could fire against mass attacks. This turned out to be highly controversial, since the Army's Artillery School taught that artillery should always be massed and never deployed as single pieces. We did the same thing with mortars. The ability of villagers to send up flares to light up the countryside when terrorists were attacked at night and to fire artillery and mortars against attackers proved a highly effective effort and did much to build morale.

Another idea we put into practice was to import a huge Weyerhauser tree cutting machine. This machine, which was used in the U.S. to produce wood pulp, could cut a swath through the jungle 10 yards wide at one pass. By cutting 50-yard swaths north and south and east and west through the jungle at intervals of one kilometer, we were able to establish "killing zones." Trip wires and listening devices would alert our artillery and helicopters whenever a band of guerrillas tried to cross one of the killing zone swaths. It proved very effective at breaking up enemy attacks.

We also experimented with air-cushion vehicles. The Army and Marine Corps were at that time developing a platform built around a large fan. The fan, when it worked properly, could transport 20 to 30 men rapidly over rice paddies, swamps, and rivers. It was a good idea, but the fans were not powerful or rugged enough to operate well.

One of our important programs was to train the younger and older men, those who had not been drafted. We formed them into local militia units to help protect village and hamlet chiefs. We set up programs whereby the Vietnamese army taught these militia to shoot carbines. It was a risky business because the Viet Cong targeted the militia in order to steal their weapons. But it was better than not protecting the chiefs-and hence the villagers themselves-from attack. We extended this program to the training of women. In some regions, especially in the

Delta region in such villages as Bat Lieu, the women did remarkably good jobs of defending the populace from Viet Cong attacks. In all such programs we had one idea in mind: protecting the village and hamlet chiefs from being assassinated.

Another program we instituted was to get the Vietnamese army to erect barbed wire fences around key villages. Into the barbed wire they sowed mines and flares. Here again we had to take calculated risks. Many villagers lost their limbs or lives because they did not know where the mines were planted. But we did our best to assure that villagers knew where the cleared paths were. It was another way of trying to protect villages and hamlets from Viet Cong attacks.

Our main efforts, however, were devoted to experimenting in combat with the helicopters which we had jerry-rigged with 2.75-inch rockets and .50 caliber machine guns. The idea was simple: helicopters could swoop in suddenly, having flown the nap of the earth, and by discriminating carefully between friend and foe, deliver accurate firepower to drive the enemy off. The main difficulty was with operating under the rules of engagement then in effect. U.S. pilots were not allowed to engage in combat but only to support the Vietnamese. This meant that our U.S. pilots were. simply chauffeurs who carried Vietnamese soldiers who did the actual firing of the rockets and machine guns. Vietnamese soldiers were prone to air sickness and we had to provide them with special incentives to get them to fly in the helicopters.

The idea enjoyed initial success because it was novel. The Viet Cong were at first frightened by the choppers and would break and run when they saw them approaching. Later, they became bolder and tried to shoot down the choppers. But this proved very difficult because the helicopters would appear so suddenly that the Viet Cong were surprised. Moreover, they hit very few because they did not know how to take a lead on the moving targets. As time went on, however, they got better at hitting the choppers. But even then, it proved not very effective. A chopper which had been shot down could be lifted out by a sling from another helicopter, be repaired, and come back to fight another day. What was described in the U.S. press as a "disaster" when six helicopters were shot down at Ap Bac proved not to be disastrous at all. All six helicopters were lifted out, repaired, and brought back to fight again. Besides, we had learned a lesson and changed our standing operating procedures [SOP]. Before Ap Bac, the orders to pilots were to go immediately to the rescue of a pilot who had been shot down. In this way five choppers were shot down trying to rescue the pilots from the first one. After Ap Bac, when a chopper was shot down, other choppers would be sent to the rear or flanks of the attacking force. We learned how to avoid sending good money after bad.

Nevertheless, the bad publicity we received from the Ap Bac operation set us back. In fact, the U.S. press was one of our most serious problems in Vietnam. The newspapers and wire services were in keen competition with one another and sent some of their most ambitious reporters to Vietnam. For example, David Halberstam reported for the *New York Times* and Neil Sheehan for UPI. Some of these reporters, Halberstam in particular, were more interested in pursuing their own political agendas than they were in reporting on the military situations. On several occasions I would take a reporter with me when I went to witness an operation. After one such trip I read in the following day's *New York Times* that the Vietnamese did not do very well. The reporter said that this was due to the unpopularity of Madame Nhu, Diem's sister. After reading the article I approached Halberstam and said, "You know, Dave, that the operation was rather successful. And whether it was or not had nothing to do with Madame Nhu. The soldiers don't even know who she was."

"Ed," he said, "the readers don't want to read anything about these military skirmishes. What they are interested in is the Dragon Lady [Madame Nhu]."

*The New York Times* had one objective reporter, Peter Braestrup. But his stories were not often picked up. He subsequently quit his job and wrote the best book about reporting in Vietnam. *The Big Story* told about how the reporters operated and denounced them for their misrepresentation of the U.S. effort in Vietnam. It's a pity that *The Big Story* did not get as much attention as it deserved because it outlined in detail the way in which U.S. public support for Vietnam, especially after the military success of the Tet operation, was undermined.

One of the main difficulties in Vietnam in the early 60s was the serial killings of the village leaders. The Viet Cong systematically singled out and assassinated the village chieftains. As a result, the villages were unable to put up any serious resistance to the guerrillas. In the calendar year 1962 over 1,200 village and hamlet chieftains were killed. It was an effective way of demoralizing the Vietnamese and preventing any organized resistance against the Viet Cong. The Dragon Lady had nothing to do with this situation. Nor was the Viet Cong able to infiltrate the Vietnamese because the leaders had not been elected by a democratic process. Had there been a free electoral process, no candidates would have been found to take on the suicidal jobs of becoming village chiefs.

Shortly before I left Vietnam in 1963, Diem was assassinated. Since there was no one of stature to take his place, Diem's death marked the beginning of the end of the South Vietnamese effort. Events unfolded rapidly after Diem's brother, the Bishop of South Vietnam, got involved in a religious squabble at Hue. The bishop, a Catholic, was able to get South Vietnamese troops ordered to attack a Buddhist demonstration at Hue. A number of messages passed quickly between Saigon and

Washington over a weekend when all of the senior officials at the State Department were out of town. These messages reportedly blamed Diem for the killings at Hue and threatened to withdraw U.S. support. This led to a lack of confidence in Diem and resulted in a series of events which led to his death. Diem was, at the time, what Syngman Rhee was to Korea, the father of his country. After his death, one leader after another tried to take over thereins of the Vietnamese government. But none emerged who were able to take charge and from then on the Vietnamese fought a losing battle against the Viet Cong. Even so, after the North Vietnamese organized regular units and the U.S. entered the war, we could have defeated them. However, by that time the support of our soldiers back home was so weak that winning the war was impossible.

Our ACTIV reports recommended that U.S. troops not enter into combat but remain as support troops for the Vietnamese. But these recommendations were not very popular back home. Neither General Wheeler, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, nor Mr. McNamara, the secretary of defense, took hold of our recommendations. As a result, they poured in more and more U.S. troops in the face of rising opposition of the press and the U.S. public. In the end, even though Tet was a military victory, the war was lost. We finally pulled out of Vietnam, making it a tragedy. It was particularly damaging to the U.S. military establishment.

Q: Weren't you shot down in a helicopter? When did that happen?

A: Yes. After I had been in Vietnam about 11 months, I was shot down in a helicopter not far from Saigon. We were taking off at Tan Son Nhut, the military airfield, when a sniper's lucky shot hit the tail rotor of my helicopter. The pilot tried to maneuver the chopper but couldn't do so because without the tail rotor he could not steer it. He engaged the overhead rotor into an auto-rotation mode and we started to drift towards the earth. However, without its tail rotor the helicopter began spinning faster and faster. I was strapped into the middle of the back seat. Otherwise I would have been thrown out when the helicopter hit the ground, as were my aide and a sergeant who was manning a machine gun. The sergeant suffered a broken arm and leg, and my aide fractured his tailbone. The pilot had both his legs broken and subsequently died in the hospital as a result of an embolism. He had saved my life because he stopped me from getting out of the helicopter after it hit the ground.
The main rotor was still rotating and in my haste to get out, fearing a fire, I would have walked into the rotor. My aide was evacuated to the States. Six weeks later he was sent back to Vietnam to finish his tour. As for me, I was kept in the hospital overnight because of bums from the seat belt.

Q: Didn't you later get hurt when you parachuted with the Vietnamese?

A: Yes. The Vietnamese paratroopers were good soldiers but their morale was low. Unlike the U.S. airborne units, their officers did not jump into combat with them.

To set an example, I decided to jump with the Vietnamese paratroopers. they jumped first into the jungle area and set up a perimeter, after which I jumped into the center. However, just as I was about to hit the ground, a gust of wind blew up.

***Brigadier General Edward L. Rown y before making a jump in Vietnam, early 1960s.***

I tried to break my fall with my arm and as a result dislocated my shoulder. I was in a great deal of pain and couldn't straighten out my right arm. The Vietnamese paratroopers thought I was saluting them and it took a bit of talking to convince them that my shoulder was really dislocated.

They sent up a purple smoke flare, which was the signal that helicopter evacuation was required.

In about five minutes a chopper landed, but it was not configured as an ambulance. The pilot, Colonel Ivan Slavich, put me in the co-pilot seat and began to transport me to the hospital in Saigon. However, Slavich spotted some Viet Cong along the way, and for the next ten minutes chased after them. He wanted to show me how effective an armed helicopter could be. However, I was more interested in getting back to the hospital. Besides, Slavich had put the Vietnamese gunner in the back seat and had to be content in trying to scare the Viet Cong rather than shoot them.

I was greatly relieved when I landed, a half hour later, and had my arm twisted back into my shoulder socket. But I have never forgotten the ride I had with "Wild man Slavich."

My right shoulder and arm were taped up. It was close to the time when my year was up, and since I was told it would take several days for me to recuperate, I decided to go home by the Western route. I went to Thailand, then to Indonesia, to India, and then to Pakistan. I wanted to go to Afghanistan to see some friends there but couldn't fit it into my schedule. Instead I went to Lebanon, then to Israel, Turkey, Greece, Italy, and France. The trip took about 30 days but I had a fascinating time, largely because I traveled with my new aide, Captain David Young. Young was an outstanding officer, a West Point graduate, who later left the Army in order to care for his dyslectic son. After he retired, he became a successful stockbroker and entrepreneur.

Q: Did you consider your tour in Vietnam a success?

A: Yes. I think we brought several innovative ideas on nation-building to Vietnam. But our biggest success was the work we did in demonstrating that the air mobility concept was a good one for fighting a counterinsurgency war. I believe our studies were the necessary link which led to the formation and deployment of the air mobile divisions in Vietnam.

Q: Was Colonel Frank Clay very helpful to you?

A: Yes. Frank Clay was extremely helpful to me by supporting me and fighting for my needs in the Pentagon. He established my office in ACSFOR, which was headed up by General Ben Harrel. Harrel was very much in tandem with Harold K. Johnson, who went from being deputy chief of staff for operations and plans [DCSOPS] to become chief of staff of the Army. Johnson, like Wheeler, his predecessor, was against the air mobility concept. However, Harrel had as his deputy General Creighton Abrams. Although Abrams was an armor officer and not keen on helicopters, he was an honest, fair, and objective officer. Besides, he was on a first-name basis with Frank Clay. As a result, I was able to get support from the Army despite the obstacles that the Army staff put in my way.

Q: Who put the biggest obstacles in your way?

A: General Harold K. Johnson. He was a relatively junior officer when he was selected to become the chief of staff, a major general who jumped over 250 officers

and made a four-star general. He was a protege of General Wheeler's and had the support of the powerful group of armor officers who were then running the Army. Johnson did not like Howze and was dead set against the air mobility concept. Later on, when he became chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the air mobile concept had proved itself in Vietnam, Johnson became a supporter of the concept. But before that time he did everything he could to try to kill air mobility.

Q: Before we leave Vietnam, let me ask you a fundamental question. In ACTIV you made efforts to combat the Viet Cong and North Vietnamese. But another way of combatting the North Vietnamese was through the use of traditional battlefield linear formations. Do you think that the ACTIV concepts were done away with because it was decided that counterinsurgency operations could not be carried out or was the high command just flat-out opposed to the whole idea and felt that nothing could beat normal linear battlefield operations?

A: I think it was a combination of both. Our original idea in **ACTIV** was that the only way to win a war against Viet Cong infiltrators was to help the Vietnamese help themselves. But this idea lost a lot of steam after Diem was assassinated and after successive Vietnamese leaders found they were unable to pull the Vietnamese people together. You will recall that our original ACTIV recommendation was to keep the war in Vietnamese hands. We insisted that the U.S. stay out of combat, believing that if we did, the Vietnamese would cease fighting for their own freedom. Only the Vietnamese, we said, could defeat the Viet Cong.

After the U.S. introduced its own forces into combat it forced North Vietnam to change their tactics. Instead of relying upon the Viet Cong, they went to linear formations themselves. We could have won that kind of a war if we had been willing to accept the large number of casualties it would involve. But by the time we became effective on the battlefield against North Vietnamese units, the war was already lost at home.

The North Vietnamese mounted one last-ditch effort at Tet. The battle of Tet was actually a military victory for the United States. But the TV coverage of our people climbing aboard helicopters to get out of Saigon unnerved the U.S. public and caused us to throw in the towel. Once we had lost the hearts and minds of the U.S. people, the net effect was the same as it had been when the French pulled out their support for the French military. The French military did not lose the war in North Vietnam, nor did the U.S. military lose the war in South Vietnam. The U.S. people-led along by the U.S. press-in my opinion, lost that war.