Division and the American Division. Eighty-five percent of the patrol leaders of the supported units reported that the dogs enhanced patrol security.[29] This, coupled with earlier testimonials, including testimony before the House Appropriations Committee stating that the dog was the best way to locate Vietcong tunnels, ensured the continuation of the mine/tunnel detector dog program.[30] The Infantry School at Fort Benning, Georgia, was directed in July 1970 to assume responsibility for the mine/tunnel detector dog program and to improve training techniques and dog effectiveness.[31]

The Marine Corps, aware of the Army's progress in the employment of mine/ booby trap detector dogs, conducted its own evaluation in 1970. It sent 18 handlers and 14 dogs to Vietnam in March 1970. The dogs were employed in combat operations with infantry and engineer elements of the 1st Marine Division and with elements of the combined action forces. The evaluators concluded that mine/booby trap detector dogs were effective and suitable for Marine Corps use.[32]

The performance of sentry, scout and tracker dogs in Vietnam was almost universally judged excellent. The mine/tunnel detector dogs received good, but somewhat less enthusiastic, reviews. These dogs failed to discover some mines and booby traps, and those who witnessed these failures and the resulting casualties quite naturally were not enthusiastic about the work of these dogs. Conversely, those saved from death or maiming by a dog were understandably grateful.

The criticism of dog performance was largely the result of the overconfidence often found in soldiers who were accompanied by dogs. Soldiers felt that the dog was a foolproof detection system, and, when the dog failed to perform, they were naturally disillusioned. The strongest supporter of the mine/tunnel detector dog program would never have suggested that the dog was a foolproof system.

German shepherds were used in Vietnam to detect contraband items, principally marijuana.[33] Because the detection program was designed to stem the flow of illegal drugs into the United States, the use of dogs centered on the major airports from which servicemen departed Vietnam. Other areas could, of course, also be searched. The program was very successful.

Clearly, based on past performance, the dog has many roles in war. But is the dog an anachronism in modern warfare?

The global nature of rising threats to our national interests demands the worldwide projection of our military capabilities. Future conflicts may necessitate the deployment and support of military forces in geographic areas and environments with which our forces have had limited experience. New weaponry and new tactics will produce a battlefield unlike anything in the past.

Although warfare may change, vital installations will still require security, infantrymen will need to detect the enemy, and mines will have to be located. The efficiency of the dog for doing these jobs in varying terrain, climate and environment has been domonstrated repeatedly. The protection of fixed installations—that is, airfields, ammunition and petroleum supply points, storage areas and docks— is vital to any operation. The present concern about rear area combat operations illustrates this requirement. In perimeter control, one dog team (dogs and handlers) can replace five to 10 men and often do the job better.

The uses of dogs in war seem to be limited only by man's ingenuity. Dogs can attack the enemy or guard against his approach. They can be used as dray ani-