Unheard voices: foreign journalists' coverage of vietnamese prisoners during the American War in Vietnam

Author(s):
Berni, Marcel

Publication date:
2024

Permanent link:
https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.3929/ethz-b-000679805

Originally published in:
Small Wars & Insurgencies 35(7), https://doi.org/10.1080/09592318.2024.2361973

SMALL WARS & INSURGENCIES
2024, VOL. 35, NO. 7, 1260–1284
https://doi.org/10.1080/09592318.2024.2361973

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Unheard voices: foreign journalists' coverage of Vietnamese prisoners during the American War in Vietnam

Marcel Berni

Strategic Studies Department, Swiss Military Academy at ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland

ABSTRACT

This article examines how foreign journalists covered the Vietnam War by focusing on how they reported on the treatment of Vietnamese detainees. As transnational actors, reporters created sources that linked the local conflict in Southeast Asia to perceptions in the wider world. Unlike the coverage of the My Lai massacre, the many reports on the fate of Vietnamese prisoners had no serious impact on public attitudes or Congressional appropriations. By providing a classification of the various acts of violence covered, this article highlights the discrepancies between the prevailing official narratives and what reporters actually witnessed in the jungles of Vietnam.

ARTICLE HISTORY Received 22 April 2024; Accepted 27 May 2024

KEYWORDS Detainees; laws of war; newspapers; prisoners of war; vietnam war

> 'The entire question of handling prisoners of war has been one of the knottiest encountered by the United States in this peculiar conflict'.[1]

Introduction

In June 1964 readers of *Life* magazine probably expected to read about the end of the 60-day filibuster against the Civil Rights Act. Instead, the front page of the popular news magazine attracted readers with the cover story 'Ugly War in Vietnam' and a full-page colour photograph of a column of American soldiers fighting their way through a rice paddy. The images of the young Japanese war photographer Akihiko Okamura dominated that week's issue.

CONTACT Marcel Berni marcel.berni@milak.ethz.ch Strategic Studies Department, Swiss Military Academy at ETH Zurich, Schuerenstrasse 4, Zurich, Birmensdorf CH-8903, Switzerland

This article has been corrected with minor changes. These changes do not impact the academic content of the article.

Okamura emulated the famous photojournalist Robert Capa, who was killed by a landmine during the First Indochina War.[2] Like Capa, Okamura reported exclusively for *Life*, which soon reached a circulation of 8.5 million and, at a price of less than a dollar, was affordable to middle-class Americans.[3] Okamura was closer to the Vietnamese civilian population than many of his Western colleagues. He covered the fighting in Vietnam fearlessly and at close range – an undertaking that earned him the *Overseas Press Club Award*, but also 53 days in a Việt Cộng (hereafter Viet Cong) prison camp.[4]

On 12 June 1964, the Japanese reporter focused on the attack on a South Vietnamese village near Cambodia.[5] After the usual aerial bombardment, the soldiers of the South Vietnamese Army had no difficulty in taking control of the village. During an extensive search of the surrounding bunkers, the South Vietnamese captured 43 prisoners.[6] It is not clear from Okamura's report whether these were actually enemy soldiers. What is clear is that the South Vietnamese soldiers immediately began torturing the prisoners to find out where they had hidden their weapons. There was no formal charge, but instead the ad hoc torture interrogation took its course: the prisoners were gagged by the soldiers in a bent and painful position, their heads were pushed under the surface of a nearby river and their nostrils were sprayed with water. Their mouths were tied shut with cloths to simulate artificial drowning. Not even Okamura's verbal protests could stop the crimes. One of the soldiers even replied that it was his duty to torture the prisoners and continued. But even three hours of torture failed to produce the desired information. The American military adviser present took note of what was happening – without intervening.[7]

Even before the issue featuring Okamura's photos, *Life* had reported on the torture of Sài Gòn's (hereafter Saigon) captured opponents. In January 1963, for example, the editors showed pictures of terrified prisoners being held at bayonet point and questioned about the whereabouts of their weapons. It was no secret to journalist Milton Orshefsky, himself a veteran of World War II, that torture was being regularly used in Indochina.[8] Thus, it was not unusual to read about American soldiers in such reports: On 26 November 1965, for example, a Viet Cong fighter tied up by Marines appeared on the cover of *Life*. A tight duck tape covered his eyes, another his mouth.

According to *Life* journalist Michael Mok, the Viet Cong fighter was taken away and put in a prisoner of war (POW) camp. In the same report, Mok recorded a conversation between the marines: 'You know the system. If they're dead, they're confirmed V.C. [Viet Cong], and if they're still breathing, they're suspects.'[9]

This article illustrates that such violent treatment of Vietnamese prisoners was covered by many foreign reporters and thus common knowledge.[10] However, from the beginning of Vietnam's American War, the treatment of Vietnamese prisoners did not provoke serious debate on the American home front. It was not until the Tết Offensive (Tết Mậu Thân, hereafter Tet Offensive) and the revelations of the Mỹ Lai massacre (hereafter My Lai), committed in

1968 but covered up and reported more than a year and a half later, that controversy over the conduct of the war escalated. On 12 November 1969, the revelation of the My Lai massacre shook the United States when the *Dispatch News Service* in Washington released a report authored by investigative journalist Seymour Hersh. Shortly afterwards, graphic images taken by Army photographer Ronald Haeberle further added to the collective shock, unveiling the horrifying truth of over 500 unarmed Vietnamese civilians being mercilessly shot by GIs from a rifle company within the Americal Division. These stark images depicted the systematic slaughter in My Lai and neighbouring hamlets, and shattered any notion that civilian killings were isolated incidents. The global circulation of these photos, particularly in colour in *Life* magazine, intensified public outrage, culminating in an interview with one of the perpetrators by Mike Wallace on *CBS*'s *60 Minutes*.[11] Unlike the coverage of the My Lai massacre, articles about Vietnamese prisoners did not have such a significant impact on Western public attitudes or Congressional appropriations.

Context and methodological approach

In the major conventional wars with American participation before Vietnam, progress had been measurable. Enemies killed and captured, enemy infrastructure destroyed, and territory gained were obvious indicators of success. In an irregular war, progress was much harder to measure. With the enemy often hiding among the civilian population, traditional patterns of progress became blurred.[12] Instead, arduous, time- consuming and often unsatisfactory operations became the new norm. The indicators of success in such assignments were much harder to measure.

In such a guerrilla war, information gathering was of great importance. For this reason, from day one, the warring parties paid attention to their captured opponents. It is only recently that scholars have begun to examine the fate of Vietnamese prisoners in detail.[13] Previously, the focus, particularly in the West, had been on American prisoners in North Vietnam.[14] Because North Vietnam openly questioned the relevance of the Geneva Conventions, captured American soldiers were treated as 'pirates' with only a fraction of the rights to which they were entitled under international humanitarian law.[15]

Less is known about how South Vietnam and the US treated their prisoners. And even less is known about the image of Vietnamese prisoners in the wider world at the time. Therefore, this article seeks to fill the research gap on how North Vietnamese and Viet Cong prisoners were perceived. To this end, this article analyses the main American newspapers and asks the following three questions: How did the media report on North Vietnamese and Vietcong detainees? How was the treatment of these communist prisoners described and portrayed? Why did the violent treatment of enemy prisoners not provoke further backlash against the American war in Vietnam?

From a methodological point of view, such a study is fraught with dangers that should be addressed at the outset. Firstly, there is the risk of false generalisation due to the fact that many accounts deal with individual fates. Secondly, there is the question of how generalisable the following reports really are: Journalists mostly work under time and information pressure. A strong tendency towards sensationalism and exaggeration is therefore inherent in the following collection of sources. However, this type of source has its advantages. The many reports describe and document in an inescapable way what echoed back to the US and the Western world about the war in Indochina. In addition, the way in which the other side was reported says a lot about the stereotypes, perceptions and judgements that were common at the time.

This article therefore focuses on the depiction of violence against Vietnamese prisoners during the long war in Vietnam and is structured both thematically and chronologically: Thematic in the sense that the acts of violence are categorised according to core themes; chronological in the sense that these subchapters are structured more or less temporally.

The research on which this article is based finds disturbing descriptions of prisoners, from the very beginning of the war right to the end. In fact, reports in the press about the treatment of communist prisoners were frequent throughout Vietnam's American War. In January 1968, a total of 464 reporters were accredited in South Vietnam, 176 of them Americans.[16] From the beginning of the war until the American withdrawal from Southeast Asia, journalists reported on the shooting of prisoners, the malnutrition of detainees, the arbitrary arrest of innocent people, the daily torture during interrogations, the war crimes committed against prisoners, the constant complaints from the *International Committee of the Red Cross* (ICRC), the frightened prisoners who did not know what was happening to them, the (hunger) strikes in the detention camps, the violations of the laws of war and the lack of punishment for perpetrators.

From time to time, leading journalists complained that they were denied access to prisoners and that their research was hampered by military censorship, particularly in the POW camps.[17] Transmitting dispatches and personal experiences from the invisible frontlines in Vietnam, reporters became transcultural intermediaries illustrating the connections between the war in Southeast Asia and the wider world. In this way, details of the war found their way to the American home front as in no other war before. Up-and-coming English-speaking journalists such as David Halberstam, Philip Shabecoff and Raymond Walter 'R. W'. Apple of the *New York Times*, Cornelius Mahoney 'Neil' Sheehan of *United Press International*, Peter Arnett and Malcolm W. Browne, both of *Associated Press*, and Ward Just of the *Washington Post*, regularly covered the war. Together with older war reporters such as Charles H. Mohr, William Tuohy, Stanley A. Karnow and James

'Scotty' Reston, they wrote about the conflict right from the beginning.[18] This article argues that their reporting on Vietnamese prisoners did not provoke serious policy debates or reforms, either domestically in the US or in the international court of public opinion. If at all, their reports were of isolated interest to members of the peace movement or international humanitarian organisations.

Murder and abuse

In view of the violence to which both female and male prisoners were subjected, their survival was a dance on a knife-edge. The violence inflicted had symbolic content and functioned as an informal language that was directed at friend and foe. Violence in the form of dead and mutilated bodies transcended spatial, cultural and temporal boundaries. To this end, the perpetrators staged their deeds and left behind their own testimonies. Jack Langguth wrote already in 1965 in the *New York Times* of 'hundreds of … examples [of executions] that are seldom reported'.[19] Only days later, *Newsweek* reported the execution of three wounded North Vietnamese by American soldiers. One of the GIs allegedly said to one of the prisoners before pulling the trigger: 'You won't smile anymore'.[20] Charles Mohr reported in the *New York Times* that soldiers of the 1st Cavalry Division had shot prisoners after the battle in the Ia Đrăng River Valley in November 1965, immediately after their own comrades had suffered the same fate.[21] Neil Sheehan had already described the execution of North Vietnamese prisoners in the same newspaper a few days earlier.[22]

According to many reporters, arbitrary arrests, intimidation of civilians, torture and murder of prisoners were commonplace. *New York Times Magazine* journalist William Tuohy quoted a US soldier: 'A little bit of terror goes a long way'.[23] Another GI cited in Tuohy's article drew attention to the differences between theoretical guidelines and actual military practice: '[This] is a total war involving all the people … Assassination would horrify General Westmoreland … But assassination is what the peasant understands'.[24]

Similar stories were told also in left-leaning publications. In *Liberation*, a New Left magazine, Eric Norden devoted 15 pages to reporting on US and South Vietnamese violations of the laws of war. As a result, as early as July 1966, Democratic Senator Stephen M. Young of Ohio told the Senate that the US should stop transferring prisoners to South Vietnam 'in the name of humanity and decency: Probably more of these prisoners are executed than are permitted to survive'.[25] Young's assessments were printed in the Congressional Record and even picked up by the *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, a regional newspaper in Missouri.[26] But there was no change in US or South Vietnamese prisoner policy and no political debate, except for empty rhetoric. In fact, similar stories continued. Earl W. Foell wrote in the *Christian Science*

Monitor in 1966 that 'many reputable reporters' had now witnessed South Vietnamese torture and murder.[27] Writing in the *New York Post*, Peter Hamill pointed out that American soldiers violated the Geneva Conventions 'every day', especially in their treatment of prisoners of war:

> Every correspondent knows this, and has seen it for himself. An American unit will move into a village, or an area, and round up every male. A South Vietnamese liaison officer will then interrogate each man, and if he believes the man is a Viet Cong guerilla, or even a sympathizer, the man will be taken off to a detainment camp. After detailed interrogation, he is usually executed.[28]

Prisoners would thus be lucky if they were only shot, Hamill quoted an American major as saying, alluding to the usual methods of torture and ill-treatment.[29] The *Washington Post* even published a picture of a Viet Cong fighter who, after being captured, was punched in the head and chest by an American GI from the 1st Cavalry Division. Another captured North Vietnamese soldier was hit in the mouth with an assault rifle by a group of soldiers. A 19-year-old soldier from the battalion said after the assault: 'I've seen too many of my buddies get it. I couldn't give a damn'.[30]

Jim G. Lucas of the *New York World Journal Tribune* went so far as to describe the brutal execution of suspects after a Viet Cong attack.[31] Similarly, on 3 April 1967, the oldest weekly magazine in the United States reported on an operation in which various prisoners taken at random were paraded around the village as a deterrent. According to the *Nation*, the practice was carried out in 'about a dozen villages in South Vietnam every week'.[32]

On 1 October 1967 William Tuohy reported on the hitherto 'worst American atrocity' in Vietnam: Two prisoners were put in front of an ad hoc firing squad and executed. As one of the prisoners was still moving, a grenade was thrown between the two bodies. Another captive was bound, placed on a chair and hung from the ceiling of a house with a rope around his neck. One of the Marines pushed the chair from under the prisoner, who was left with only his feet touching the ground and strangled by the rope. The detainee was then further abused with kicks to the head, stomach and chest. After nearly killing the victim with punches and a sandbag, he was stabbed with a knife and decapitated. The Marines involved received only lenient sentences.[33]

It was not only newspapers that reported the murder and abuse of Vietnamese prisoners. In a television interview, a former Green Beret GI reported that he had personally shot a prisoner and witnessed other such killings.[34] More reports of prisoner abuse and murder followed. On 3 November 1969, *NBC* broadcast a clip of Vietnamese allies abusing a prisoner. On the same evening, *CBS* broadcast footage of a wounded POW being stabbed to death by South Vietnamese soldiers.[35]

When the *Winter Soldiers*, a group of veterans keen to expose war crimes, spoke out against the American war in Southeast Asia in 1971, the fate of

enemy prisoners once again found its way into national news coverage. A multi-page interview in *Life* magazine with Lieutenant Colonel Anthony B. Herbert alluded to the 'Standing Operating Procedure' for dealing with prisoners of war:

> My first engagement with the enemy in Vietnam, I captured two VC who were trying to run. A sergeant came running up and tried to bayonet the people … I grabbed him and threw him down.[36]

It was not only the American media that reported on Vietnamese prisoners in South Vietnam. For the communist *Liberation Radio*, the mistreatment of captives was a trove of propaganda to draw on. In a broadcast on 15 August 1972, it condemned South Vietnamese President Nguyễn Văn Thiệu's emergency law, which he was using to make arbitrary arrests. According to the radio broadcast, prisoners of war were used as minesweepers and living shields in battles.[37] North Vietnamese print propaganda sought to exploit these and similar allegations: Thousands of students, workers, peasants, women and children were tortured in South Vietnamese prisons, according to the *Liberation Press Agency*.[38]

In this context, John F. Kerry's testimony before the Senate Foreign Relations Committee seems symptomatic. In his much-publicised speech on 22 April 1971, Kerry pointed out that abuse and torture in South Vietnam were not 'isolated incidents', but were part of 'crimes committed on a day-to-day basis with the full awareness of officers at all levels of command'.[39]

Torture

The Geneva Convention, which both South Vietnam and the US had ratified, strictly prohibited not only abuse and murder, but also torture and any other inhumane treatment of prisoners. Nevertheless, torture in the treatment of detainees soon spread to alarming proportions. These abuses came to the attention of the American public repeatedly, particularly through the above-mentioned *Winter Soldier* hearings in 1971. However, the first reports of prisoner interrogations appeared in the print media as early as November 1964. John Hughs, for example, wrote in the *Christian Science Monitor* at the time that the South Vietnamese Army was shaped by its conventional training, which was superfluous for South Vietnam's civil war. According to Hughs, this frustration was responsible for the 'violent methods' used in many interrogations.[40] In spring 1965 Donald Wise, foreign correspondent for Britain's *Sunday Mirror*, echoed that American soldiers were assisting their South Vietnamese allies in torturing detainees.[41] During interrogations, innocent peasants regularly died from knees to the groin, drownings in water or loss of blood.[42] Beverly Deepe of the *New York Herald Tribune* reported on so-called 'frying' torture, in which prisoners were abused with electric shocks, as well as the cutting off of fingers,

ears, fingernails and genitals by American soldiers.[43] Malcolm W. Browne described similar abuses in his 1965 book *The New Face of War*.[44] *The Nation*'s readership had been aware of similar crimes since 1964.[45]

Even readers of major newspapers were quick to criticise the torture practised by American and South Vietnamese units: In a letter to the editor of the *New York Times*, a doctor from the University of Pennsylvania drew attention to the frequent reports by American journalists describing the torture of communist prisoners. The behaviour of the US *State Department* was characterised by 'immoral apathy' and a 'narrow legalistic position'.[46] Another reader's letter complained that the torture of prisoners of war was 'common, if not routine, and occurs with the full knowledge and in presence of American officers, who do not protest'.[47]

Already in July 1965, the *New York Times* printed three pictures of tortured Vietnamese who had been badly beaten during interrogations southeast of Đà Nẵng (hereafter Da Nang).[48] Lloyd Garrison had previously written that the torture of Viet Cong prisoners by South Vietnamese troops was common knowledge: 'In recent months numerous news photographs of such excesses have appeared in the United States and abroad'.[49] Just over two weeks later, Robert B. Semple highlighted the fact the several photographs had been published showing communist prisoners being tortured by the South Vietnamese. Now it was up to the Americans to put pressure on Saigon to ban torture.[50]

However, allegations and evidence of US and South Vietnamese torture continued to be reported. Anyone who carefully read an important article by William Tuohy could have guessed as early as 1965 that torture was counter-productive in this war and ultimately counter to American interests.[51] Tuohy exposed his readers to the real war:

> Anyone who has spent time with Government units in the field has seen the heads of prisoners under water and bayonet blades pressed against their throats. In more extreme cases, victims have had bamboos slivers run under their fingernails or wires from a field telephone connected to arms, nipples or testicles.[52]

Referring to Tuohy's article, Eric Norden described in February 1966 the war in Vietnam as 'the dirtiest war in [American] history'.[53] In October 1965, another journalist wrote for the *Nation*: 'Torturously exacted confession and conversion are no longer things we fight against. These are now part of our own arsenal, weapons of our own struggle'.[54]

Torture remained a persistent theme in the print media. In August 1966, for example, Robert J. Sarti reported in the *Arizona Republic* that 'both sides' were using torture.[55] In the same month, an editorial by Joseph Kraft reminded *Washington Post* readers of the torture and murder of prisoners of war:

> Saigon does not treat men taken in the Vietnamese conflict as prisoners of war enjoying the rights of the Geneva Convention. On the contrary … Without believing all the horror stories, it is quite clear that the Vietcong soldiers taken prisoner … are in some cases tortured and killed. The American Government is thus in the ambiguous position of asking humane treatment for its own captured soldiers while being a party to inhumane treatment for the soldiers of the other side … In this situation a general reform in treatment of prisoners is obviously called for.[56]

No such reform took place. Instead, many more journalists witnessed torture and murder. In September 1966, the *Baltimore Sun* reported on the interrogation of two farmers who were forced under water and beaten. They were then tied to a tree and left to die.[57] On the same day, James Reston, writing in the *New York Times*, pointed to the great brutality that only a civil war could bring, and which was explicitly manifested in the treatment of prisoners.[58] Shortly before the Tet Offensive, the *Washington Post* published five pictures showing waterboarding of at least one prisoner during *Operation Wheeler/Wallowa*.[59] According to the article, water torture was

> said to be in fairly common use among Allied troops in Vietnam: Those who practice it say it combines the advantages of being unpleasant enough to make people talk while still not causing permanent injury.[60]

Peter Arnett wrote in the same newspaper that waterboarding was an accepted form of interrogation in Vietnam.[61] When Lieutenant Colonel Anthony B. Herbert spoke out against the institutionalised torture in his battalion, he was simply told: 'That's the way it is. You can't rock the boat. You can't antagonize the big dragons'.[62]

The *Chicago Sun Times* even ran a front-page story about a different torture technique. A Vietnamese prisoner was pushed out of a US Army helicopter in order to make the other prisoners in the chopper talk.[63] Water, helicopter and electric torture were staples of American reporting. William Greider, for example, reported in the *Washington Post* on seven Army veterans who made public confessions about brutal interrogations of Vietnamese prisoners.[64] Interrogator John Drolshagen reported in *Life* on the use of electrical torture on detainees. An American officer had even 'filleted' a prisoner alive, to the effect that he then had to be killed: 'We had to kill him [the prisoner] after that, you couldn't take a guy in that condition to a hospital'.[65] On the same page, the editors published a picture of a farmer being pushed to the ground by a South Vietnamese and an American soldier and being waterboarded to reveal information.[66] Further allegations from returning veterans were not long in coming: In December 1970, the *New York Times* quoted a group of GIs who spoke of widespread murder, torture and terrorism by American forces in South Vietnam.[67]

How did officials react to such reports? The US *Department of Defense* had 'no specific comments' to make in response to the many allegations that were made in 1971 and 1972, nor to earlier allegations.[68] This also applied to allegations of 'helicopter burials' and waterboarding made by a military intelligence officer as part of the anti-war movement and picked up by the media.[69] About a hundred other soldiers testified in Washington in December 1970 that they had witnessed the torture and murder of Vietnamese prisoners and civilians: The *New York Times* quoted them as saying: 'They charged that "crimes against the South Vietnamese people" were commonplace, deliberate and matter of policy'.[70] An Army interrogator told the same outlet that during his deployment in 1968 he had personally beaten, cut and abused Vietnamese prisoners in the presence of his superiors to extract information. American officers looked on as South Vietnamese field police branded some prisoners with a metal spoon.[71] Additionally, American soldier Michael J. Uhl stated that field telephones were regularly used in the torture of prisoners.[72] At the same time, he questioned the usefulness of the methods deployed.[73]

Unsurprisingly, the *Liberation Press Agency* referred to articles in the *New York Times* and its affiliated magazine by Sydney H. Schanberg. Based on interviews and records smuggled out of South Vietnam, Schanberg concluded that the South Vietnamese government tolerated the torture of prisoners. Such incidents were, according to Schanberg, 'typical' and documented by numerous sources.[74]

Crimes of the South Vietnamese armed and police forces

American GIs did not act alone in South Vietnam. Rather, they were part of a larger coalition of South Vietnamese and Western armed forces. In this respect, the portrayal of enemy prisoners by the South Vietnamese Army and Police is of interest. According to journalist and author Jonathan Schell, the South Vietnamese Army had its own brutal style of interrogation.[75] James Reston reported that the South Vietnamese had little interest in capturing Viet Cong fighters, instead preferring to kill them. The *New York Times* reported on a US government study which concluded that the brutality of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam in dealing with Viet Cong prisoners discouraged defectors from escaping and that desertions were therefore rare.[76] That same month, the *Baltimore Sun* illustrated that South Vietnamese troops were punching and kicking prisoners.[77] Neil Sheehan stressed that Vietnamese military police frequently shot, beat, tortured or otherwise mistreated Viet Cong prisoners. The most common methods of torture used by South Vietnamese government forces included beating prisoners, dragging them behind moving vehicles, applying electrodes to sensitive parts of their bodies, pouring peppered water up their nostrils or scalding them with hot water.[78]

Intimidation, contempt, arbitrariness, abuse and torture during field interrogations were just some of the allegations that emerged from an article by Orville Schell.[79] Three previous articles in the *New York Times* had already pointed out that many detainees had been arrested pre-emptively and that only 5 to 10% of those arrested were actually guerrillas.[80] These impressions were confirmed by reports in the *Chicago Tribune Press Service* in March 1966, the *San Francisco Chronicle* in January 1967 and the *Washington Post* in June 1975, to name but a few.[81]

The erosion of American support for the South Vietnamese government owed a great deal to the bleak military situation and the brutal visual evidence. When the head of the Saigon National Police, Brigadier General Nguyễn Ngọc Loan, brutally shot a prisoner on the streets of Saigon on 1 February 1968, the world watched in disbelief.

Images of the gruesome crime, captured by an *NBC* cameraman and an *Associated Press* photographer, went viral as an illustration of the horrors of an unpopular war.[82] However, not much changed, despite the continuation of similar stories. Stories like that of Charles Mohr, who described the torture of a South Vietnamese interrogator with the participation of American soldiers.[83] The *Washington Post* reported on the interrogation of a 25-year-old Viet Cong prisoner by American and South Vietnamese troops. An American soldier gave the following information to the newspaper: 'We find that it is much better to let the Vietnamese security men do the questioning'.[84] They were better suited to 'oriental' interrogation techniques, which in this case included beatings, a mock execution with a carbine and intimidation with a German shepherd dog.[85]

The *Washington Post* complained that 'most of the Vietcong prisoners released in South Vietnam were in bad shape due to savage torture, inhuman treatment, and frequent transfer from one prison to another'.[86] The *New York Times* also reported on torture and executions in South Vietnamese POW camps during this period. On 20 July, a reader's letter even said:

> [In my experience as a USAID pacification program officer for the city of Da Nang], the South Vietnamese police and prisons systems were the most hated and feared entities in Vietnam … Rather than aid, I say – until every political prisoner in South Vietnam is released, and the non-Communist opposition to the Thieu regime is permitted to function free of the political terror which is the very kind of tyranny we said we went to Vietnam to oppose – not another dollar, and not another Saigon.[87]

On 27 July 1973, Thomas M. Lippman recorded similar allegations against the Saigon government and analysed reports from *Amnesty International* and other human rights organisations. Quoting from a confidential document, Lippman wrote that South Vietnamese prisons were 'hellish places' where 'brutal tortures are still going on'. Lippman even quoted from a letter written by 14 prisoners in a civilian prison near Biên Hòa:

> We were beaten brutally as in the Middle Ages. We were beaten with truncheons on our heads, on the whole body. We were tortured with electrodes, with lamps directed into our eyes, with pins into the fingers and toes.[88]

Mistreatment and self-serving classifications in captivity

While the focus of torture was more or less on obtaining information, the mistreatment of prisoners was often characterised by a deliberate need to harm and humiliate the helpless victims. In this respect, one can speak of autotelic violence, which finds its meaning exclusively in itself and in the destruction of another body. The US Army defined prisoner mistreatment as any treatment of the enemy that was less dignified than that guaranteed to American military personnel.[89] According to this definition, mistreatment was commonplace in Vietnam. Early on the *New York Times* had reported on interviews with Viet Cong POWs, which revealed that despite the 'brutal practices' of South Vietnam's prison guards, the captured guerrillas had maintained high morale.[90] Marius Livingston referred to these rumours in a letter to the editor on 28 July 1965. A professor at Glassboro State College, he was highly critical of the mistreatment by the South Vietnamese allies, which he even compared to Nazi war crimes:

> Under no circumstances can we allow captured enemy soldiers to be abused or mistreated … This is a matter of great urgency. It is a test case. It cannot go unchallenged. The conscience and honour of this nation hang in the balance.[91]

On 24 December, the *Washington Post* even insisted that the US was responsible for all prisoners transferred to South Vietnam.[92] In this regard prisoner classification soon became a contested topic: It seemed impossible to categorise the prisoners accurately, especially as the South Vietnamese government treated many Viet Cong prisoners as traitors rather than POWs and placed them in overcrowded civilian prisons.[93] Jonathan Randal reported in the *New York Times* that the South Vietnamese authorities did not keep 'adequate records' of prisoners.[94] Although progress had been made in granting POW status, many 'terrorists' were still being executed by the South Vietnamese regime, the New *York Times* reported a few days later.[95] This problem was soon recognised by American politicians. When Congresswoman Bella Abzug wanted to speak to political prisoners during a visit to South Vietnam in 1973, South Vietnamese officials did not know what she even meant. Many prisoners were locked up together, and Western categories were rarely considered.[96] Although Abzug raised this crucial issue with the Committee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs in the House of Representatives, it was little more than a storm in a teapot.[97]

In January 1968, the *Atlantic* published a detailed analysis by Orville Schell. It detailed the treatment of prisoners at a Chu Lai assembly point. Schell

repeatedly pointed out the confusion between POWs and 'civil defendants'. That same year, *Life* again shocked the public with awful pictures of prisoners from Vietnam. This time it published five pictures from the prison island of Côn Sơn (hereafter Con Son), taken by former navy pilot Thomas R. Harkin. Harkin had heard about a secret wing on Con Son, and himself found it during a visit as an aide to two members of Congress. According to him around 500 prisoners were kept in so-called 'tiger cages'. These were subterranean steel enclosures built during the French colonial period, with only light from above. The captives were kept like animals in foul-smelling, overheated enclosures and abused with aggressive lime powder dripped into their eyes. Almost all the prisoners were thirsty and ill. Tuberculosis, which spread rapidly in the cages with the least amount of space for movement, was omnipresent. Because of the constant hunger, some of the prisoners ate grass, lizards and insects. Some were forced to drink their own urine.[98]

The *Washington Post* reported on the tiger cages before the pictures were published in *Life*. According to a report by the propagandist *Radio Hanoi*, more than a hundred political prisoners died in this way in nine months.[99] According to the South Vietnamese commander of the Con Son prison, the prisoners were all hardened criminals, known as 'tigers'. In response to critical inquiries that soon followed, Frank E. Walton, the chief American adviser on the application of the laws of war in Vietnam, praised the Con Son prison system in the press as a detention centre that embodied even higher standards than prisons in the United States.[100] Walton felt that the treatment of prisoners should be left to the South Vietnamese regime alone – and passed the buck: 'You have no right to interfere in Vietnamese affairs'.[101] The *Evening Star* similarly quoted Walton as saying that conditions in American prisons were even worse. The same report, however, also referred to statements by American politicians accusing American officials of an institutionalised 'cover-up'.[102] A few days later, the paper reported again on the 'brutal and inhumane' treatment of political prisoners and POWs at Con Son.[103]

Even the *New York Times* repeatedly reported on the conditions at Con Son prison. Among other things, it referred to an ICRC inspection report that criticised the prison. Lack of fresh food, water and clothing were just some of the reasons why Democrats Augustus Hawkins and William Anderson later spoke of 'atrocious … conditions'.[104] The *Washington Post* clarified that the conditions of detention at Con Son were merely 'part of a pattern of brutality, overcrowding and torture in jails throughout South Vietnam'.[105] The article referred to the testimony of Douglas Hostetter, a *Vietnam Christian Service* volunteer who had been giving sewing classes at Tam Kỳ Provincial Prison in Quảng Tín Province. Hostetter testified to the paper that many prisoners – including minors – were detained without trial or hearing. He said he was aware of torture at an interrogation centre near where he was staying at the time: 'In the interrogation centre [across the street] there was the usual electric shock, beatings, sticking with pins, burning with cigarettes and at times, water torture'.[106]

The inhumane images from Con Son gave many Americans pause for thought. How could the US provide military, financial and moral support to a regime that tolerated such practices? On 1 April 1973, a reader of the *Washington Post* wrote a reader's letter:

> While we become engrossed in welcoming back our POW's [orig.], Americans cannot afford to pass over lightly the plight of the tiger cage prisoners and their political prisoners incarcerated in the most abominable conditions in South Vietnam. While we seem outraged at the least suffering inflicted on our POW's [orig.], we cannot live in good conscience with a double standard of justice that says our boys deserve freedom and care for their part in the war but the political prisoners of South Vietnam deserve the worst man is capable of dishing out. We need to wake ourselves up to the reality of the kind of government we are supporting over there.[107]

These revelations could not have come at a worse time for Washington. In the context of the peace negotiations and the Nixon Doctrine, they threatened not only the American negotiating position in Paris, but also the approval of further funding by the Senate. If more tales of torture and mistreatment were to emerge, the captured Americans in North Vietnam would be increasingly at risk.

But that was exactly what was happening, as a witness told several correspondents at a press conference immediately after his return from Con Son: American Don Luce described his observations and strongly criticised American support for the prison.[108] Harkin doubled down, describing Con Son as a symbol of American involvement in the war. These accusations were picked up by US media: The *Washington Star* noted the American origin of the iron bars at Con Son, the *New York Times* sharply criticised the widespread torture, and the *Washington Post* even called for Walton's removal.[109]

Like Hostetter, more and more witnesses came forward as the war progressed. Soon after, Marjorie Nelson, a doctor from New Haven, complained to a government commission that she had witnessed widespread torture at Quảng Ngãi. A *New York Times* report, based on Nelson's testimony, should have raised the alarm about the conditions in the detention centre. Originally built for 500 prisoners, the prison held between 800 and 1,300 captives, including many women with children: 'I saw dozens of patients with bruises of varying severity. I also examined patients who had coughed up, vomited or urinated blood after being beaten about the chest, back and stomach'.[110] Nelson added:

> Prisoners also told me of being tortured by electricity with wires attached to ears, nipples and genitalia; by being forced to drink concoctions containing powdered lime and other noxious substances, and by being tied up and suspended by ropes upside down from the rafters for hours.[111]

Prisoners classified as 'civil defendants' were particularly vulnerable. Civil defendants, who were not protected by the Third Geneva Convention because of their nebulous status, were also abused by the Army's Green Berets, for example when members of the Special Forces electrified a cable cage containing civil defendants.[112] In May 1972, journalist Alexander Casella published a voluminous article in the *New York Times Magazine* on the arbitrary classification of prisoners.[113] Casella's article highlighted the mistreatment of Vietnamese prisoners by Americans. US Army officials took notice of Casella's report, but shelved it. The US Army's internal final verdict after a lengthy review process was: 'A clever mixture with a dash of fact'.[114] Nevertheless, a nervous search for similar allegations began in the office of the Chief of Military Police. Dozens of newspaper articles were analysed and checked for veracity.[115] Even Frank A. Sieverts, Special Assistant to the Under Secretary of State for Prisoner of War Affairs at the *State Department*, admitted in a *New York Times* commentary on Casella's article that torture did occur in South Vietnam. Nevertheless, he criticised Casella's report.

Unlike Casella, however, he was referring only to prisoners of war.[116] Unsurprisingly, the latter stood by his comments even after Sieverts criticised them.[117] However, there were no subsequent changes in military practice. Instead, the Office of the Chief of Military Police collected further reports and left the matter up to internal investigations.

Conditions in the prison camps continued to make headlines: On 8 June 1972, the *Washington Post* reported on a protest by prisoners on Phú Quốc prison island who were served only rotten fish.[118] A few days later, the *New York Times* wrote about the violent suppression of the protests, which resulted in 13 deaths and 56 injuries.[119] On 15 August, the same newspaper again reported allegations of torture in South Vietnamese prisons.[120] The *Washington Post* quoted an ICRC report describing the conditions in the camp as 'disgusting, catastrophic and appalling'.[121]

Conclusion

Since 1965, journalists continuously reported on the fate of communist prisoners. The US Army also realised that public opinion was fundamental to the course of the war. It therefore collected all the reports, newspaper clippings, personal accounts, books and works of journalists – whether favourable or unfavourable. The My Lai massacre was not the start of this process. After all, reports on the treatment of prisoners had already before then been compiled, annotated, and neatly archived by the Army.[122] All this paints a clear picture: Anyone who wanted to know about the war and human rights abuses in South Vietnam could read about them. Indeed, reading these texts makes Chandler Davidson's words from February 1964 seem prophetic: 'Is it, perhaps, that not many people are aware of the kind of war to which the United States gives at least tacit moral support? That seems unlikely'.[123]

Although not all media reports were critical, there was ample evidence that a large proportion of communist prisoners in Vietnam were tortured and ill-treated. In this context, the US objection that most of the prisoners in the tiger cages were civilians was of secondary importance. The theoretical boundaries between the categories of POW and civil defendant had been blurred in practice for some time. This was the official reaction when American representatives had to justify the tiger cages in Con Son in the face of a media uproar:

> We recognise that Con Son is civil prison, not PW facility, but this distinction is technical one and … does not excuse what has been depicted as grossly inhumane treatment of detainees, many of whom are reportedly interned for political offences.[124]

After the fall of Saigon in May 1975, the *Washington Post* reported, based on declassified ICRC reports and interviews, that the US government had known of 'beatings and large-scale brutality in some of South Vietnam's largest prisons and prisoner-of-war camps' since 1969.[125] Even if some of the newspaper reports analysed here can be accused of a tendency to scandalise, it is clear from the majority that the leading media reported unvarnished accounts of the treatment of Vietnamese prisoners. In addition, there were favourable reports which, following the official diction, sought to portray the treatment of prisoners in South Vietnam as exemplary – especially in the early years of the war.[126] On 10 December 1967, for example, *Parade Magazine* wrote of enemy POWs living 'in comfortable captivity' and being 'well-treated, well-fed, well-clothed'.[127] But even as the war progressed, Saigon's own POW policy was praised. In 1972, the *San Diego Union* reported on 'the best possible treatment' and commented that 'Saigon … has chalked up one of the finest records for treating POWs of any nation during wartime'.-[128] Six months later, the *Chicago Tribune* reported on the seemingly luxurious conditions in South Vietnam's prison camps.[129]

In the United States, however, people were far less offended by the treatment of prisoners than by the deliberate killing of unarmed civilians, as at My Lai. The evidence seems clear: Vietnamese prisoners – civilian or military – were of minor importance to the average newspaper reader. Although – as this article has shown – reporters and readers' letters kept pointing out their fate, it was secondary to public memory. Instead, the fate of American POWs in North Vietnamese hands greatly overshadowed – and essentially shrouded the suffering of their fellow Vietnamese victims in a thick cloak of silence. A compilation of sources and newspaper articles on American and South Vietnamese war crimes published by Catholic and Jewish clerics as early as 1968 caused little public uproar.[130] Many of the reports were about the abuse, torture and murder of prisoners. For more than a decade, reporters followed in Akihiko Okamura's footsteps, echoing the violence suffered by communist

prisoners. Unlike the killings of unarmed civilians at My Lai, these echoes of violence had no lasting impact. The practical impact of these graphic reports remained marginal.

How can it be explained that these reports disappeared almost without trace, and that a defensive reaction of denial of guilt and responsibility took hold almost immediately? The lack of widespread criticism seems to be linked to a general indifference towards enemy prisoners, as well as to the patriotic support for America's own boys far from home. Paradoxically, Jonathan Schell and Bernd Greiner even speak of 'a kind of pride in sinning'.[131] A take-no-prisoners mentality was thus adopted by the home front, as evidenced by its politicians, and incorporated into the old narrative of American exceptionalism. The image of the dutiful patriot and the brave jungle warrior, who could only defeat the enemy by confronting him with his own ruthless lawlessness, took hold in much of civil society. It does not seem far off the mark to speak of a 'cover-up' initiated by the military and completed by the indifference of politicians. Anyone willing to take the gloves off in the face of such an enemy was sure to win the loyalty of conservative veterans' associations and politicians. The latter exerted increasing influence on the military judiciary, with the result that many war tribunals were not even convened or that convicted perpetrators were given unusually lenient sentences.[132] As a result, soldiers in the field increasingly interpreted acts of violence against prisoners as trivial offences. The suffering of others was of no interest either in Vietnam or in much of American society. Empathy for the enemy was rare. Only the peace movement took up critical media reports. Nevertheless, there was no window of opportunity at the political level to remedy the institutionalised abuses in the treatment of communist prisoners. It is possible that this process was linked to a social self-protection already diagnosed by the psychologist Robert Jay Lifton.[133] The uncomfortable transgression of civilisational imperatives by one's own boys in the distant imperial periphery did not fit into the tried-and-tested master narrative of America's virtuous wars. To some extent, the *Winter Soldiers* mentioned in this article do fit into that narrative, as they sought to strengthen opposition to military tribunals and to exonerate alleged war criminals as victims of the system. In contrast, they themselves were always the purified ones, claiming civic obedience and loyalty to America. The fact that many of them were themselves guilty of the worst war crimes could almost be forgotten in the face of their public apologies. It may well be that the loss of confidence in the opinion-forming media that began at this time is linked to the questioning of national self-images and myths triggered by Vietnam.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributor

Marcel Berni is a research fellow at the Chair for Strategic Studies, Swiss Military Academy, ETH Zurich. He has published articles and essays on the Vietnam War, Swiss history, and contemporary issues in international strategy and the history of violence.

ORCID

Marcel Berni http://orcid.org/0000-0002-2932-8654

Notes

1. Apple, "U.S. Alters Policy to Safeguard Enemy Captives,", 6. The author would like to thank the reviewers and the editor-in-chief for their time and effort in the review process.
2. Hunt, "In the Steps of Robert Capa,", 3.
3. Asbury, "Time Inc, To Revive LIFE as a Monthly", 74.
4. Okamura, "Back from a Vietcong Hellhole in the Jungle," 56D-62. On Okamura, see Hirano, Noted Japanese War Photographer Goes on Display, *The Japan Times*, 3 September 2014, https://www.japantimes.co.jp/news/2014/09/03/national/noted-japanese-war-photographer-goes-on- display/. Henceforth, the term *Viet Cong* will be used for the successors of the Việt Minh. This mainly refers to the armed segment of the National Liberation Front, which Ngô Đình Diệm and many Americans called Viet Cong.
5. Okamura, "A Little War, Far Away – And Very Ugly," 34-43.
6. The terms *prisoner, detainee* and *captive* are used synonymously in this article. However, the term *prisoner of war (POW)* is only used for those prisoners who have been classified by the governing authorities as captured combatants.
7. Ibid.
8. Orshefsky, Burrows, "We Wade Deeper into Jungle War," 30-31.
9. Mok, Schutzer, "In They Go – to the Reality of this War," 59-60.
10. This article is based on the dispatches of foreign journalists. These are non-Vietnamese, mostly American, reporters who quickly made a name for themselves working for leading US print newspapers.
11. Jones, My Lai: Vietnam, 1968, and the Descent into Darkness, 212-224; Gray, Martin, "My Lai: The Struggle Over Outrage," 93-96; Olson, Roberts, My Lai: A Brief History with Documents, 146-177; and Allison, *My Lai: An American Atrocity in the Vietnam War*, 75-94; Bilton, Sim, Four Hours in My Lai, 347-363.
12. Daddis, No Sure Victory.
13. Berni, *Außer Gefecht*, 25-39.
14. Rochester, Kiley, *Honor Bound*; Davis, Office of the Secretary of Defense, *The Long Road Home*.
15. Berni, "The ICRC and Communist Captives During Vietnam's American War."
16. However, these figures should be treated with caution, as they also include women and freelance media representatives who sometimes made short visits to South Vietnam. See Braestrup, *Big Story*, 9-10. For other reports before 1966 in which Americans abused prisoners, see Levie, 'Maltreatment of Prisoners of War in Vietnam," 376.

17. See, for example, Gershen, 'Inside a POW Camp: A Close-Up Look at Enemy Prisoners,' *Parade Magazine*, 10 December 1967, 10-11; Butterfield, 'South Vietnam Lets Reporters Visit P.O.W. Camp,' *New York Times*, 29 October 1971, 3; Benoit, 'Prisoners of War Protest Conditions in S. Vietnamese Camp,' *Washington Post*, 8 June 1972, F2; Emerson, *Winners and Losers*, 126.
18. Karnow, *Vietnam*, 296-297; Halberstam, *The Best and the Brightest*, 204-206.
19. Langguth, 'Brutality is Rising on Both Sides in South Vietnam,' *New York Times*, 7 July 1965, 7.
20. *Newsweek*, 29 November 1965, cited in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, *In the Name of America*, 60. *Reuters* also reported similarly after the battle in the la Drang River Valley. See Norden, American Atrocities in Vietnam, *Liberation*, February 1966 (reprint), 4.
21. Mohr, "Obey P.O.W Code, U.S. Soldiers Told,", 1, 4; Raymond R. Coffey of the *Chicago Daily News* reported similarly on 19 November 1965. See *Chicago Daily News*, 19 September 1965, cited in Norden, American Atrocities in Vietnam, 4.
22. Sheehan, "Battalion of G.I.'s Battered in Trap," 3. See also the articles in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, *In the Name of America*, 60-61.
23. Tuohy, "War is Hell and, by God, This Is One of the Prime Examples:' A Big 'Dirty Little War," 514.
24. Ibid., 513.
25. Stephen M. Young, cited in Congressional Record – *Senate, 20 July 1966, 15,638, cited in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, In the Name of America*, 66; Young had previously criticised American crimes in Vietnam. See Norden, American Atrocities in Vietnam, 5; and Dellinger, "Political Realism and Moral Disaster," 18-19.
26. See *St. Louis Post-Dispatch*, 21 July 1966, cited in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, *In the Name of America*, 66.
27. *Christian Science Monitor*, 22 July 1966, cited in ibid., 73.
28. *New York Post*, 25 July 1966, cited in ibid., 66-67.
29. *New York Post*, 25 July 1966, cited in ibid., 73-74.
30. "Tense GIs Batter 2 Captives," A2.
31. *The New York World Journal Tribune*, 14 March 1967, cited in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, *In the Name of America*, 111.
32. *The Nation*, 3 April 1967, cited in ibid., 112.
33. William Tuohy, "'The Worst U.S. Atrocity in Vietnam:' 7 Marines Stand Trial," A12.
34. D'Amato, Gould, Woods, "War Crimes and Vietnam: The 'Nuremberg Defense' and the Military Service Resister," 430. On the role of television news in the Vietnam War, see Rid, *War and Media Operations*, 53-63.
35. See NARA, RG 319, Records of the Army Staff, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (ODCSPER), Records of the Vietnam War Crimes Working Group, War Crimes Allegations Case Files, Box 4A: Wennergren Allegation thru Rose Allegation, Folder: NBC Allegation (Kit Carson's Scouts), ibid., Folder: CBS Allegation.
36. Anthony B. Herbert, cited in Jackson, "Confessions of The Winter Soldiers," 24. See also NARA, RG 319, Records of the Army Staff, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (ODCSPER), Records of the Vietnam War Crimes Working Group, War Crimes Allegations Case Files, Box 8 Helicopter Gunship Incident thru Snyder Allegation, Folder: Herbert Allegation [Part 1 of 2], ibid., Folder: Herbert Allegation [Part 2 of 2].

37. NARA, RG 389, Records of the Provost Marshal General, POW/Civilian Internee Information Center, Confidential Records, Box 24, Folder: Confidential, 5-11-02, Vietnam, Review of U.S. Policy on Treatment of PW (1966-72), Southern People Urged to Fight Government Arrests, Liberation Radio [Clandestine] in Vietnamese to South Vietnam 1100 GMT 13 Aug 72.
38. Ibid., "N.Y. Times Denounces Torture in S. Vietnam Jails," [Clandestine] in English to East Europa and the Far East 14 Aug 72.
39. John F. Kerry, cited in Congressional Record (92nd Congress, 1st Session) for Thursday, 22 April 1971, Complete Testimony of Lt. John Kerry to Senate Foreign Relations Committee, 180.
40. *The Christian Science Monitor*, 23 September 1964, cited in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, *In the Name of America*, 108.
41. *Sunday Mirror*, 4 April 1965, cited in Norden, American Atrocities in Vietnam, 1.
42. Ibid.
43. *New York Herald Tribune*, 25 April 1965, cited in ibid., 2.
44. Browne, *The New Face of War*. See also Norden, American Atrocities in Vietnam, 2; Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, *In the Name of America*, 59-60, 69-70, 80.
45. See Davidson, "America's 'Dirty' War," 301; Kapstein, "Vietnam: In the French Footsteps," 480; Sahlins, "The Best Torture: Once You've Broken Him Down," 266-270; and Oglesby, "Vietnam: This is Guernica," 714-721.
46. Mildvan, "No War Prisoner Law," 36.
47. Hunt, "Vietnamese Torture," 32.
48. "South Vietnamese Use Sticks and Water in Interrogating Suspects," New York Times, 27 July 1965, 3.
49. Garrison, "U.S. Tries to Curb Vietnam Torture," 2.
50. Semple, "U.S. Bids All in Vietnam Obey Geneva War Code," 3.
51. Tuohy, "'War is Hell and, by God, This Is One of the Prime Examples:' A Big 'Dirty Little War'," 511- 512.
52. Ibid., 510.
53. Norden, American Atrocities in Vietnam, 1.
54. Sahlins, "The Best Torture," 266.
55. *The Arizona Republic*, cited in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, *In the Name of America*, 82.
56. Kraft, "Treatment of Prisoners," A15.
57. *The Baltimore Sun*, 5 September 1966, cited in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, *In the Name of America*, 114.
58. Reston, "Saigon: The Rising Brutality," E8.
59. Operation 'Wheeler/Wallowa' was a typical 'search and destroy' operation carried out from September 1966 to February 1968 in the province of Quảng Nam, mainly by brigades of *Task Force Oregon*. This later became the infamous 23rd Infantry Division. However, the operation was also carried out by soldiers from the 1st Cavalry Division and the 82nd Airborne Division.
60. "Interrogation," A1, A; See also Rejali, *Torture and Democracy*, 172.
61. Arnett, "'Sanitizing' a Stubborn Viet Village," A1.
62. Anthony B. Herbert, cited in Jackson, "Confessions of 'The Winter Soldiers'," 24.
63. See "Pictures Studied by Army," 25; D'Amato, Gould, Woods, "War Crimes and Vietnam," 430. The photographer noted on the back of the picture: "The picture isn't too pretty – but the whole episode had good results as the other 2

'charlie's' [enemies] told us everything we wanted to know." An unidentified photographer, cited in "Pictures Studied By Army," 27.

64. Greider, "Ex-GIs Tell of Torturing Prisoners," 20. See also NARA, RG 319, Records of the Army Staff, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (ODCSPER), Records of the Vietnam War Crimes Working Group, War Crimes Allegations Case Files, Box 7 Mittelstaedt Allegation thru Marhoun-Anderson Allegation [Press Media], Folder: Stemme-Brown-Martinsen Allegation.
65. John Drolshagen cited in Jackson, "Confessions of 'The Winter Soldiers'," 26-27; Drolshagen's allegations were also cited five weeks later by the *Washington Post*. In the same newspaper article, the infantryman testified that electric torture was a common practice in South Vietnam. See "Veterans Say They Saw U.S. Atrocities in War," B2.
66. Herbert, cited in Jackson, "Confessions of 'The Winter Soldiers'," 27.
67. "Antiwar Group Hears of 'Crimes'," 15.
68. "Slides Said to Show U.S. Torture in War," 3.
69. Ibid.,
70. See note 67 above., 15.
71. Nathan Hale, cited in ibid.
72. Ibid.; Michal J. Uhl, *Vietnam Awakening*, 2, 130, 144.
73. Michael J. Uhl, cited in "Antiwar Group Hears of 'Crimes'," 15.
74. Schanberg, "Saigon Torture in Jails Reported," 1.
75. Schell, *The Real War*, 110.
76. *New York Times*, 21 June 1965, cited in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, *In the Name of America*, 81.
77. See *Baltimore Sun*, 26 July 1965, cited in ibid., 71.
78. Sheehan, "Vietnam: The Unofficial Brutality," 4; and Student Christian Movement, *The Forgotten Ones*, 23-24.
79. Schell, "Cage for the Innocents," 29-34.
80. *New York Times*, 9 October 1966, cited in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, *In the Name of America*, 108; *New York Times*, 7 May 1966, cited in ibid., 109; *New York Times*, 11 September 1966, cited in ibid., 110.
81. *Chicago Tribune Press Service*, 12 March 1966, cited in ibid., 110; *San Francisco Chronicle*, 26 January 1967, cited in ibid., 116; Novitski, Lippman, Separating Friends from Foes, *Washington Post*, 23.06.1975, cited in NARA, RG ANRC, Records of the American National Red Cross, Box 37, Records Relating to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC); 1900-2005, Folder: ICRC – Mention in Press – Con Son/Tiger Cage Incident – July/Sept. 1970.
82. Miller, *The Vietnam War*, 155-156.
83. An unidentified US soldier, in *New York Times*, 6 October 1966, cited in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, *In the Name of America*, 74.
84. Tuohy, "Captive Vietcong Shows Bravery During Grilling," A22.
85. Ibid. On the use of dogs to track down the wounded, see Gillam, *Life and Death in the Central Highlands*, 178.
86. "Tortured by Captors," 9.
87. Jacqueney, "South Vietanamese Prisons," A27.
88. Lippman, "Clandestine Document Assails South Vietnam on Prisoners," A10.
89. NARA, RG 319, Records of the Army Staff, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (ODCSPER), Records of the Vietnam War Crimes Working Group, War Crimes Allegations Case Files, Box 20 Callander Incident thru RSB Schueller

[orig.] Incident, Folder: RSB Schueller Incident [orig.], William E. O'Donovan, Subject: War Crimes Investigation, 2.

90. "Vietcong Morale High," 6.
91. Livingston, "Tortures Protested," 3.
92. Fay, "U.S. Considers Possible Operation of Own POW Camps in S. Vietnam," A7.
93. Ibid.
94. *New York Times*, 25 December 1966, cited in cited in Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam,
    In the Name of America, 87.
95. Buckley, "Saigon Improves Care of Captives," 1.
96. Morrison, *The Elephant and the Tiger*, 637.
97. House of Representatives, Committee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, *The Treatment of Political Prisoners in South Vietnam by the Government of the Republic of South Vietnam*, 4.
98. Graves, "How they Unearthed the Tiger Cages," 2A; and "The Tiger Cages," ibid., 26- 29.
99. "Saigon Probes Tiger Cage Use," *Washington Post*, A13.
100. Frank E. Walton, cited in "The Tiger Cages," 29.
101. Ibid.
102. Augustus F. Hawkins, cited in Walters, "Viet Political Prison 'Cages' Assailed," A1.
103. "Muskie Hits Con Son Prison," 8.
104. Smith, "Red Cross Scored P.O.W. Treatment in Con Son Prison," 1-2; See also Fox, "4 South Vietnamese Describe Torture in Prison 'Tiger Cage'," 7.
105. Anderson, "Prisoners Tortured in S. Vietnam Jails," B1.
106. Douglas Hostetter, cited in ibid., B1.
107. Byrne, "Tiger Cage Prisoners," C7.
108. Hammond, *Public Affairs*, 359-361; and Emerson, *Winners and Losers*, 475-478.
109. Hammond, *Public Affairs*, 362-362. On the impact of Harkin's research, which cost him his job, see Ciabattari, "Harkin Revisits the Tiger Cages," N19.
110. Marjorie Nelson, cited in Smith, "Vietnam Prisoner Torture Described by U.S. Doctor," 3.
111. Marjorie Nelson, cited in ibid. Similar allegations were later made by Jane Barton for another prison. See Indochina Peace Campaign, *Women Under Torture*, 19, 25.
112. Greider, "Ex-GIs Tell of Torturing Prisoners,|" 20. See also NARA, RG 319, Records of the Army Staff, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel (ODCSPER), Records of the Vietnam War Crimes Working Group, War Crimes Allegations Case Files, Box 7 Mittelstaedt Allegation thru Marhoun-Anderson Allegation [Press Media], Folder: Stemme-Brown-Martinsen Allegation.
113. Casella, "The Politics of Prisoners of War," 9-15.
114. NARA, RG 389, Records of the Provost Marshal General, POW/Civilian Internee Information Centre, Confidential Records, Box 24, 511-02 Vietnam Misc Periodicals Concerning PW Treatment (1966-73), Folder: Confidential 511-02 Vietnam Misc Periodicals Concerning PW Treatment (1966-73), PW/MIA Task Force, Point Paper New York Times Magazine Article Ref PW, 30 May 1972.
115. See ibid.
116. Sieverts, "P.O.W. Treatment," 31.
117. Casella, "The Author Replies," 31.
118. Benoit, "Prisoners of War," F2.
119. "South Vietnamese Kill 13 P.O.W.'s in Rioting," 25.

120. "Saigon Denies Report of Torture in Prisons," 4.
121. Novitski, "Phuquoc, Major Red Cross Concern," cited in NARA, RG ANRC, Records of the American National Red Cross, Box 37, Records Relating to the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC); and 1900-2005, Folder: ICRC – Mention in Press – Con Son/Tiger Cage Incident – July/Sept. 1970.
122. See, for example, NARA, RG 389, Records of the Provost Marshal General, POW/Civilian Internee Information Centre, Confidential Records, Box 24, 511-02 Vietnam Misc Periodicals Concerning PW Treatment (1966-73), Folder: Confidential 511-02 Vietnam Misc Periodicals Concerning PW Treatment (1966-73), PW/MIA Task Force, Point Paper New York Times Magazine Article Ref PW, 30 May 1972.
123. Davidson, "America's 'Dirty' War," 300.
124. Cited in Hammond, *Public Affairs*, 362.
125. Novitski, Lippman, "Viet Prison Brutality Documented," A16.
126. See, for example, Buckley, "Saigon Improves Care of Captives," 1; "Camps Hold 2,500 Captured Reds," 12-13; Gershen, "Inside a POW Camp"; Butterfield, "South Vietnam Lets Reporters Visit P.O.W. Camp"; Roosevelt, "Geneva Rules For POWs Are Given Strict Compliance in South Vietnam," 11F- 12F; Kirk, "Many Communist POWs Balking at Repatriation," 8; and "Doubt Cast on Paralysis Of 'Tiger Cage' Inmates," 24.
127. Gershen, "Inside a POW Camp," 10.
128. Roosevelt, "Geneva Rules for POWs Are Given Strict Compliance in South Vietnam," 11F, 12F.
129. Kirk, "Many Communist POWs Balking at Repatriation," 8.
130. Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam, *In the Name of America*. See also Fiske, "Clerics Accuse U.S. of War Crimes: A 'Consistent Violation' of World Rules is Found by Interfaith Group," 1, 6.
131. Greiner, War Without Fronts, 339; Schell, Observing the Nixon Years, 17-19.
132. Solis, "America, the 1949 Geneva Conventions, and War Crime Courts-Martials in the Vietnam Conflict," 124; Solis, "Military Justice, Civilian Clemency: The Sentences of Marine Corps War Crimes in South Vietnam," 59-84.
133. Lifton, Home from the War.

Bibliography

Allison, William Thomas. "My Lai: An American Atrocity in the Vietnam War."

Apple. "U.S. Alters Policy to Safeguard Enemy Captives," *New York Times*, July 1966, 6. The author would like to thank the reviewers and the editor-in-chief for their time and effort in the review process.

Arnett. "'Sanitizing' a Stubborn Viet Village." *Washington* Post (August 1968). A1.

Asbury. "Time Inc, to Revive LIFE as a Monthly," *New York Times*, 25 April 1978, 74.

Berni, Marcel. *Außer Gefecht: Leben, Leiden und Sterben "kommunistischer" Gefangener in Vietnams amerikanischem Krieg*. Hamburg: Hamburger Edition, 2020.

Berni, Marcel. "The ICRC and Communist Captives during Vietnam's American War." In *Captivity in War during the Twentieth Century*, edited by Marcel Berni and Tamara Cubito, 137–156. Cham: Palgrave Macmillan, 2021.

Bilton, Michael, and Kevin Sim. *Four Hours in My Lai*. New York: Penguin, 1992

Braestrup, Peter. *Big Story: How the American Press and Television Reported and Interpreted the Crisis of Tet 1968 in Vietnam and Washington*. Novato: Presidio, 1994.

Browne, Malcolm W. *The New Face of War*. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1968.
Buckley. "Saigon Improves Care of Captives." *New York Times*, January 1967. 1.
Byrne. "Tiger Cage Prisoners." *Washington Post*, April 1 (1973): C7.
Casella. "The Politics of Prisoners of War." *New York Times Magazine*, May 28 (1972): 9–15.
Clergy and Laymen Concerned About Vietnam. *In the Name of America*. New York: Clergy and Laymen Concerned about Vietnam.
D'Amato, Anthony A., Harvey L. Gould, and Larry D. Woods. "War Crimes and Vietnam: The 'Nuremberg Defense' and the Military Service Resister." In *The Vietnam War and International Law, Vol. 3*, edited by A. Falk Richard, 407–462. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1972.
Daddis, Gregory. *No Sure Victory: Measuring U.S. Army Effectiveness and Progress in the Vietnam War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011.
Davidson. "America's 'Dirty' War." *The Nation* (November 1964):301.
Davis, Vernon E. *Office of the Secretary of Defense. The Long Road Home: U.S. Prisoner of War Policy and Planning in Southeast. Asia*. Washington: Office of the Secretary of Defense, 2000.
Fay. "U.S. Considers Possible Operation of Own POW Camps in S. Vietnam." *Washington Post*, December 24 (1965): A7.
Gillam, James T. *Life and Death in the Central Highlands*. Denton: University of North Texas Press, 2010.
Gloria, Emerson. *Winners and Losers: Battles, Retreats, Gains, Losses, and Ruins from the Vietnam War*. New York: W.W. Norton & Company, 2014.
Gray, Truda, and Brian Martin. "My Lai: The Struggle Over Outrage." *Peace and Change* 33, no. 1 (2008): 252–274. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0130.2007.00477.x.
Greider. "Ex-GIs Tell of Torturing Prisoners." *Washington Post* (July 1970 19):20.
Greiner, Bernd. *War without Fronts: The USA in Vietnam*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2010.
Halberstam, David. *The Best and the Brightest*. New York: Random House, 1972.
Hammond, William M. *Public Affairs: The Military and the Media, 1968-1973, 2*. Washington: Center of Military History, 1996.
House of Representatives, Committee on Asian and Pacific Affairs of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. *The Treatment of Political Prisoners in South Vietnam by the Government of the Republic of South Vietnam*. Washington: Committee on Foreign Affairs, 1973.
Hunt. "In the Steps of Robert Capa." *Life* (June 1964):3.
Hunt. "Vietnamese Torture," *New York Times*, July 1965, 32.
Indochina Peace Campaign. Women Under Torture. Santa Monica: Indochina Peace Campaign, 1973.
Jacqueney. "South Vietanamese Prisons." *Washington Post* (July 1973 20):A27.
Jones, Howard. *My Lai: Vietnam, 1968, and the Descent into Darkness*. New York: Oxford University Press, 2019.
Kapstein. "Vietnam: In the French Footsteps." *The Nation*, December 1964 21: 480.
Karnow, Stanley. Vietnam: A History. The First Complete Account of Vietnam at War. New York: Penguin Books 1983.
Langguth. "Brutality Is Rising on Both Sides in South Vietnam," *New York Times*, 7.
Levie, Howard S. "Maltreatment of Prisoners of War in Vietnam." In *the Vietnam*." In *War and International Law*, edited by A. Falk Richard, 361–397. Vol. 2. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1969.
Livingston. "Tortures Protested," *New York Times*, August 1965, 3.

Mildvan. "No War Prisoner Law," *New York Times*, 30 June 1965, 36.
Miller, Edward. *The Vietnam War: A Documentary Reader*. Chichester: Wiley Blackwell, 2016.
Mohr. "Obey P.O.W Code, U.S. Soldiers Told," *New York Times*, 1 December 1965, 1, 4.
Mok, Schutzer. "In They Go - to the Reality of This War." *Life* (1965):59–60.
Morrison, Wilbur H. "The Elephant and the Tiger: The Full Story of." *the Vietnam War*.
Oglesby. "Vietnam: This Is Guernica." *The Nation*, June 1967 : 714–721.
Okamura. "Back from a Vietcong Hellhole in the Jungle." *Life*.
Olson, James Stuart, and Randy Roberts. *My Lai: A Brief History with Documents*. New York: Palgrave, 1998.
Orshefsky, Burrows. "We Wade Deeper into Jungle War." *Life* (1985):30–31.
Rejali, Darjus. *Torture and Democracy*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2007.
Reston. "Saigon: The Rising Brutality," *New York Times*, September 1965. E8.
Rid, Thomas. *War and Media Operations: The US Military and the Press from Vietnam to Iraq*. London: Routledge, 2007.
Rochester, Stuart I., and Frederick T. Kiley. *Honor Bound: American Prisoners of War in Southeast*. *Asia, 1961-1973*. Washington: Historical Office, Office of the Secretary of Defense, 1999.
Sahlins. "The Best Torture: Once You've Broken Him Down … ." *The* Nation (October 1965). 266–270.
Schanberg. "Saigon Torture in Jails Reported," *New York Times*, 1972
Schell, Jonathan. *Observing the Nixon Years: "Notes and Comment" from the New Yorker on the Vietnam War and the Watergate Crisis, 1969-1975*. New York: Vintage Books, 1989.
Sheehan. "Battalion of G.I.'s Battered in Trap," *New York Times*, 19 November 1965, 3
Sieverts. "P.O.W. Treatment," Cited in *New York*." *Times*. June 1972: 4. 31.
Solis, Gary D. "Military Justice, Civilian Clemency: The Sentences of Marine Corps War Crimes in South Vietnam." *Transnational Law and Contemporary Problems* 59, no. 10 (2000): 59–84.
Solis, Gary D. "America, the 1949 Geneva Conventions, and War Crime Courts- Martials in the Vietnam Conflict." In *Do the Geneva Conventions Matter?*, edited by Matthew Evangelista and Nina Tannenwald, 105–136. New York: Oxford University Press, 2017.
Student Christian Movement. *The Forgotten Ones: The Political Prisoners of Vietnam* Singapore: Student Christian Movement Malaysia 1973
Tuohy. "'War Is Hell And, by God, This Is One of the Prime Examples:' A Big 'Dirty Little War'," *New York Times Magazine*, November 1965, 514.
Tuohy. "Captive Vietcong Shows Bravery During Grilling." *Washington Post* (December 1966 19):A22.
Uhl, Michal. *Vietnam Awakening*. McFarland: Jefferson, 2007.