Forty years after its publication, *Winning Hearts and Minds: War Poems by Vietnam Veterans* remains one of the most compelling, insightful, and moving accounts of the American war in Vietnam. A key work of witness of the twentieth century, this poetry anthology of over one hundred pieces, written by thirty-three contributors, testified to the disaster of what was then America’s longest war. Although the current conflict in Afghanistan has now claimed that grim record, and along with its sister war in Iraq has generated a fair amount of debate, the war in Vietnam is still America’s most controversial and contested military campaign. *Winning*, and the body of “Vietnam war poetry” that it helped to establish, presented a searing critique of the war by those who had fought in it, a critique that continues to offer a valuable opportunity to understand and examine “America’s policies and attitudes towards Asia through the eyes of the men who implemented them.” This article presents an overview of the history and legacy of “the seminal anthology against which all future Vietnam war poetry would be judged”, and outlines how the collection can be viewed as a particularly powerful and perceptive case of moral witness. Four decades on, now is an appropriate moment to consider the legacy of *Winning*, to see where it came from and where it led to, and to start to come to terms with its profound and enduring moral significance.

Whilst interesting and penetrating analyses of *Winning* can be found in works such as Michael Bibby’s *Hearts and Minds: Bodies, Poetry, and Resistance*
in the Vietnam Era, Subarno Chattarji’s *Memories of a Lost War: American Poetic Responses to the Vietnam War*, or Lorrie Goldensohn’s *Dismantling Glory: Twentieth-Century Soldier Poetry*, the actual story of its publication, placed in a literary-historical context with particular attention given to its antecedents and successors, has not been investigated as thoroughly. The fullest account of the anthology’s publication, Caroline Slocock’s “Winning Hearts and Minds: The 1st Casualty Press”, is a helpful description of the painful publishing process faced by the collection, but does not give much consideration to what came before or after. Furthermore, since Slocock’s article was released in 1982, it did not have the benefit of being able to assess the long-term legacy of the anthology. This study utilises the material available to Slocock and brings the story up to date with additional information from the newly accessible Jan Barry Archive at La Salle University and recent interviews with some of the key poets. By examining the forerunners and descendants of *Winning*, as well as the volume itself, we can begin to appreciate the importance of its role in the history of Vietnam war poetry.

The first section of this article tells that story. Starting with stateside poets, it traces the outlines of Vietnam war poetry in the years immediately preceding the publication of *Winning* in 1972. It then touches on two individual works of poetry, D. C. Berry’s *saigon cemetery* and Michael Casey’s *Obscenities*, that were also released in 1972, before detailing the publication and reception of *Winning*. It is suggested that 1972, and in particular *Winning*, should be understood as a crucial point of origin for Vietnam war poetry. Subsequently, the various legacies of the volume are examined: the challenge it presented to notions of victimhood in war poetry; the poets that it introduced to the literary world; the anthologies that followed it, including its sequel *Demilitarized Zones: Veterans after Vietnam*; and its continuing impact in the 1980s and beyond. In this prodigious lineage extending from *Winning*, it is possible to discern the values set forth in the groundbreaking anthology, particularly the antiwar beliefs and attitude of critical moral reflection at the centre of the collection. It is this, among the other legacies, that makes the book so important in the development of Vietnam war poetry—*Winning* provided a firm antiwar base which much of the future poetry would build and expand upon. And, since this antiwar lineage has dominated Vietnam war poetry, in terms of both prolificacy and proficiency, the overview of the anthology’s progeny provided here is, in a way, also a brief history of Vietnam war poetry itself. *Winning* was a founding document of Vietnam war poetry, and by examining its impact and influences we can come to a greater understanding of both the anthology itself and the poetry it helped to inspire.
The second section situates the anthology within the related ideas of poetry of witness and moral witness. Through an exploration of Carolyn Forché’s conceptualisation of poetry of witness and Avishai Margalit’s understanding of moral witness, it is argued that Winning can be seen as an interesting and informative poetic example of moral witness. Subsequently, the rejection of both war and the violence of war that formed the central foundation and ultimate moral message of Winning is examined, as are the various moral concerns that led to this committed position, from the poets’ perceptive insights into the problematic combatant-noncombatant distinction through to their radical and presaging ideas on the nature of soldier responsibility. The strength and determination of Winning’s moral witness contributed to the aforementioned antiwar grounding in which so much of the following Vietnam war poetry would be anchored. But, even apart from its lasting influence on the development of Vietnam war poetry, such thoughtful and penetrating moral witness also highlights the significance of the anthology in its own right, as a poetic performance that offers a valuable contribution to our moral understanding of war from the perspective of former soldiers. Thus, although the two central strands of this article, the role of Winning in the history of Vietnam war poetry and the moral witness of the collection, are interlinked, in order to view them more clearly it is helpful to approach each issue in turn, hence the twofold structure employed here. Still powerful, provocative, and alive in the echoes of its influence, Winning remains, forty years on, a remarkable and revealing work of war literature.

Although the publication of Winning in 1972, alongside Obscenities and saigon cemetery, signalled the emergence of Vietnam war poetry as a powerful voice of witness to the ongoing war in Southeast Asia, some American poets had been writing about the war since the mid-1960s. Mostly, these were “stateside” authors, noncombatant civilian American protest poets, such as Allen Ginsberg, Denise Levertov, and Robert Bly. Ginsberg’s Wichita Vortex Sutra was published in 1966, Levertov’s The Sorrow Dance a year later, and a year after that Bly’s The Light Around the Body won the National Book Award for poetry. Subsequently, The Teeth-Mother Naked at Last, also by Bly, offered some of the most powerful and unforgettable lines written by a stateside poet during the war:

If one of those children came toward me with both hands in the air, fire rising along both elbows,
I would suddenly go back to my animal brain,
I would drop on all fours, screaming,
my vocal chords would turn blue, so would yours,
it would be two days before I could play with my own children again."11

Pacifist activists such as Daniel Berrigan were also writing and publishing poetry during this period.12 Edited volumes of protest poetry, such as Bly and David Ray’s *A Poetry Reading Against the Vietnam War* and Walter Lowenfeld’s *Where is Vietnam? American Poets Respond*, supported this growing body of literary dissent.13 Additionally, several translations of Vietnamese poetry appeared during the war, for example Thich Nhat Hanh’s *The Cry of Vietnam*, and the 1971 collection *We Promise One Another: Poems from an Asian War*.14 With regard to poems written by American soldiers, however, there was relatively little output before 1972. Only one anthology and three individual works of American soldier-poetry were published before that key breakthrough year.

The anthology, *Boondock Bards*, was a hyper-patriotic, prowar collection published in 1968. As the text on the inside cover of the dust jacket explained, the military newspaper *Pacific Stars and Stripes* had been receiving a small number of poems “from American troops in the war zone” as early as 1962, “but it was not until the large buildup of troops in Vietnam in 1965 that the trickle became a torrent.” Consequently, on 5 November 1965, “*Pacific Stars and Stripes* began a BOONDOCK BARDS column composed of these poems...and since then the newspaper has run 3,000 or more.”15 The *Boondock Bards* anthology brought together a selection of these poems, which, as several sources have stated, were “primarily doggerel”.16 Unreservedly patriotic and enthusiastically prowar, the poems in the anthology exhibited “a combination of naïvety, bravado, and prejudice”, and viewed the American war in Vietnam as a necessary part of the “fight for freedom and democracy. American ideals and stated mission are accepted without question.”17 “Freedom” was a typical poem from the collection:

Fighting for the cause of freedom,
A cherished right today,
For this land is trying to be denied it,
But we’re not letting Charlie have his way."18
Poems extolling this “cause of freedom” often attacked those “things they all call ‘hippies.’ / ...draft dodgers, and protestors with their signs” back in America:

Show no pity on the draft-card burners back home
For they are the unloyal
That threaten the land we own.19

Of course, as Subarno Chattarji astutely reasons, such “distaste for opposition gives the lie to the claim of freedom back home being defended abroad.”20 Yet, as “anachronistic and unpersuasive” as these poems might appear from a postwar perspective, they nonetheless demonstrated “the extent to which the soldiers, especially in the 1965-7 period, believed in their mission, and in that expression of belief lay real feelings.”21 By the time that Winning was published, however, belief in that mission and the feelings attached to it had altered significantly, and, with its determined questioning of both America and the war, the 1972 anthology pulled the Vietnam war poetry genre in a diametrically opposed direction.

In contrast to Boondock Bards, the three individual works of American soldier-poetry published before the watershed year hinted at the critical antiwar stance that Winning would take. Published in 1967, Dick Shea’s vietnam simply was the first book of poetry written by an American veteran of the war in Vietnam.22 Although it received little attention on its release and subsequently failed to become an established part of the Vietnam war poetry canon, Shea’s work foreshadowed the style of much of the early poetry. With its concrete confessional approach, stripped-down and bare verse, sardonic phrasings of grim humour, and evolving antiwar sentiment, vietnam simply displayed many of the characteristics that would underpin the poems in Winning. The two other pre-1972 individual collections of American soldier-poetry, Earl E. Martin’s A Poet Goes to War and Timothy Clover’s The Leaves of My Trees, Still Green, were both released in 1970.23 The sense of disillusionment, bitterness, and betrayal that Martin presented would become a common theme in the early poetry: “The trouble with me is I used to believe / all that propaganda bullshit / ...then Nam hit me”.24 Clover’s poems revealed “an articulate imagination and linguistic inventiveness that might have produced a great poet.”25 Unlike the Boondock Bards, Clover offered a wholly negative interpretation of what the American presence “gifted” the Vietnamese:

I’ll bury your father who died by my hand
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And build you a desert on your green land.
You’ll have soldiers for brothers and if you want more,
For your sister or mother I’ll give you a whore.²⁶

A college graduate who had opposed the war, Clover was drafted, despite being married and the father of an infant child, when he was twenty-one years old. Clover never wrote any more poetry—on Wednesday, 22 May 1968, he was shot and killed in Vietnam.²⁷ The works by Shea, Martin, and Clover indicated the powerful potential of soldiers as witnesses to the war, but as interesting as their poetry was it would not be until 1972 that this potential was fully realised.

Whilst Winning was absolutely crucial in enabling the emergence of a poetic veterans’ voice, this task was also aided by the concomitant release of D. C. Berry’s saigon cemetery and, in particular, Michael Casey’s Obscenities. Berry’s sequence of poems confronted the dehumanising effects of the war and focused on the disintegrating impact of battle on the body. A medic who served in Vietnam from 1967 to 1968, Berry’s portrayal of violence and death, “the end / where / absolute / zero / begins / to / begin”, revealed a determination to bear unflinching witness to his experience of the war’s horrors:

The way popcorn pops is
the way punji sticks snap
into your skin and stab

pricking urine
into cardiovascular
systems and apparatus
apparently
unorganizing then demonstrating
it.

then you die
either from the spike,
the p,
or the
sun gone to grain
expanding
in your eye.²⁸

Similarly, Casey’s Obscenities, published just prior to saigon cemetery, offered bleak and uncompromising poetic testimony of the American involvement in Vietnam. In his foreword to the collection, Stanley Kunitz identified Obscenities, with a rough degree of precision given the failure of the works by Shea, Martin, and Clover to make much of an impact, as “the first significant book of poems written by an American to spring from the war in Vietnam”.²⁹ Casey’s poems detailed his service as a military policeman in Vietnam from 1969 to 1970, with the titular obscenities omnipresent in the work:

Eddie throws an old poncho
We found on the ruins of LZ Gator
Over most of it
And then he grabs
The more solid looking leg
And drags it to the side of the road
I pick up the loose hand
A right hand
That is still warm
Because of the sun³⁰

Casey’s deeply cynical poems hooked into the mood of a war-weary America, and upon its release Obscenities became a remarkably popular work of poetry.

Published almost simultaneously alongside Winning, Casey’s Obscenities had been the recipient of the Yale Younger Poets Award in 1972. Aware that the war would soon be officially over and that interest in related literature might decline as a result, Yale University Press billed Obscenities as an antiwar work and pushed the publication date forward “a little ahead of time”, which, given the popularity of the work, appears to have been a wise decision.³¹ With sales exceeding even the fantastic figures of Winning, Casey’s book became the biggest selling work of American soldier-poetry from the war in Vietnam ever published.³² Such success generated even more attention and The New York Review of Books printed a joint examination of the two works entitled “Poetry of the Unspeakable” on 8 February 1973, just
days after the Paris Peace Accords formally ended America’s military involvement in Vietnam.\textsuperscript{33} The poetic voice of veterans may have portrayed the seemingly unspeakable, but their witness was no longer unspoken or unheard—Vietnam war poetry had now emerged.

As important as Casey’s \textit{Obscenities} was in this process, the publication of \textit{Winning} represented the epicentre of this emergence. However, the significance of \textit{Winning} as a key work of moral witness to the war, the positive reception and substantial attention given to the anthology upon its release, and the enduring legacy it bequeathed, all belie the difficult beginnings of the book. An outgrowth of the burgeoning antiwar veterans’ movement, the collection brought together a selection of poems gathered over four years by members of the Vietnam Veterans Against the War (VVAW). Many of the contributors were actively involved in the organisation, as were the editors Larry Rottmann, Jan Barry, and Basil T. Paquet. Indeed, Rottmann had edited the VVAW newspaper and Barry was one of the original cofounders of the movement.\textsuperscript{34} Perhaps unsurprisingly, given the strongly critical and antiwar stance of both the VVAW and the poems, the initial efforts of the three editors “to find a commercial publisher for their anthology met with no success”.\textsuperscript{35} As Caroline Slocock suggests, this was more likely to have been a result of commercial considerations than political reservations and censorship, although one does not have to believe in Marxist theories of literary production to understand that the two issues are undoubtedly connected.\textsuperscript{36} With no publisher willing to take on the project, the editors decided to establish their own independent publishing house. They named it 1st Casualty Press, thus echoing the title of the VVAW newspaper \textit{1st Casualty} and taking inspiration from the maxim commonly attributed to the Greek tragedian Aeschylus: “In war, truth is the first casualty.” And so, printing “by off-set litho on a Quaker Press”, \textit{Winning} was finally published on 1 April 1972.\textsuperscript{37}

Despite limited resources and no commercial backing, the anthology sold well and received a warm response from the American press. 1st Casualty Press and its supporters managed to sell a “first edition of 10,000 copies and run into a second edition of the same number within six months”, and extracts of poetry from the collection “were printed in major newspapers and magazines across the USA.”\textsuperscript{38} For example, on the eve of publication on 31 March 1972, \textit{The New York Times} printed three poems from the collection on its op-ed page.\textsuperscript{39} In May, \textit{The Home Reporter} and \textit{Sunset News} of Brooklyn, New York, began printing one poem a week with the promise “to continue doing so until American forces were withdrawn from Indochina”, and in June, \textit{Midwest}, the magazine of the \textit{Chicago Sun-Times}, printed
three pages of the poems, which “alone brought in over 1,000 book orders from its readers.”

Perhaps the most significant moment of attention, though, came on 14 May 1972, with John Seelye’s “favourable and influential” assessment of the anthology in The New York Times Book Review. According to Barry, one of the editors of the anthology, it was this “amazing review” which helped to launch the anthology “into the 50,000 copies orbit”, an extraordinary sales figure for a book of poetry in modern America. Indeed, it was after this panegyric press coverage and laudatory attention that commercial publishers began to take notice, and in the summer of 1972 1st Casualty Press agreed a contract for joint publication with McGraw-Hill, thus aiding and increasing distribution of the book to that impressive amount. The editors, poets, and supporters of VVAW and 1st Casualty Press had succeeded, despite initial difficulties, in producing and spreading the powerful words of witness contained within the pages of Winning.

The book itself provided a crucial platform for the versified voice of veterans, a voice that had hitherto been limited to one collection of uncritically patriotic “doggerel” and three overlooked individual works. In establishing and promoting a space for a collective expression of antiwar veteran poets, Winning was, as the editors noted in their introductory remarks, “the first anthology of its kind.”

W. D. Ehrhart, a contributor to the collection who would go on to become one of the preeminent poets to write about the conflict, acknowledged that whilst it “was not the first appearance of poems dealing with the Vietnam war to be written by soldiers who helped to fight that war”, the book “quickly became a classic: the seminal anthology against which all future Vietnam war poetry would be judged.”

The publication of Winning marked the birth of a new poetic domain, a point of origin to which subsequent Vietnam war poetry would forever be connected.

The structure of the anthology was simple. With thirty-three poets, contributing between one and thirteen pieces each, the poems were “arranged as a series of shifting scenes which describe, in rough chronological order, a tour of combat duty in S.E. Asia.”

As the subtitle of the collection, War Poems by Vietnam Veterans, indicated, the poets were mostly ex-soldiers who just a few years earlier had been fighting for the war they were now writing against. All but three of the contributors were American veterans who had served in the war. Thus, these were primarily poems of experienced witness, pieces of personal testimony that presented the perspectives of American soldiers who had been to and through the warzone and had returned with a determination to tell their stories.

This strong experiential basis of Winning, and the way in which it was approached by these veteran poets, leads us to a key legacy of the collection. “Previous war poets”,
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the editors suggested in their introduction, “have traditionally placed the blame directly on others. What distinguishes the voices in this volume is their progression toward an active identification of themselves as agents of pain and war—as ‘agent-victims’ of their own atrocities.” This was a realisation that “came quickly to some and haltingly to others, but it always came with pain and the conviction that there is no return to innocence.” The idea and acknowledgement of lost innocence, in which war was portrayed as that “hell where youth and laughter go”, was certainly not a new one and had been a theme threaded through much of the poetry written by soldiers of earlier wars. However, by identifying soldiers as not just victims but also as perpetrators of war, *Winning* sealed a significant shift in English-language war poetry. The victim status of the soldier was not replaced, it remained and rightly so, but the recognition of the soldier as perpetrator added a necessary and nuanced dimension to war poetry. The irretrievable loss of innocence could now be understood as, in part at least, self-inflicted, a result of the violence of the perpetrator reflected back on the self. This insight may have stemmed from the particular type of war that the poets of *Winning* participated in. Poets from earlier wars had mainly fought against an easily identifiable enemy and on a front line that could be clearly defined, even drawn on a map. This was not the case in Vietnam, where American soldiers fought against forces they found difficult, if not impossible, to distinguish from the civilian population, and on an indeterminate front line that seemed to span the entire country. In such a climate, these soldiers may have had a heightened sense of feeling like or acting as a “perpetrator”. Comparing the confusing climate and controversial cause of their war to the perceived clear-cut nature and unquestionable cause of the “good war” their fathers and uncles had fought in, whether or not that perception was accurate, may also have contributed to this self-identification as a perpetrator. Whatever the reason, the poets in *Winning*, to a far greater extent than their predecessors, actively engaged with the notion that soldiers could be morally responsible for and complicit in war. Not only was this a significant departure from earlier war poetry but, as the second section of this article suggests, it also prefigured recent developments within moral philosophy with regard to understandings of soldier responsibility. Crucially, *Winning* helped to turn English-language war poetry from primarily a poetry of victimhood into a poetry that acknowledged the potentially ambiguous role of soldiers in war.

On a more practical level, another lasting legacy of the collection was its introduction to the literary community of a number of important veteran writers. Whilst some of the contributors published few or no more poems following *Winning*, others produced key works of Vietnam war poetry. One of the editors,
Paquet, did not release any additional poems after his thirteen impressive pieces in Winning, but both Barry and Rottmann continued to write and publish powerful poetry. As mentioned above, the anthology included several poems by Ehrhart, an ex-Marine who went on to produce a prodigious body of war and non-war related poetry, as well as insightful analyses of the poetry that emerged from the war. Five poems by Frank A. Cross, Jr. appeared in the book, and he would write Reminders, a slim but valuable contribution to the body of Vietnam war poetry. The collection also contained selections from Casey’s Obscenities. Another contributor was Gustav Hasford, whose novel The Short-Timers provided the basis for Stanley Kubrick’s 1987 film Full Metal Jacket. Thus, Winning provided the starting point for several significant literary careers.

Furthermore, although the literary quality of Winning has sometimes been overlooked, its contribution to this aspect of war poetry should not be neglected. According to Vince Gotera, whose book Radical Visions: Poetry by Vietnam Veterans was the first monograph to focus solely on veteran poetry, “the guiding premise behind the seminal anthology” was the belief that it was possible “both to write out of political convictions, as an essential base for the poem itself, and to write good poetry.” However, caught up in the urgency of combating a continuing evil, some of the poets did privilege the political, and the moral, sometimes at the expense of the aesthetic. Hence, a number of pieces were rough and clumsy, “artless poems, lacking skill and polish”, as Ehrhart himself suggested in retrospect. Yet, for all the lack of literary niceties, the raw, stark style of these concrete poems did seem to be an appropriate and necessary mode of communication for the thoughts and feelings of these antiwar veterans. In the coming years, this approach would be refined and altered, but as Vietnam war poetry gained that “skill and polish” perhaps lacking from Winning it nonetheless remained indebted to these early poets for their first significant attempts, occasionally unsteady but always determined, to put the war into words.

Two additional points should be made with regard to the literary quality of Winning. Firstly, although, if taken in isolation, some of the poems may not have been perfect poetic performances, viewed together the poems were mutually supportive of each other, their poignancy and impact heightened through a powerful combined and cumulative effect. “Collectively”, Ehrhart summarised some years later, “they had the force of a wrecking ball.” Secondly, although it may have been true that some of the “soldier-poets were not really poets at all but rather soldiers so hurt and bitter that they could not maintain their silence any longer”, others were writers who displayed real poetic talent. Alongside the six
poems from Casey’s *Obscenities*, the most noteworthy contributions were those of the editors themselves, Barry, Rottmann, and, in particular, Paquet. Looking back over the “Soldier-Poets of the Vietnam War” in a 1987 article, Ehrhart suggested that of the poems Paquet contributed, “three or four must rank as among the very best Vietnam war poems yet written.”55 Even in 2010, after decades of intensely prolific poetic production by American veterans of the war, Ehrhart still maintained that Paquet “wrote some of the best stuff that’s ever been written about the war”, although as indicated above, he “virtually walked away from writing a few years later.”56 Paquet’s “Morning—A Death” was rightly labelled a “masterpiece” by Ehrhart, a poem that captures “at once the new, sophisticated battlefield medicine of Vietnam and the ancient, ageless human misery and futility of all wars”:

```
You are dead just as finally
As your mucosity dries on my lips
In this morning sun.
I have thumped and blown into your kind too often,
I grow tired of kissing the dead.57
```

Paquet was, like D. C. Berry, a medic during the war, and together their writings pushed a poetic perspective that pictured the human body, our fragile corporeality, as the most telling and devastating site of the destruction caused by war. This viewpoint exerted a strong influence on war poetry throughout the twentieth century, and it continues to do so today, echoed in the poems written by American veterans from the 9/11 wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, such as Brian Turner’s “Here, Bullet”:

```
If a body is what you want,
then here is bone and gristle and flesh.
...here, Bullet,
here is where the world ends, every time.58
```

A more immediate legacy of *Winning* was a further collection of writings by American veterans of the war in Vietnam. As the editors of *Winning* noted, their volume was “the first in a series of anthologies being published by 1st Casualty Press, a company formed by members of the Vietnam Veterans Against The War to create a forum for writings coming out of the Indochina experience.”59 The next anthology, *Free Fire Zone: Short Stories by Vietnam Veterans*, was released in 1973,
published in collaboration with McGraw-Hill again, the press that had agreed to publish *Winning* after the book’s initial success. *Free Fire Zone*, however, possibly as a result of the war’s official end, achieved nowhere near the coverage, sales, or impact of the first anthology. This weakened an already struggling 1st Casualty Press. An aborted “Experimental Theatre Production” of the poetry from *Winning*, conceived and adapted by Barry’s wife, had exacerbated extant tensions between Barry and Rottmann and, eventually, an acrimonious split occurred between Barry and the other two editors of the first anthology. Nonetheless, Rottmann and Paquet, along with another veteran writer called Wayne Karlin, continued with the plan of 1st Casualty Press to publish more collections and it was these three veterans who edited *Free Fire Zone*. Nonetheless, by the end of 1973 this editorial team had also separated and 1st Casualty Press disbanded. With the demise of the press it seemed as though a planned third volume of veteran writings, *Postmortem*, intended as a poetic sequel to *Winning*, would also perish. However, two veterans from the first anthology, Barry and Ehrhart, resurrected the idea and established an enduring lineage of anthologies linked directly back to *Winning*.

Barry and Ehrhart produced a fitting poetic sequel to *Winning*. After the poor sales and lack of interest in the short-story collection *Free Fire Zone*, McGraw-Hill abandoned plans to publish *Postmortem*, “an anthology of poetry and prose about the veteran’s return to America, on the grounds that it would no longer find an audience.” The editors of the short-story collection, Karlin, Paquet, and Rottmann, had even started to collect pieces from veterans in preparation for this post-combat volume, “but soon after *Free Fire Zone* was published the three editors all went their separate ways”. A year later, Barry and Ehrhart were discussing what had happened to the proposed “second book of poetry” when they decided to put it together themselves. Thus, in December 1974, they began collecting poetry written by American veterans of the war in Vietnam. Again, they set up their own small independent press, East River Anthology, “a non-profit artists’ cooperative organized in 1975 by Jan Barry and W. D. Ehrhart.” On 4 July 1976, timed to coincide with America’s bicentennial celebrations, *Demilitarized Zones: Veterans after Vietnam* was published.

Dedicated to “those who refused to honor America’s longest war”, *Demilitarized Zones* was very much a continuation of *Winning*. The poets exhibited the same feelings of anger, sadness, and betrayal, and yet again they were willing to ask difficult moral questions and to examine their own role in the war. But whilst the tone and approach was similar, the focus of the poetry shifted from combat to the effects of combat, and the setting was no longer Vietnam but America.
Significantly, the poems detailed the experiences of veterans “during the period of greatest neglect of veterans”, a time when postwar America was “scrambling hard to erase Vietnam from its memory and its conscience.” These poetic acts represented a stand against forgetting in favour of remembering, a refusal to submit to sanitisation, and an insistence that the story of America’s involvement in Vietnam be told, and told without bowdlerisation. The anthology, which placed sketches, photographs, and prose pieces alongside the poetry, included works by Barry and Ehrhart, other Winning contributors such as Frank A. Cross, Jr. and Herbert Krohn, and the aforementioned early poets Earl E. Martin, Timothy Clover, and D. C. Berry. Demilitarized Zones also contained entries from other poetic talents beginning to emerge in the 1970s, including John Balaban, Horace Coleman, Steve Hassett, Gerald McCarthy, Perry Oldham, Doug Rawlings, and Bruce Weigl. Among this list were budding poets who would go on to write some of the most important and enduring of all Vietnam war poetry. Although not as successful in terms of sales or attention as Winning, the 1976 anthology was vital in providing a collective outlet for the continuing poetic voice of veterans and, as with its predecessor volume, in creating a space in which new poetic talent could flower, the lotus beginning to “grow in places where the fire once burned.”

The influence of Winning on Vietnam war poetry continued far beyond the 1970s. During the 1980s, many of the poets who had emerged from either Winning or Demilitarized Zones published key individual collections of poetry. Alongside these works, Barry and Ehrhart continued to produce anthologies that supported and consolidated this rapidly expanding poetic voice. Peace Is Our Profession: Poems and Passages of War Protest was edited by Barry and published in 1981 by East River Anthology, the independent press that had been established in order to produce Demilitarized Zones. A clear continuation of the previous two volumes of poetry, Peace Is Our Profession represented a collective artistic and moral protest against both war and the possibility of nuclear annihilation. Subsequently, in 1985, Ehrhart edited Carrying the Darkness: The Poetry of the Vietnam War, which, as a single volume collection of poems about the American war in Vietnam, remains unsurpassed. By the middle of the 1980s, the war had “produced an outpouring of poetry unparalleled in American literature”, and for this anthology Ehrhart selected just over two hundred remarkable pieces from a possible pool of “well over 5,000 poems”. Among the seventy-five contributors were all of the most important and influential poets to have emerged from the wreckage of the war up to that point. In 1989, Ehrhart edited a condensed and refined version of Carrying the Darkness that focused solely on the preeminent veteran poets, a “best of” kind of thing.
Unaccustomed Mercy: Soldier-Poets of the Vietnam War contained just twelve poets, the writers who, as Ehrhart accurately identified, had thus far best represented “the terrible beauty that Vietnam engendered in sensitive hearts, the curious grace with which the human spirit can endow even the ugliest of realities”: John Balaban, Jan Barry, D. F. Brown, Michael Casey, Horace Coleman, W. D. Ehrhart, Bryan Alec Floyd, Yusef Komunyakaa, Gerald McCarthy, Walter McDonald, Basil T. Paquet, and Bruce Weigl. Eight of the twelve poets had been included in either Winning or its sequel Demilitarized Zones, and every single one of them approached their writings about the war with the same penetrating honesty of those earlier works, that unflinching “gaze falling on horror, withstanding it, and in unalleviated consciousness of negativity holding fast to the possibility of what is better.”

The Barry and Ehrhart collections published after Winning were not the only other poetry anthologies produced in the 1970s and 1980s, but the path and pedigree of this particular lineage is indisputable. Two clear continuous and connecting threads run through each of them: Barry or Ehrhart or both as editors; and a determined artistic and moral commitment to bear witness to the war. Moreover, it should be noted that not only were these anthologies part of an evolving body of Vietnam war poetry, but they also helped to carve the contours of that body. By emphasising, through selection and omission, certain poets and certain poems from an increasingly large volume of works, they helped to consolidate and reinforce a strong antiwar poetic identity firmly rooted in the values and the voices of Winning. This was not, however, a distorted or unrepresentative shaping of that poetic body. Although less critical Vietnam war poetry was being produced, it did not meet, either in terms of quantity or quality, the levels achieved by more critical poets. Indeed, it was those poets willing to challenge, confront, and question the war, rather than those repeating and supporting sanitised and bowdlerised national narratives, who were writing the most interesting, insightful, and accomplished poetry. The anthological descendents of Winning, therefore, represented an accurate picture of the most prolific and proficient poetry being written by American veterans of the war. This was a key legacy of Winning and its progeny—to sustain, strengthen, and secure the preponderant antiwar beliefs and the attitude of critical moral reflection that was, and remains, at the heart of Vietnam war poetry.

Many of the poets included in and supported by the anthological descendents of Winning continued to publish individual collections in the 1990s. The decade saw a dramatic climax in the production of Vietnam war poetry, propelled by these established writers and the emergence of a number of new veteran poets,
such as Doug Anderson, Kevin Bowen, David Connolly, and Dale Ritterbusch. Three developments that originated in the 1980s and flourished in the 1990s were vital in this process: the return visits to Vietnam of several prominent poets; the birth and growth of the William Joiner Center for the Study of War and Social Consequences at the University of Massachusetts Boston, particularly its annual Writers’ Workshops; and the formation and expansion of Viet Nam Generation, Inc., an organisation which published the Viet Nam Generation Journal and supported its sister press Burning Cities. These three factors helped to create an atmosphere and an apparatus through which Vietnam war poetry could thrive, and all three, in terms of both the participating poets and the spirit of artistic and moral commitment they exhibited, had connections stretching back to Winning and its offspring.

Whilst the production of Vietnam war poetry declined in the new millennium, several key poets continued to write. Viet Nam Generation, Inc. had collapsed due to staffing and funding issues, but the Joiner Center remained, and return visits to Vietnam and cultural exchanges between the two countries still occurred. Furthermore, the events of 11 September 2001 and, in particular, the subsequent decision of America to pursue a course of war in Afghanistan and Iraq, provoked a powerful response from certain poets that demonstrated the continuing relevance, insight, and necessity of their work. Important poets who had first surfaced in the 1990s, such as Anderson, Bowen, Connolly, and Ritterbusch, produced new poetry in the 2000s, as did veteran poets who had been included all those years before in the anthologies of the 1970s: Balaban, Barry, Casey, Coleman, Ehrhart, McCarthy, and Weigl. Ehrhart, who first emerged with Winning in 1972 and went on to become an incredibly influential and perceptive editor and writer of Vietnam war poetry, published a collection as recently as 2010. While these poets are now in many ways far removed from that first anthology, they are still connected to its values and its voices, to the determination of the contributors of Winning to write a poetry that remembers and warns, a poetry that, as Ehrhart wrote in a recent piece, is concerned by the dangerous posturing of all those “who have never heard the sound / of teenaged soldiers crying for their mothers.” They are poets who, like all the veterans of Winning, are still invaluable moral witnesses.

II

As a collection of the thoughts and feelings of people who fought in and subsequently against the American war in Vietnam, recorded at a time when the war was still ongoing, Winning is a tremendously rich and potentially useful source
of historical witness. It allows us, forty years on, to look back and explore the wartime experiences and postwar reflections of a group of antiwar veterans. And whilst the coherency of the voices and values expressed in the anthology enables us to examine the work as a whole and so discern a collective viewpoint, it is also possible to focus on any one of the individual contributors. An index of poets in the back of the book that gives details of each person—place of origin, rank and role in the war, years of service, and any military medals and awards received—offers a small but revealing glimpse into the lives of these veterans. For anyone seeking a greater understanding of the American war in Vietnam, therefore, Winning is a rich document of historical witness. Furthermore, these poems have particular advantages over other accounts of the past. As Ehrhart wrote in Carrying the Darkness:

"Time may play tricks with human memory. Scholars and politicians, journalists and generals may argue, write and rewrite "the facts." But when a poem is written, it becomes a singular entity with an inextinguishable and unalterable life of its own. It is a true reflection of the feelings and perceptions it records, and as such, it is as valuable a document as any history ever written."

Indeed, perhaps this was the purpose of the collection. “Ultimately”, Goldensohn suggests, the “book aims at history rather than literature, at ethics rather than aesthetics.” The anthology is by no means a complete account of the war, significant voices, such as those of the Vietnamese, women, and civilians, are missing. Yet, in terms of the American servicemen who fought in the war, and in particular the VVAW, Winning represents a key work of witness to one of the most important events in the American past—one that still resonates strongly in the present.

Whilst the anthology can be viewed simply as a lasting and informative piece of historical witness, as indicated above the literary form of that witness should not be overlooked. Goldensohn’s description of the anthology as a work of “ethics rather than aesthetics” is perhaps a little inaccurate. Instead, it is helpful to think of Winning as a work of ethics through aesthetics. Originating from and connected to the antiwar spirit of the VVAW, the collection represented a moral stance given form through artistic commitment. Taken together, that moral stance and artistic commitment also form the basis of a type of poetic expression that can be understood as “poetry of witness”. Carolyn Forché, whose anthology Against
Forgetting: Twentieth-Century Poetry of Witness offers an eloquent and extensive exploration of this idea, uses the term “poetry of witness” to describe the works of poets who, like the writers of Winning, have “endured conditions of historical and social extremity”, works that stand “as poetic witness to the dark times in which they lived.” These works are testimonies to an “experience of extremity”, such as political persecution, torture, or war, that a person has endured and chosen to bear witness to through poetry. They are stories that need to be told and stories that need to be heard, stories that signify both an act of remembrance and a call of warning. As the title of Forché’s collection suggests, the struggle “against forgetting” is the central characteristic of poetry of witness. Such poems play a vital role in preventing the terrible events they describe from sinking into “the sea of forgetfulness”. Moreover, if, as Carl Jung argues, our “capacity to deal with evil” is diminished by the attempt to “eschew evil and, if possible, neither touch nor mention it”, by the “primitive tendency in us to shut our eyes to evil”, by the failure of remembering, then the determination of poetry of witness to confront evil, to keep our eyes open to evil, to continue to look at evil even as it recedes into the past, represents a significant and valuable moral act.

The idea of warning, the sounding of a cautionary alarm to both the present and the future, is another essential feature of poetry of witness, and one that has deep roots in war poetry. As Wilfred Owen wrote in 1918: “All a poet can do today is warn.” Furthermore, as Forché emphasises, poetry of witness “writes to the future” to warn it, “to remind it of the ease of moral disaster and ethical complacency.” Crucially, in the reciprocally related acts of remembrance and warning, poetry of witness endeavours to speak to and affect us, the reader, in such a way that we, too, may remember and warn, surrogate witnesses who carry within us the seed of another’s story. Such an idea was expressed in one of the pieces in Free Fire Zone: “the nice thing about the story is that now that you have heard it, what happened is part of you, too.” Works of witness, therefore, “will not permit us diseased complacency. They come to us with claims that have yet to be filled, as attempts to mark us as they have themselves been marked.” As a work set against complacency, a work that impressed a deep mark upon the reader, a work that simultaneously remembered and warned, Winning was, and remains, a compelling collection of poetry of witness.

Furthermore, the testimony of Winning was such that it represented an embodiment of “moral witness”. In The Ethics of Memory, Avishai Margalit suggests that in order “to become a moral witness one has to witness the combination of evil and the suffering it produces: witnessing only evil or only suffering is not enough.”
This must be a direct and unmediated experience of extremity, a “moral witness has knowledge-by-acquaintance”. Additionally, although “observers who are not themselves the suffering victims of evil can serve as moral witnesses”, Margalit stresses that “the paradigmatic case of a moral witness is one who experiences the suffering—one who is not just an observer but also a sufferer.” Thus, a moral witness often originates in a state of victimhood. However, as suggested above, the status of the witness as victim was complicated in Winning by the concomitant position of the poets as perpetrators. The testimony of these poets, therefore, revealed not just their moral courage in the decision to bear witness but also their moral complicity in the events that they described. Indeed, it was the tension and knotted intricacy of this victim-perpetrator-witness nexus that gave the poetry much of its vitality, passion, and insight.

A further feature of moral witness identified by Margalit is risk. There are, he posits, two forms of risk that a moral witness encounters: firstly, “the risk of belonging to the category of people toward whom the evil deeds are directed”, summarised as “the risk of being a victim”; and secondly, “the risk of trying to document and record what happens for some future use”, put simply, “the risk of being a witness.” Such risks are a necessary condition of moral witness since, according to Margalit, an “utterly sheltered witness is no moral witness.” In the case of Winning, a third form of risk can be added, that of being a perpetrator, or, to locate the risk more precisely, the risk of confronting oneself as a perpetrator. Finally, and essentially, moral witness is ultimately “one whose testimonial mission has a moral purpose.” It is the moral content of the message that is the defining characteristic of moral witness, and the writings of the contributors of Winning revealed a determination to question the morality of the American war in Vietnam, as well as a willingness to face the complicity of themselves and others in the conflict.

Before we explore the actual moral content of the poetry, it is important to acknowledge the significance of the active choice that the poets took to bear witness to the war. All those who served in Vietnam were observers, witnesses in the narrowest sense, but not all made the decision to bear witness, to testify. By telling their story, by remembering, by warning, the poets took a stance, chose not to remain silent and, by doing so, engaged in a moral act. It was also an act of existential self-creation. The choice to accept the burden of responsibility that is attached to a testifying moral witness can be “viewed as a deliberate effort to make one’s life a life of self-definition under the most adverse conditions”, to take on “the mission of telling your story, of living with a sense of being a witness.” Furthermore, this choice, to bear witness and to live “with a sense of being a
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witness”, may be an important step in confronting an experience of extremity and in constructing a trace of meaning from a traumatic event. Thus, in their poetry of witness, in their status as witnesses, and in their choice to bear witness, the poets of Winning expressed and demonstrated their moral character and artistic commitment.

What, then, was the moral message of Winning? The principal stance of the collection, the ethical thread that held the anthology together, was a wholehearted rejection of war and the violence of war. In poem after poem the contributors described the brutalising and dehumanising impact of war upon all those it touches. The result was a twofold moral denouncement: a specific condemnation of the American war in Vietnam and a more general repudiation of violence. For Forché, this “protest against violence” is central to poetry of witness. As such poets separate and distance themselves from their experiences of extremity they are ceaselessly drawn back to these sites of trauma as they struggle to warn, to remember, to confront. In negation they must return to that which they negate. Thus, witnesses are inescapably bound to their own point of origin as witnesses, but bound in a relationship of resistance: “poetry of witness is itself born in dialectical opposition to the extremity that has made such witness necessary.” Since it was the war and the violence of war that made their witness necessary, it was this that the poets of the anthology most fervently opposed. Anchored in their own personal experiences of extremity, the antiwar and nonviolent values espoused by these veterans formed the central foundation and ultimate moral message of Winning.

Yet, if the poets’ rejection of the war was singular in its totality, it nonetheless stemmed from a multitude of moral concerns, with the contributors reflecting upon a variety of significant and complex issues. These included: guerrilla warfare and noncombatant immunity; the dehumanisation of the Vietnamese; technological and chemical warfare; bodily destruction and death; and the question of responsibility. A continuing theme throughout the anthology, the difficulty of fighting against guerrillas and the related problem of distinguishing between friend and foe was often portrayed in terms of a breakdown in the combatant-noncombatant distinction and the resulting violations of noncombatant immunity. The book was filled with poems detailing the violence inflicted upon the Vietnamese, some soldiers, some not. What was “a home for some”, one poet wrote, was “a target for others”, and under such conditions it was unsurprising—though no less reprehensible, the poetry insisted—that civilians, including children, felt the force that was intended for enemy combatants, and the force that was sometimes intended for them. Witnesses to “a time when children / are shot and bombed”,
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the poets did not avert their gaze from such horrors, nor shy away from their own complicity in these acts of violence. As Basil T. Paquet wrote in “Mourning The Death, By Hemorrhage, Of A Child From Honai”: “small, denuded, one-armed thing, I too was violator”. Coupled with this, the poems pictured a tendency among some American soldiers to dehumanise the Vietnamese, to view both the people they were fighting against and the people they were supposedly fighting for as a subhuman other. Again, this contributed to problems with the combatant-noncombatant distinction:

Trinh Vo Man was a poet in his own land a scholar to his own people a venerable and wise old man in his village throughout his native land a warm and kind man to his wife and children and grandchildren a humorous and tolerant man to his neighbours an hospitable man to all

til the blue-eyed visitors came uninvited and shot him because a Man wearing black pajamas to them was just a slope, a dink, a gook was ‘Vietcong’

Hence, the poets acknowledged and engaged with the fact that one of the central “rules of war”, a key aspect of *jus in bello*, was often violated, with terrible consequences, during the American war in Vietnam.

Additionally, the poets described other moral problems associated with the American conduct of the war. Several pieces identified issues with the technological
aspects of American warfare, how the planes equipped with guns that flooded villages “with 18,000 bullets per minute”, or the omnipresent helicopters “riding the clouds, appointed scythe-swinger of / the aluminum age, / silvery engines of slaughter: hellfire raining from above”, raised psychological and moral questions about killing at a distance:

There was a lesson in physiology:
Bullets make you bleed very fast.
But circling at one hundred feet
Spare you the visions of particular fountains

Related to and part of this technologised warfare, the use of chemical weapons, especially napalm, concerned and angered many of the contributors. In these poems, the war was pictured as a battle against nature itself, as though the landscape of Vietnam was the main enemy and primary target of the American war effort. “Peace is tons of napalm falling”, one veteran suggested satirically, while another emphasised that this was a war “made on infants / and every living leaf / When trees are blindly hunted / and harvests are napalmed...” Although this destruction of the Vietnamese landscape received significant attention, it was the bodily destruction and death of Americans and Vietnamese alike that dominated the anthology’s discourse on the war’s devastating impact. In “visions / Of torn flesh and smashed bone” the poets highlighted the dreadful effect of violence enacted upon the human body, “a face blown in...an eye blown out...an arm blown off...a body blown open”. In their writings about these “broken bodies / Littering the earth”, the poets confronted the ultimate product of war—death.

The bullet passed
Through his right temple,
His left side
Could not hold
Against the metal,
His last ‘I am’ exploded
Red and grey on a rubber tree.

As with this poem, it was sometimes unclear whether the victim of death was American or Vietnamese, and throughout the collection the deaths of both American and Vietnamese people were examined alongside each other. The poets
refused to place the suffering of Americans above that of the Vietnamese and, in
doing so, denied an America-centred hierarchy of moral and mortal meaning that
underpinned many of the validations and tactics of the war in Vietnam. Like the
death they portrayed, the poets did not choose sides. Furthermore, taken together,
these representations of technological and chemical warfare, destruction of the
Vietnamese landscape, and destruction of American and Vietnamese people,
constituted a scathing criticism of the way in which the war was being fought and
strongly suggested a violation of another strand of *jus in bello*: proportionality.
Moreover, such poems also contested the war’s *jus ad bellum* criteria. Put simply,
was the justification for the war—whatever that might be—worth all this?

Perhaps the most interesting aspect of the moral witness of *Winning*, however,
was the poets’ attribution of responsibility. Those charged as culpable, both for
the conduct of the war and the war itself, included politicians and the military,
but beyond these usual suspects the poets identified two further transgressors: the
American nation and American soldiers. “Americans are desperate to believe”, the
editors of the anthology wrote, that “they do not share in the complicity of the
acts committed by their sons and their leaders.” 

The poets attacked this belief by insisting that ordinary Americans were indeed morally responsible for the war. Often, the poets implied that the apathy of the American people was partly to
blame for the war, or at least the war’s continuance. “Sleep, America”, wrote Gustav
Hasford, “Silence is a warm bed.”

Another veteran expressed a desire to bring home the impact of the war to the American public and shake the country from
this slumber:

```plaintext
If only a trade could be made
Send the garbage and leaves to Nam
Send the corpses to suburbia.

Take the war out of the T.V.s and put it in the
  complacent streets
Kick Amerika awake
Before it dies in its sleep.
```

Others focused on those who went beyond bystander apathy to an active attempt
to ignore the war, those members of the American public who strove to avoid the
knowledge of what was being done in their name. Rottmann described one soldier
writing home to his parents about the horrors of the war and their rebuking reply:
“Please don’t / write such depressing letters. You’re upsetting / your mother.”112 Further issues of national responsibility addressed by the poets included the problem of blind patriotism, ideals of “duty honor country”, cultural values, and the idea that the younger generation had been failed by the older generation, the children questioning the parents who sent them to kill and be killed: “We were told to be heroes / because if we were / Our fathers would have us back”.113 These were poems knocking “at the front door to America’s conscience.”114

It should be noted that in their examination of the abovementioned issues, from the combatant-noncombatant distinction all the way through to national responsibility, the contributors of Winning grappled with a similar set of concerns to those addressed five years later in Michael Walzer’s seminal work on the moral philosophy of war, Just and Unjust Wars.115 Although their explorations and analyses were not as systematic as Walzer’s, that this group of veterans just out of the warzone prefigured a key work in the moral philosophical canon and wrote with such penetrating insight, highlights how remarkable the anthology was.

Moreover, with regard to soldier responsibility, the poets were considerably ahead of moral philosophy. Soldiers, Walzer argued, “are not responsible for the overall justice of the wars they fight; their responsibility is limited by the range of their own activity and authority.”116 He therefore confined his investigation and attribution of soldier responsibility to the conduct of soldiers within the warzone. Whilst this was a core concern for the poets, they also pushed further and broadened the burden of soldier responsibility by intimating that soldiers could be “responsible for the overall justice of the wars they fight”. They identified American soldiers, themselves, as perpetrators not solely as a result of the way in which the war was being fought—although, as highlighted above, they did address such issues—but also quite simply because they were fighting an unjust war. In other words, even if no jus in bello criteria had been violated, and it should be emphasised that the vast majority of American soldiers did adhere to proper moral conduct, as implementers of what they saw as a wrong war the poets considered themselves culpable of wrongdoing:

Yea as I walk through the valley of death
I shall fear no evil
For the valleys are gone
And only death awaits

And I am the evil117
Against the orthodox understanding of soldier responsibility which decouples the justness of a war from the participating combatants, this group of veterans radically suggested instead that the two could be connected, that soldiers could bear some responsibility for the cause they were fighting for as well as their own individual conduct within the warzone. In doing so, the poets questioned a deeply entrenched assumption that has only recently, in works such as David Rodin and Henry Shue’s *Just and Unjust Warriors* and Jeff McMahan’s *Killing in War*, been examined and challenged within moral philosophy. As the editors of the anthology wrote:

> The outrage has been too much, and still it goes on. This poetry is an attempt to grapple with a nightmare, a national madness. It is poetry written out of fire and under fire. The war still goes on. We were, and are, a part of the evil. And the fire still burns.

The veteran writers of *Winning* produced meaningful and insightful poetry from the wreckage of traumatic experiences of extremity. They exemplified what Viktor Frankl described as “the uniquely human potential at its best, which is to transform a personal tragedy into a triumph, to turn one’s predicament into human achievement.” In doing just that, the poets secured a lasting legacy, one that endures, forty years on, in the body of Vietnam war poetry they helped to establish and in the content of their moral witness which, now as then, offers an opportunity for a greater understanding of the morality of war from the perspective of those who have fought on the front line.
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