A Crisis of Authority: President Eisenhower and Dien Bien Phu

by Camille Van Bruaene

The Vietnam War profoundly reshaped the American public's trust, military strategy, and the domestic political landscape. This research examines a pivotal moment in American foreign policy: President Dwight D. Eisenhower's inability to secure congressional authorization for intervention at Dien Bien Phu in 1954. Drawing on a comparative historical analysis of congressional records, declassified executive documents, and secondary policy literature, I argue that this non-intervention resulted from a combination of congressional anti-unilateralism following the Korean War and Eisenhower's "hidden-hand" leadership. Still scarred by the high casualties and unilateral burdens of the Korean conflict, Congress successfully asserted its constitutional role by demanding a multilateral coalition as a prerequisite for intervention. Simultaneously, Eisenhower operated as a sophisticated strategist rather than a passive leader, utilizing these legislative hurdles as a strategic shield. By publicly deferring to congressional conditions he knew were unattainable, Eisenhower effectively validated his private opposition to an Asian land war while protecting his political image. This case demonstrates that legislative constraints function most effectively when they align with an executive who perceives the political advantages of operating within institutional bounds.

Introduction

The mid-1950s marked a crucial and formative period for American foreign policy, characterized by the institutional struggle over presidential authority to commit the United States to war. This project seeks to answer the central question: What explains why President Eisenhower was unable to secure broad congressional authorization for military action in Vietnam? This research explores a critical historical moment that carries immense policy relevance and normative implications regarding the separation of powers in foreign affairs. The Vietnam War is arguably the most consequential American foreign policy failure of the 20th century, shaping the public's trust, military strategy, and domestic political landscape for years following. Analyzing the institutional barriers that prevented this initial escalation provides essential insight into the limits of executive power and the enduring effectiveness of checks on presidential war-making authority. The decision not to militarily intervene at Dien Bien Phu delayed American combat involvement in Vietnam by more than a decade. Examining how and why Congress successfully asserted its authority in 1954 can force rigorous, public debate about the scope of military engagements and deepen understanding of the constitutional constraints. The policy outcome of Dien Bien Phu resonates with modern questions of executive authority, notably the debates on the legality of military attacks on cartel vessels and the justification provided by the executive branch (Fortinsky 2025). The successful assertion of conditional authority by Congress in this crisis also established a foundational precedent that challenged the emerging "imperial presidency" narrative in the post WWII-era that assumes executives seek to expand the war-making authority. This study hypothesizes that the decision to not intervene militarily in 1954 was driven fundamentally by two factors: Congress' desire to avoid repeating the unilateral engagement of the Korean War and Eisenhower's "hidden-hand" leadership. Congress' political caution translated directly into the strategic imposition of highly restrictive institutional preconditions that Eisenhower used to justify a predetermined policy of restraint.

Literature Review: Congressional Anti-Unilateralist Sentiment Post-Korean War

Two primary policy options, Operation Vulture and United Action, competed during the Dien Bien Phu crisis, reflecting the influence of anti-war sentiment after the Korean War. George Herring describes in *America's Longest War: The*

United States and Vietnam that the initial military proposal was "code-named VULTURE, the plan… called for the bombing of Vietminh supply lines and entrenchments around Dienbienphu by U.S. B-29s" (Herring 32). He writes, "Eisenhower expressed to the National Security Council bitter opposition to putting American troops into the jungles of Indochina. He went on to insist, however, that the United States could not forget its vital interest there" (Herring 31). Some of Eisenhower's top military advisers raised questions of how the airstrike in Operation Vulture would logistically work without destroying the entire fortress. One Defense Department analyst warned, "One cannot go over Niagara Falls in a barrel only slightly" (Gravel 89). Moreover, "sensitive to Truman's fate in Korea, [Eisenhower and Dulles] were unwilling to act without backing from Congress" (Herring 34). Eisenhower understood the significance and risks of getting involved in Vietnam, and he wanted to protect U.S. interests; however, he opted for the multilateral approach in United Action.

United Action was a diplomatic strategy prioritizing the formation of a multilateral coalition before any military commitment, and it was an attempt that demonstrates a desire for shared risk and legitimacy. Many sources emphasize that members of Congress were scarred by the Korean War experience and were determined not to authorize another Asian land war without certain guardrails. These apprehensions primarily stemmed from the high rate of American casualties in a war that failed to yield a decisive victory (Vergun 2023). Fredrik Logevall's *Embers of War* emphasizes that Eisenhower distrusted the purely military solution (Operation Vulture) and insisted on sharing risks through collective action. Logevall details how Eisenhower's primary goal was to avoid repeating the mistakes of Korea, in which the United States shouldered a majority of the burden of a UN-sanctioned war. Richard Immerman describes Eisenhower's goal in his book, *John Foster Dulles: Piety, Pragmatism, and Power in U.S. Foreign Policy*. He discusses how Secretary Dulles, as a part of the administration, flew to London and Paris to diplomatically convince both nations to join United Action. However, the British were not convinced. At this point, the United States had not yet received any positive responses to its request for United Action. Eisenhower was not certain whether the Indochina situation should be brought before the United Nations, but "this is the kind of thing that must not be handled by one nation trying to act alone. He refused to speculate on action by the United States in the event of open aggression by Communist China in Indochina" ("Editorial Note"). This literature establishes that the administration's strategy made congressional authorization contingent on allied participation. Congress made allied participation a precondition for military authorization.

Scholars generally agree that the British refusal to join United Action was the decisive blow against intervention. This approach, however, understates the independent agency and anti-war sentiment from congressional leaders. For instance, common historical narrative notes that the U.S. "would have intervened in the Indochina War...had not the congressional leadership, after a secret meeting on April 3, made intervention conditional on British participation and had not the British refused" (Herring and Immerman 1). Treating British refusal as the *primary* cause for non-intervention overlooks the possibility that congressional leaders were not simply following the executive's lead on intervention plans. Instead, Congress may have been imposing strict, strategic conditions because it was opposed to sole American intervention.

Literature Review: Eisenhower's Leadership

Scholarly accounts of President Eisenhower's leadership during the 1954 crisis in Dien Bien Phu are divided, offering interpretations that portray Eisenhower's inability to secure congressional authorization in different lights. Traditional accounts often portrayed Eisenhower as passive and disengaged, as he delegated foreign policy to Secretary Dulles and avoided the difficult decisions. Political scientist Richard Neustadt's *Presidential Power: The Politics of Leadership* portrayed Eisenhower as a "passive-negative" leader who wasn't fully engaged in the political process, allowing key foreign policy figures like Secretary of State John Foster Dulles to fill the resulting vacuum. Under this interpretation, the failure to secure congressional authorization would be attributed to Eisenhower's reluctance to apply the full weight of presidential power to mobilize support for intervention at Dien Bien Phu. He did not create a sense of emergency that constituted immediate

congressional reaction. Eisenhower expert John Prados also describes Eisenhower as "willing to be led, and either Radford or Dulles seized the initiative" (Prados 28). Though Prados modifies his view over time as more documentation becomes available, this view suggests the failure to gain authorization stemmed from a fundamental lack of executive push.

In contrast, other scholarship, particularly Fred Greenstein's *The Hidden-Hand Presidency*, argues that Eisenhower was a sophisticated operator who deliberately worked behind the scenes. Greenstein contends that the President's apparent reluctance to seek authorization was, in fact, strategic. By allowing Dulles and Admiral Arthur William Radford to publicly advocate for military intervention, Eisenhower ensured that the political fallout from the decision not to intervene would be shared among multiple actors. Revisionist scholars, such as Melanie Billings-Yun in *Decision Against War* and David L. Anderson in *Trapped by Success*, suggest that Eisenhower welcomed legislative constraints and stringent conditions as a politically useful cover to justify his private decision to avoid committing the U.S. to a costly Asian land war.

The division in literature arises primarily from the scholars' focus on different levels of executive action and types of evidence. Traditional accounts, such as Neustadt, tend to focus on the public sphere. They observed Eisenhower delegating tasks and noted his apparent reluctance to engage actively in mobilizing support for intervention at Dien Bien Phu. In contrast, revisionist scholarship, like that of Greenstein, benefitted from the declassification of private documents and White House memos. This line of thinking re-interpreted Eisenhower's non-action in Dien Bien Phu as strategic use of legislative conditions to justify his private decisions not to commit the U.S. to a land war. Therefore, the difference is rooted in whether scholars rely on public perception and visible political struggle or on evidence of behind-the-scenes policy orchestration. This academic contradiction is central to the research question, as it determines whether we interpret the failure to secure authorization as presidential weakness or calculated strategy.

Congress Post-Korean War

The recent memory of the Korean War (1950-1953) generated caution within Congress, making military authorization in Vietnam highly risky politically. This cautionary environment was driven by multiple politically potent factors that directly informed legislative behavior in 1954. Firstly, there was fear of another Asian land war and a high number of deaths. The Korean conflict ended in a costly stalemate rather than a clear victory. Congress was aware that the U.S. had suffered over 37,000 deaths and spent billions without achieving the reunification of Korea (Vergun 2023). This cemented a deep fear of mass casualties and a costly land war on the Asian mainland. Secondly, the Korean War was perceived domestically as a largely unilateral American burden, with the U.S. bearing the brunt of the casualties and financial cost. In 1954, congressional leaders were unwilling to give President Eisenhower the power that could possibly lead to a similar commitment that would be as, if not more, lengthy and resource exhausting as Korea. The negative experience of the Korean War made Congress determined not to authorize another war without certain guardrails. Therefore, given the strong opposition to repeating a conflict similar to Korea, Congress was unlikely to grant the authorization. The anti-unilateralist sentiment was thus *the* pre-existing condition that made the diplomatic demand and Eisenhower's strategy politically viable. It created an institutional barrier by making Congress unwilling to grant authorization without guardrails, thereby providing the fundamental "why" behind the legislative reluctance that prevented the U.S. from entering Vietnam in 1954.

In late 1953, the French were struggling to control uprisings happening in their colonies in Indochina. As a result, the French military, under General Henri Navarre, established a heavily fortified base in Northwest Vietnam in an outpost called Dien Bien Phu in an attempt to intercept the nationalist supply lines into Laos and to maintain a base against enemy forces. However, in March of 1954, the Viet Minh, under General Vo Nguyen Giap, encircled the French base with 40,000 communist troops and artillery ("French Defeated at Dien Bien Phu"). On May 7, 1954, after 57 days of battle, the French positions collapsed. However, before this defeat, the French pleaded with the United States for military support in Dien Bien Phu. The core evidence supporting the hypothesis resides in the intersection between the unilateral plan devised by the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the politically motivated criteria imposed by congressional leadership.

In the early stages of the Dien Bien Phu crisis, the U.S. military command formulated an intervention plan known as Operation Vulture, spearheaded by Admiral Arthur Radford. This plan presented a commitment of massive, unilateral U.S. air power. Douglas MacArthur II wrote in a top secret note that the Pentagon had "reached the conclusion that three tactical A-weapons, properly employed, would be sufficient to smash the Vietminh effort there" ("Memorandum by the Counselor (MacArthur) to the Secretary of State"). This extreme consideration of using nuclear weapons underscores the potential political magnitude of the crisis. In the opinion of Dulles and Radford, the failure to act might cost the U.S. Southeast Asia, so they advised that the President should "have Congressional backing so that he could use air and seapower in the area if he felt it necessary in the interest of national security" ("Memorandum for the File of the Secretary of State"). Their assessment of the gravity of the situation was unquestioned; however, the congressmen insisted that there should be "no more Koreas with the United States furnishing 90% of the manpower" ("Memorandum for the File of the Secretary of State"). This legislative sentiment factored into the creation of congressional guardrails, which were present in an alternative intervention plan known as United Action.

In a meeting between Secretary of State Dulles and Congress on April 3, 1954, congressmembers made it clear that any military intervention was contingent upon meeting three specific pre-conditions: "[1] a firm understanding that the Associated States would become independent, [2] there had to be agreement for rapid and effective development of the indigenous forces of the area; and [3] there had to be a good military plan for victory" ("Record of the Secretary of State's Briefing for Members of Congress, Held at the Department of State, May 5, 1954, 5:30 p.m."). The demand for French commitment to Vietnamese independence ensured that any U.S. intervention would be driven by a clear political objective, contrasting with the ambiguities of the Korean War. The requirement for local burden-sharing and sustainability was designed to prevent the immediate, mass deployment of U.S. ground troops. The need for a strategic military plan to prevent a prolonged and costly stalemate was a direct lesson learned from the Korean War. The expansion of these prerequisites was not simply a procedural obstacle, but instead the observable manifestation of the reluctance toward military intervention following the Korean War. Legislators stated that U.S. military intervention required not only that the three objectives of a prior aid program be "met to an increased degree," but also that "other states with interests in this area, particularly the UK and also Australia and New Zealand, should also agree to join in" ("Record of the Secretary of State's Briefing for Members of Congress, Held at the Department of State, May 5, 1954, 5:30 p.m."). This fourth requirement for allied participation served as an institutionalized rejection of unilateralism. Congress was unwilling to delegate their war-making power unless the responsibility was demonstrably shared by the U.S. allies. The April 3rd meeting stipulated that U.S. military intervention would require explicit agreement from allied states, effectively transforming this condition into an insurmountable obstacle for military authorization. Thus, Congress used its caution by creating a protective shield designed to prevent repeating the costly commitment experienced in the Korean War.

The imposition of the specific conditions in United Action confirms the central hypothesis that the heightened legislative barrier was a result of the deep political caution stemming from the Korean War experience. The conditions demonstrate that Congress was strategically focused on mitigating the major risks associated with Korea: cost and casualties, unilateral burden bearing, and political ambiguity. In a *Memorandum for the File of the Secretary of State* written on April 5, 1954, it was noted that "both the Secretary and Admiral Radford pointed out that the Administration did not now contemplate the commitment of land forces. The Congressmen replied that once the flag was committed the use of land forces would inevitably follow" ("Memorandum for the File of the Secretary of State"). This highlights the hesitancy from Congress members against intervening solely since they believed that it would be incredibly easy for U.S. involvement to escalate in a similar manner as it did in Korea. The weariness was a "unanimous reaction of the members of Congress that there should be no Congressional action until the Secretary had obtained commitments of a political and material nature from our allies" ("Memorandum for the File of the Secretary of State").

Eisenhower's Leadership Style

The decision against military intervention in Dien Bien Phu was a product of President Dwight D. Eisenhower's deliberate leadership style and sophisticated use of aforementioned legislative conditions to validate his personal refusal to commit ground troops. Fred Greenstein identifies five central strategies of the Eisenhower presidency: "hidden hand leadership; instrumental use of language; the complementary strategies of reusing in public to 'engage in personalities' but nevertheless privately basing actions on personality analyses; and the selective practice of delegation" (Greenstein 57). My analysis focuses on the "hidden-hand" approach, delegation, and the instrumental use of language as the key attributes that shaped the 1954 decision to not intervene. Greenstein's "hidden-hand" framework defines a President who intentionally projects a passive public image while actively steering policy from behind the scenes. This involves "camouflag[ing] his participation not only in political activity generally falling outside popularly conceived bounds of presidential leadership, but also in more commonplace political leadership" (Greenstein 59). By operating out of the public eye to achieve policy goals, Eisenhower insulated the dignity of the office from partisan politics. His routine practice of "hidden-hand" leadership is exemplified by a March 19, 1954 telephone conversation with Secretary of the Treasury George M. Humphrey. At the time of the call, the administration's proposed Internal Revenue Code of 1954 was under siege by Senate Democrats. As noted by Mrs. Whitman, Eisenhower's personal secretary,

> "The President called Secretary Humphrey and asked him to speak to [Texas oilman] Sid Richardson, who was really the angel for Lyndon Johnson when he came in. Ask him what it is that Texas wants. We help out in drought, take tidelands matter on their side, and tax bills. He tells Sid he is supporting us, then comes up here and disproves it. Perhaps Sid could get him into the right channel, or threaten to get [Texas Governor Allan] Shivers into primary and beat him for Senate. Humphrey says this is exactly the time to do it, too, and if he talks to Sid, it can't be said that DDE is taking advantage of long-time friendship" ("Phone Calls, March 19, 1954").

Having previously gone against his own party's tradition to support the Submerged Lands Act and emergency drought relief, Eisenhower expected Johnson's cooperation on tax reform in return. Eisenhower viewed the Senator's opposition as him straying from the course of "fine conservative government." Consequently, Eisenhower exercised his presidential power through side channels, such as Richardson, to sway Johnson's vote. This maneuver allowed Eisenhower to exert maximum pressure on the Senate Minority Leader while utilizing Secretary Humphrey as a buffer to protect his own public image. Another instance of Eisenhower's covert leadership was in a 1953 letter to South Carolina Governor James Byrnes in which Eisenhower urged Governor Byrnes to comply with non-discrimination matters that fell under Federal jurisdiction. Prior, the governor had protested an executive order instituting racial integration in Southern federal facilities. Eisenhower used a "personal and confidential" letter and framed his actions as a constitutional mandate rather than a personal grievance (Greenstein 61). The President understood that it was his job "to convince, not to publicize", and the letter is demonstrative of the "behind the scenes" work that Eisenhower conducted in order to get his will ("Memorandum for Mr. Rabb").

President Eisenhower was actively engaged in the foreign policy process and gathered advice and information from those around him. He was known for his organizational skills and ability to delegate, and he developed extensive formal and informal networks. These included receiving advice from Secretary of State John Foster Dulles, his Cabinet, and the National Security Council (NSC). Eisenhower utilized these networks in a unique way by leading them along until "he could get them to express ideas that he was testing out privately" (Slaton 23). This allowed subordinates to use their expertise while simultaneously absorbing the public pressure of controversial decisions. Although this approach made him appear "passive at times, he encouraged the image that his hands were tied by Congress and Allies. This had the effect of shielding him from personal attacks…thereby paying excellent political dividends" (Anderson 46). Eisenhower was involved in every step of the decision-making process, contrary to how it appeared to the public, highlighting his "hidden-hand" skills at getting

others to cover his political image. Moreover, the President had a close personal and professional relationship with Secretary Dulles and trusted him for advice. As a result of this relationship, public perception was that Dulles "called the shots," however in reality, Dulles was the one who "carried messages…not ma[d]e policy" (Ambrose 302). Eisenhower actually "preferred that the secretary of state be the one to run the public gauntlet of praise and criticism," allowing Eisenhower both presidential and diplomatic flexibility (Anderson 20). Additionally, Eisenhower created a sense of loyalty amongst the administration that accounted for their willingness to accept criticism for policies that were actually the President's. As Press Secretary James Hagerty recollected,

> "'President Eisenhower would say, 'Do it this way.' I would say, 'If I go to that press conference and say what you want me to say, I would get hell.' With that he would smile, get up and walk around the desk, pat me on the back and say, 'My boy, better you than me'" (Hoxie 4)

Eisenhower frequently employed a strategy in which he would permit advisors to present their arguments on policy matters, even when he had already privately made conclusions about their positions (Preston 77). By allowing them the opportunity to voice their perspectives, he maintained the image of being a receptive and empathetic leader. This practice primarily served as a political cover as it enabled him to appear deliberative while masking his predetermined conclusions. He successfully deployed this tactic during the 1954 Indochina crisis to maintain the appearance of open deliberation while privately opposing military intervention at Dien Bien Phu.

President Eisenhower's decision not to intervene at Dien Bien Phu was rooted in a deep-seated personal and professional opposition to ground warfare in Indochina. This conviction was highlighted during the 179th meeting of the NSC, where he stated, "I can not tell you . . . how bitterly opposed I am to such a course of action. This war in Indochina would absorb our troops by divisions!" ("Memorandum of Discussion at the 179th Meeting of the National Security Council, Friday, January 8, 1954"). As a former General, he feared the military would "be cut to pieces" (Hadley 81). Eisenhower was careful to ensure that his strong personal beliefs did not appear as though it was a clear refusal. Interestingly, while Eisenhower was opposed to ground troops in Indochina, he was not opposed to a quick air strike to avoid a quagmire ("Memorandum of Conversation, by the Secretary of State"). He utilized the NSC as a tool to gather information and anticipate consequences, often returning to his office to privately reflect after listening to his advisors (Hadley 96). This behavior shows that the decision against intervention was a deliberate choice, not a result of committee indecision. Eisenhower "decided matters for himself" and only used the formal advisory process to validate his own strategic restraint (Hadley 114).

President Eisenhower's staunch opposition to unilateral intervention in Indochina was further reinforced by a strategic desire to avoid the imperialist label and the threat of total war. To navigate these pressures, he pivoted toward a policy of United Action, which required a multilateral coalition. This served as an alternative to Operation Vulture, a proposed unilateral U.S. airstrike that many of Eisenhower's advisors argued was the correct solution to the siege. Far from being a passive bystander, Eisenhower countered this extreme military commitment by insisting on a much more diplomatically taxing process. He utilized the requirement for allies in United Action and congressional satisfaction as "mutually reinforcing constraints" (Anderson 28). While his administration maintained the appearance of readiness by keeping options like carrier support available, the President "repeatedly pointed out to his advisers that congressional support would have to be obtained before any U.S. military intervention could be considered" (Preston 88). Eisenhower used the bureaucracy and demand for United Action as a shield to prevent the intervention his advisors were debating. While he and Secretary Dulles expressed personal frustration with the lack of British and French cooperation, Eisenhower remained committed to the idea that Congress had to be on board with any form of intervention. By insisting on exhaustive information gathering and unattainable international consensus, Eisenhower made the possibility of aiding the French within a meaningful timeframe impossible (Preston 90).

President Eisenhower's strategic efficacy was further reinforced by his sophisticated use of language, which he employed in a "fashion similar to his hidden-hand strategy – to create smoke screens for his actions in his role as covert prime minister" (Greenstein 67). He deliberately utilized purposefully ambiguous rhetoric to maintain political maneuverability. This skill allowed him to evade sensitive topics during press conferences, often claiming ignorance. Eisenhower's ability to leave "the impression that such utterances were guileless" distinguished him from prior politicians (Greenstein 67). A primary example of his discretion occurred in his correspondence with Winston Churchill regarding United Action. On April 4, 1954, Eisenhower proposed "an ad hoc grouping or coalition composed of" concerned nations to check Communist expansion, yet he remained purposefully unclear as to not disclose his own military conclusions to his allies (Churchill 136). By refusing to show his hand too early, Eisenhower effectively placed the burden of action on Great Britain, using diplomatic vagueness to protect his interests while the situation at Dien Bien Phu deteriorated.

Consequently, the refusal of the U.S. to intervene in Dien Bien Phu was not a result of Congress denying Eisenhower the necessary authority; rather, it was the result of Eisenhower blocking intervention himself through hidden-hand mechanisms. His ability to shield his presidency by using councils and advisors as buffers provided the necessary cushion against potential backlash of losing Indochina. He publicly respected Congress's preconditions for intervention and utilized their reluctance as a convenient pretext. Unlike later administrations that sought to bypass legislative obstacles, Eisenhower cultivated these constraints to solidify his preferred policy of non-intervention, ensuring his hidden decision became the nation's reality.

Conclusion

The 1954 crisis at Dien Bien Phu highlights a moment in which the structural resolve of the legislative and the strategic agency of the executive aligned to prevent a premature military escalation. This study confirms that the inability to secure military authorization was driven by a deep congressional desire to avoid repeating the unilateral engagement, high costs, and ambiguous outcome of the Korean War. This political caution translated into the strategic imposition of restrictive institutional preconditions designed to protect against unilateral burden. These barriers were expertly navigated and utilized by President Eisenhower's "hidden-hand" leadership. This research offers a significant contribution by elevating the institutional agency of the U.S. Congress in foreign policy decision making while simultaneously illuminating the sophisticated methodology of the Eisenhower presidency. The 1954 crisis serves as a powerful illustration of how the legislative branch can effectively reclaim and assert its constitutional war-making authority through the strategic imposition of policy preconditions. Crucially, this case demonstrates that legislative constraints achieve their maximum efficacy when they align with an executive who perceives the political advantages of operating within institutional bounds. The crisis remains a crucial historical precedent affirming the efficacy of legislative checks on executive war-making authority. This precedent is highly relevant to modern constitutional debates concerning the scope and legality of presidential military action, underscoring that institutional caution can serve as a vital safeguard for national interests.

References

Ambrose, Stephen E. *Eisenhower: Soldier and President.* Simon & Schuster. 1968.

Anderson, David L. *Trapped By Success: The Eisenhower Administration and Vietnam, 1953-61*. Columbia University Press. 1991.

Churchill, Winston. *The Churchill-Eisenhower Correspondence, 1953-1955.* The University of North Carolina Press. 1990.

"Dien Bien Phu & the Fall of French Indochina, 1954." U.S. Department of State, *U.S. Department of State,* history.state.gov/milestones/1953-1960/dien-bien-phu.

"Editorial Note." *Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,* https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v13p1/d716.

Fortinsky, Sarah. "Rand Paul Condemns Donald Trump's Caribbean Sea Operations." Text. *The Hill,* 26 Oct. 2025, https://thehill.com/homenews/senate/5573870-rand-paul-caribbean-boat-strikes/.

Fortinsky, Sarah. "Senators in Both Parties Raise Questions about Trump, Hegseth Boat Strikes." *The Hill,* 26 Oct. 2025, thehill.com/homenews/senate/5574179-congress-concerns-trump-military/.

"French Defeated at Dien Bien Phu | May 7, 1954." *HISTORY*, 9 Feb. 2010, https://www.history.com/this-day-in-history/may-7/french-defeated-at-dien-bien-phu.

Greenstein, Fred. *The Hidden-Hand Presidency: Eisenhower As Leader.* Basic Books. 1982.

Hadley, David Putnam. "Dwight D. Eisenhower, The National Security Council, and Dien Bien Phu," *The Gettysburg Historical Journal:* Vol. 8, Article 7. 2009.

Herring, George C. *America's Longest War: The United States and Vietnam, 1950-1975.* McGraw-Hill, 2013.

Herring, George C., and Richard H. Immerman. "Eisenhower, Dulles, and Dienbienphu: 'The Day We Didn't Go to War' Revisited." *The Journal of American History,* vol. 71, no. 2, 1984, pp. 343–63. JSTOR, https://doi.org/10.2307/1901759.

Hoxie, Gordon. *The White House: Organizations and Operations.* Center for the Study of Presidency. 1971

Immerman, Richard H. *John Foster Dulles: Piety, Pragmatism, and Power in U.S. Foreign Policy.* Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, 1998.

Logevall, Fredrik. *Embers of War: The Fall of an Empire and the Making of America's Vietnam.* Random House, 2012.

Mancini, Ryan. "Sunday Shows Preview: Hegseth in the Hot Seat as Details Emerge around Drug Boat Strikes." *The Hill*, 6 Dec. 2025, https://thehill.com/homenews/sunday-talk-shows/5637270-sunday-shows-preview-hegseth-controversies-boat-strike/.

"Memorandum by the Counselor (MacArthur) to the Secretary of State." *Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,* https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v13p1/d711.

"Memorandum for the File of the Secretary of State." *Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,* https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v13p1/d686.

"Memorandum for Mr. Rabb", August 12, 1953. Whitman-DDE file, Dwight D. Eisenhower Library, Abilene, Kansas.

"Memorandum of Conversation, by the Secretary of State". *Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,* https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v13p1/d636.

"Memorandum of Discussion at the 179th Meeting of the National Security Council, Friday, January 8, 1954". *Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,* https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v13p1/d499#:~:text=The%20President%20commented%20that%20this,absorb%20our%20troops%20by%20divisions.

Phone calls, March 19, 1954, Whitman-DDE file, Dwight D. Eisenhower Library, Abilene, Kansas.

Preston, Thomas. *The President and His Inner Circle.* Columbia University Press. 2001.

"Progress Report by the Under Secretary of State (Webb) to the National Security Council." *Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,* https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1951v06p1/d207.

"Record of the Secretary of State's Briefing for Members of Congress, Held at the Department of State, May 5, 1954, 5:30 p.m." *Historical Documents - Office of the Historian,* https://history.state.gov/historicaldocuments/frus1952-54v13p2/d833.

Slaton, James F. "Intervention in Vietnam: President Eisenhower's Foreign Policy". Air War College. 1995.

Vergun, David. "America Marks Anniversary of End of Korean War." *U.S. Department of War*, 24 July 2023, www.war.gov/News/News-Stories/Article/Article/3418679/america-marks-anniversary-of-end-of-korean-war/.