
Erroneous Conduct of Foreign Policy : A Realism Analysis of US Involvement in the Vietnam War

Abel Josafat Manullang
Universitas Padjadjaran

Email: bel20001@mail.unpad.ac.id

Abstract: *The Vietnam War is known to be one of the longest wars the US has been involved in. Many may have associated the war as just another one of the many proxy wars the US was involved in during the Cold War. However, there is more to learn from the Vietnam War as the recent conflicts the US was involved in, like that in Afghanistan, bore a resemblance to that of the Vietnam War. Hence, to understand the current state of the US, it is important to take a thorough look into the Vietnam War. The article aims to provide explanations to the driving force behind US involvement, its flawed approaches and perception towards its conduct in Vietnam along with the state of realism after the end of the Vietnam War. The article utilizes the qualitative research method along with the realism school of thought to answer the research questions. The result shows that the national interest on power accumulation and national security considerations were the driving force behind the US involvement. The analysis over the foreign policy as shown through the Rational Choices Model also shows the skewed views behind the policy. Moreover, on the issue of US approaches throughout the war, the reliance on realist values can be attributed as one of the factors that led to the US failure in Vietnam.*

Keywords: *Cold War, Foreign policy, Realism, United States, Vietnam War*

Abstrak: Perang Vietnam merupakan salah satu perang terlama yang melibatkan Amerika Serikat. Banyak yang hanya mengasosiasikan perang tersebut sebagai satu dari sekian banyak perang proksi yang Amerika Serikat ikuti selama Perang Dingin. Namun, ada banyak hal yang bisa dipelajari dari Perang Vietnam, terlebih melihat adanya kemiripan dengan konflik yang belakangan ini diikuti Amerika Serikat dengan Perang Vietnam, seperti konflik di Afghanistan. Oleh karena itu, untuk memahami Amerika Serikat, penting untuk mengkaji Perang Vietnam dengan lebih mendalam. Artikel ini bertujuan untuk menjelaskan alasan dibalik partisipasi Amerika Serikat dalam Perang Vietnam, pandangan dan pendekatan yang salah terkait Vietnam, serta keadaan realisme usai berakhirnya Perang Vietnam. Artikel ini menggunakan metode penelitian kualitatif dan teori realisme dalam menjawab pertanyaan penelitiannya. Hasilnya menunjukkan bahwa kepentingan untuk memperoleh lebih banyak kekuatan serta pertimbangan keamanan nasional adalah faktor dibalik partisipasi Amerika Serikat. Analisis terkait kebijakan luar negeri yang bersangkutan melalui Rational Choices Model juga menunjukkan persepsi yang salah dalam konstruksi kebijakan tersebut. Selain itu, terkait pendekatan Amerika Serikat selama Perang Vietnam, ketergantungan pada nilai-nilai realisme bisa diatribusikan sebagai penyebab kegagalannya di Vietnam.

Kata Kunci: Amerika Serikat, Kebijakan luar negeri, Perang Dingin, Perang Vietnam, Realisme

INTRODUCTION

The Vietnam War has been considered as an interesting and complex chapter in US history. It was a war where the US had to face a whole new type of warfare which was known as the 4th generation of warfare (Simko, 2019). Not stopping there, the US also had to deal and adapt with the battlefield as well because in South Vietnam, apart from the absence of a concrete battlefield, the climate and other natural conditions there. In short, it was the kind of war the US had never fought before.

Aside from being a new kind of war, the war would also be the longest war the US has ever participated in to this day. This murky involvement would eventually be over both by lack of concrete progress in South Vietnam and domestic pressure (Manullang, 2021). Referring to the latter, the American public, which initially supported the involvement, strongly opposed it especially upon witnessing the atrocities, the use of deadly armaments (biological weapon to countless bombing campaigns) which claimed the lives of countless civilians, done by the US there. It begs many questions, one of which being on the purpose and reason behind US involvement.

There are various views and sentiments towards the US involvement. Some support it as they consider it a necessity of the US back then, while others consider it as one of the worst mistakes in US foreign policy history (Resky, 2015). But, despite the various sentiments to it, the Vietnam War is also a poignant scar left upon the nation from the Cold War. The painful memory inherent to this particular conflict is palpable in the Vietnam War memorial where more than fifty thousand names of US casualties are engraved on it. Now, as the relations between the US and Vietnam have long moved on beyond that conflict to a point where they are now working together to

settle the loose ends (unexploded ordnances and diseases caused by US weapons) left by the US there (Utama et al., 2019). Nevertheless, despite how much has changed since the end of the war, there are still many things to be learned from that particular chapter of US history.

To dismiss the Vietnam War as just another one of the many US engagements during the Cold War would not be proper. In fact, the contemporary US engagements and foreign policies can be traced back to that particular chapter of US history. Hence, to set aside the Vietnam War would be an absurd attitude as it would pave the path for another historic recurrence. Moreover, the complexity of the Vietnam War, including US involvement there, inevitably brings many misconceptions to it.

The article seeks to explain and provide analysis regarding US involvement and how the policy to partake in the Vietnam War through the lense of the realism school of thought. The emphasis and focus realism has on states' pursuit of power and competition in the international system makes realism suitable as the theoretical framework to guide the analysis on the discussion points.

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The School of Realism

Realism is an international relations theory that views the states, which are the main actors in international relations, as rational actors with interest to gain power. Realism has three main characteristics, notably known as the 3S which refers to statism (how states are the main actor in the international system as a result of their sovereignty), survival (the main interest of states in their activities in the international system) and self help (in the anarchic international system

there are no overarching entities to police the system, hence states must rely on themselves to maintain their survival). Realism considers states as rational actors, driven by the conflict ridden human nature, that pushes them to maintain a policy or an outlook where the focus would be on power accumulation (Jacobs, 2014). In a realist viewed world, peace can only be achieved through the balance of power or when a hegemon has come to rule the system. Aside from that, it also portrays the international system as an arena where states would showcase their power. One of the ways they do so is in terms of hard power, that is their military instrument or their *ratio ultima regum* in their conduct of international relations.

Being one of the oldest schools of thought, it is no surprise that realism had many classical predecessors that dated way before the conception of international relations study. A prominent example of it would be Thucydides, famous for its account of the Peloponnesian War and concepts like the Melian Dialogue and Thucydides Trap (Jørgensen, 2018). Realism also posits how the anarchical feature of the international system makes interactions among states imbued with zero sum game. Moreover, there also exists variants of realism, one of which being structural realism or better known as neorealism. Neorealism still maintains the same stance as realism but instead of focussing on the power oriented character of states, neorealism also sheds light to the impact given by the anarchic international system (Mearsheimer, 2013). In this sense, neorealism believes that the anarchic structure of the international system is the main force behind the states' competitive or zero sum interactions. But despite the variants and developments realism went through, one thing remains the same, that is the centrality of power both for states and the international system.

RESEARCH METHOD

In providing the explanations, the article utilizes the qualitative research

method. Qualitative research method is a research method that begins with formulating the research questions, collecting the relevant data (primary, secondary or both), interpreting the data to obtain the result and conclusion (Bryman, 2012). The article uses secondary data that is obtained from past articles or books and media publications that cover the relevant issue. The article uses the state level of analysis whilst also putting into consideration impacts from the international level. Through the use of qualitative research method, state level of analysis and secondary data, the article would then provide the answer from what drove the US to Vietnam, how the foreign policy to embark upon Vietnam was constructed and eventually its flawed approaches throughout the war.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Driving Force behind the Involvement

As previously mentioned, the Vietnam War occurred with the backdrop of the Cold War. In such a condition, the US considered any communist presence, especially in terms of states, as a threat to its security. In analyzing the policy to embark upon Vietnam, it is useful to look into structural realism. This variation of realism still maintains the same idea that the international system is anarchic while putting an emphasis on how the anarchical nature of the system influences states to seek power. The trait influenced by the system and ongoing events back then (the Cold War) along with the state's quest for more power could be understood as the basis to understand why the US considered the Vietnam War as one of its interests.

The US, apart from its aforementioned push and interest to be involved in Vietnam, finally got an opportunity for its entry to the conflict. In 1964, during a patrol around the

Gulf of Tonkin, the USS Maddox, a US vessel that was assisting South Vietnamese forces, was attacked by the North Vietnamese. Despite the confusion and uncertainty surrounding the event, the government utilized to mobilize the public opinion to support the eventual US entry into Vietnam. The American public supported the move considering the negative perception surrounding communism (which was associated with North Vietnam) and how such an attack on the USS Maddox was deemed as a concrete threat (Schuman, 1969). Another thing worth mentioning is how the government also framed the entire policy of getting into Vietnam as a responsibility bestowed to the US as the frontliner of global democracy. Such acceptance from the people played an important role in the upcoming policies and approaches the US used during the Vietnam War.

Returning to conditions set by the Cold War, the competition for power and influence in the international system is also an important factor to consider. Following the realism school of thought, within the anarchical international system, states are bound to compete with each other to gain more power. Such an anarchical and competitive atmosphere was palpable during that period. Hence, it was no surprise that the US, as one of the global powers involved in the Cold War, shaped its policies to accommodate its stance against the USSR.

The stage for the global power's competition would eventually be also set in Vietnam, a former French colony. The Vietnam we all know today is different to its Cold War counterpart which was divided in two, North Vietnam which aligned more the USSR and South Vietnam which leaned more to the US. The two divided Vietnams were involved in a conflict where North Vietnam sought to unite the two Vietnam under its rule. In their quest to bring a united Vietnam to fruition, they were gaining good momentum with the support of both China and the USSR. Following the negative development where the North

Vietnamese and the overall communist influence kept on growing in the region which negatively affected the stability of South Vietnam, the US intensified its support to South Vietnam. These supports however did not amount to a huge US military personnels presence, as the US only provided financial aids, military advisors and armaments. Despite following the same measures like that of the USSR, South Vietnam did not appear to fare any better. Nonetheless, the current state of the conflict was not in favor of US interest.

In this case, for the US to lose South Vietnam to the communist North Vietnam would not only be a loss in the competition, but also a threat to US national security (Lin, 2009). Such extension of US national security during the Cold War was also present outside the case of Vietnam, notably the formation of numerous security treaties (NATO & SEATO) along with the US nuclear umbrella concept. With that, it can be understood that for the US to feel threatened, it does not necessarily mean that some states were threatening it in a direct military sense, but rather through threatening other states or objects of interest that the US had its interest in (Buzan, 2016).

A Deluded Foreign Policy Construction

The Rational Choices Model can be utilized to get a better understanding of the way the entire policy to Vietnam was constructed. The model covers 4 stages in which foreign policy is made which is as follows: problem recognition and definition, goals selection, option and alternatives identification along with the choice (Ramadani & Trisni, 2019). In the first stage, the government would need to define the problem at hand. In the problem recognition and definition stage, the government would do so.

Then, in the goals selection stage, the government would decide what are the stakes in the issue which later would determine the response it might take. The choice stage refers to the final choice taken by the government after a deep consideration of the many options it can resort to, which would be the substance of its foreign policy, in response to the relevant issue.

First, in the problem recognition and definition, there are many points to take in the US's view towards the Vietnam issue. For this stage, there are 4 components to understand which are as follows: all actions or the external factors that are relevant to the issue, the motivation behind the actors' actions, capabilities of each actor that was involved in the issue along with the condition and tendency of the international system. The actions or external factors that were relevant to the issue were the aggressions or destabilizing actions done by North Vietnam against South Vietnam (Dougherty & Stewart, 2016). A supporting fact to why such a view gained US attention can be attributed to another similar conflict the US was involved in back then (although in a different scale of aggression), that was the Korean War. In regard to the motivation behind the actors' actions, we can first break it down between North and South Vietnam. North Vietnam was motivated to keep on destabilizing South Vietnam through numerous, both direct and indirect, means so eventually the southern government would crumble and the reunification of the two Vietnams could occur. South Vietnam, on the other hand, was motivated to maintain its sovereignty over its territory and people although it was severely overwhelmed by the many issues it had. Despite not being directly threatened,

South Vietnam was a vital object of interest for the US hence any disturbance or threat against it could be considered as an extended threat against the US as well.

On the capabilities of the actors involved, apart from noting the obvious distribution of power between the three parties, a look into the US government would be useful. For the country to be involved, it is imperative for the president to obtain the US congress agreement for such a policy to be made. The president has the capacity to frame or securitize issues which would allow it to allocate more resources to attain the relevant goal despite how objectively it was not necessary or not requiring that level of urgency. In this case, the president, through lobbying the congress and securitizing the Vietnam issue, could gain the support and resources it needed for a foreign policy that dictates the entry to Vietnam to emerge (Brown, 1976). For the condition and tendency of the international system, the Cold War provided a proper background that not only provided the basis of palpable tension between the US and the USSR but also by spreading or proliferating it to numerous other regions, one of which happened to be the then divided Vietnams. The Cold War also in part contributed to the deluded view the US had in many areas, one of which was on its national security, that pushed it to commit into things it did not necessarily need to.

For the goals selection stage, the US had some interests it wished to attain or protect in regard to the Vietnam issue. A good point to start would be the goal to maintain the US's identity as the front line of the Western

democracy. In this case, the policy to set sails for Vietnam, specifically South Vietnam, can be understood as a way to accentuate its identity. Another goal the US had was related to its national security. While it may be hard to understand how a country thousands of miles away, not to mention was less industrialized, from the US could be viewed as a threat to the US, the US still considered it that way as a result of the aforementioned condition of the international system. Shifting our attention back to South Vietnam, the ties or commitment the US had made with it was also part of the goals the US wished to keep. The US had a wide range of goals, which were also interconnected with other goals, it wished to attain

In identifying its options and alternatives, the US had two options in general which are to go with the cooperative or confrontative approach. Each of the two approaches has their own consequences, both positive and negative. Not surprisingly, resorted to a range of confrontative approaches. Cooperative or a more peaceful approaches were ruled out considering the nature and urgency that had been present then, especially following the Gulf of Tonkin incident. The aforementioned interest in the goals selection process also contributed to the manner in which the US responded in its policy. While it is true that to add more fire into the flame, in this case it was the Vietnam issue, would certainly entail more conflicts that the US must take care of in the future, it would at least open up a lot more options rather than its cooperative counterpart.

Finally, after defining and identifying both the issue and its options, the US made the choice which would be the main substance of its foreign policy in regard to the Vietnam issue. The US

resorted to go with the confrontative approach. Apart from increasing the amount of armament and military assistance units, the US finally deployed its troops in huge amounts to Vietnam (Wicker, 1991). As a result of the policy, the US would officially be involved in the Vietnam War and the rest is history.

As explained through the use of the Rational Choices Model, the writer surmises that the construction of the policy was in accordance with the realism school of thought. The entire policy to be directly involved in the conflict was another manifestation of US interest and willingness to utilize its power to attain its interest. Despite being elaborated through the Rational Choices Model, one can doubt how the aforementioned conditions, from the scale of the conflict to the view of a threat the US put on it, could really be considered as a rational reason to employ countless resources, especially military ones, as apparent in the forthcoming policy back then. For that trait, the US could be considered as an offensive realist, a type of structural realism that posits how states would pursue power or even hegemony through its many programs and policies. While it is true that we can also attribute the nature and condition of the international system, especially with how the Cold War has set the stage for numerous proxy wars to occur between the two global superpowers, again we can also point out the way the US had made its policies, which apart from following the offensive realism, which was also power oriented. Hence, the pursuit of power also played a part in the goals selection, especially in how some of the goals were somewhat

exaggerated like the ones regarding national security as well as the need to maintain its status.

Flawed Conduct and Execution of the Policy

After the construction of the foreign policy to embark upon Vietnam as elaborated through the Rational Choices Model, then came the time for the policy to be executed during the Vietnam War. The experience in Vietnam was very different from other military engagements the US had been involved in. In World War II, the US, armed with its vast military arsenal, could make use of the war's fixed battlezone. The clear knowledge of the enemy's territory and how they look would not be something that was present in Vietnam. Back then, despite being a novel kind of conflict, some states had been familiar with it. France and the UK were some examples of them. France was the colonizer of Vietnam, back when it was still part of its Indochina, before it finally gave them their independence following their defeat in Dien Bien Phu (Windrow, 2003). The UK faced a similar type of conflict during the Malayan Emergency in which it managed to adapt and eventually handle the conflict. Unfortunately, the US would not follow the steps of the UK, but rather that of France, the predecessor of US presence in Vietnam. In the end, despite the absence of a proper understanding of the nature of the conflict, the US finally brought its troops in huge numbers starting in 1965.

The way the US conducted its operations in Vietnam is also worth mentioning. As mentioned before, the battlefield or the way the battles were fought in Vietnam were blurred due to the asymmetrical nature of it. Such confusion in conducting military operations were bound to happen in such circumstances, especially considering how many times the US would achieve little to nothing despite suffering many casualties and depleting countless resources (Herr, 1991). In

responding to such frustration, realism also imbued the response the US resorted to. A notable example of such response would be how a lot of the operations conducted by the US were in line with the realist view on ethical guidance or better known as the realist ethics.

The realist take on ethics or ethical realism is the realist view that in the anarchic international system, the only viable ethics are the states' national interests. Through that understanding, realism does not consider other ethics, especially those involving moral obligations, that would guide states' activities in the international system (Shapcott, 2014). The realist ethics can be seen at work in US militaristic approaches in the Vietnam War. One notable example would be the decision to bomb Cambodia, a neutral country that utilized by North Vietnam and the Vietcong as a safehaven. The operation, named Operation Menu, was the idea of Henry Kissinger, US Secretary of State back then. Despite the risk presented by the move to Cambodia's stability (back then, it was also struggling with communist forces) and not to mention the possibility of civilian casualties, the US went along with the operations. Knowing that attacking a neutral state would not be something the American public welcomed, the US government kept the operation as a secret from the public, something that should not be done in a democracy like the US. Such a policy like that can be considered in accordance with realist ethics through the consideration of how despite such action being unsanctioned, the US went along with it as it was in line with its interest in Vietnam.

Although the US also made other methods, especially the ones that used softer approaches, they were only subsidiary means in the bigger scheme of the operations in Vietnam (Cawthorne, 2010). Indeed, the US did have programs like the Strategic

Hamlet Program that provided the civilians better living accommodation to obtain their trust. The aforementioned program was also part of the US pacification program in Vietnam alongside programs like the Revolutionary Development, Agrovillage and Combined Action Platoon. The pacification programs the US had may have given us a vision of how the US was also aware of the need to focus on softer approaches. Unfortunately, the pacification scheme pales in comparison to the hard or militaristic measures the US resorted to. Moreover, the repercussions brought by the militaristic approaches also made things arduous for pacification programs to bring positive results. Such circumstances, the difficulty faced by the pacification programs to bring results, only made it more convenient for the US to keep on resorting to its militaristic approach.

Another shot of ethical realism at work would be done during the Nixon administration. Apart from being known to finally bring peace with honor as a means to end US involvement in the Vietnam War, the administration is also known for many of its realism imbued conduct in regard to the war. One of such conduct, aside from the afore-explained realist approach to military operations, another notable example of such conduct would be the Vietnamization program which fully ran under the Nixon administration. Upon first glance, many may have noted the main purpose of the program was to make the South Vietnamese Army (ARVN) a lot more independent so as they would not be relying on their American counterpart. The US also went the extra miles through providing enormous supplies of armaments to reach that end. Upon the use of the realist perspective, one can pinpoint the underlying reason to this move which can be attributed to the US desire to leave South Vietnam.

Such conditions finally took a toll on the US government's image to the public. At last, the US could not just abandon South Vietnam, a country it had

deemed as an ally for years, to deal with the problem which the US couldn't solve up to that point. The US also learned of how much to keep the commitment in South Vietnam would eventually lead to further depletion of resources the US could use for other purposes, hence it was rational and in line with the realist approach to come up with the program. A failure in Vietnam may indeed leave a bad mark on the US, but it would certainly stop it from pursuing its interest in the international system. It would be absurd to consider Vietnam as the sole or central interest, despite the countless resources that had been mobilized, the US had during the Cold War. As in the end, the war in Vietnam is just one of the many entanglements the US had back then. If it no longer sees an outcome that benefits its interest in Vietnam, it could just move somewhere else to pursue its national interest.

Before getting into the repercussions of such a resort, it is also important to note the inconsistency US had to its realist ethics. What is meant with that is how the US, through its operations and policies, appeared to embrace both considerable constraints and realist ethics. Operation Rolling Thunder is a good example in which the US wanted to conduct a bombing campaign over North Vietnam so they would not be able to supply the insurgents in South Vietnam. But, due to constraints given by the government in Washington, the military was only allowed to target limited sites under the government's supervision. It was as if the US knew the consequences of embracing the ethic yet it still sought to get the benefits. In the end, as shown in its operations (notably Rolling Thunder), we can see how a combination between realist ethics and constraints did not end up well. It was also for this characteristic that many considered the military to be fighting with one arm tied in the back. Such inconsistency can be attributed as one

of the reasons the war ended not in the favor of the US.

An important repercussion brought by the resort to realist ethics would be the deterioration of the US government's image among the public. Initially, the American public went along with the decision to go to South Vietnam, believing that the government would bring positive influences along their operations to drive the communists, something the US public heavily opposed to, out of the country. But following the media's heavy presence throughout the war, the American public bore witness to the countless atrocities their fellow soldiers committed in the name of democracy or to serve the US national interest. One of such atrocities is the My Lai massacre where US forces killed more than 500 civilians (Turse, 2013). It would eventually lead to many demonstrations taking place in the US and even in other countries as well. The pressure would amount to be so enormous that President Lyndon B. Johnson refused to be nominated by his party to go for the next term. The pressure also remained until the next president, President Nixon, took over and finally brought an end to US involvement in the war. The demonstrations and the way they affected the government's conduct in regard to the Vietnam War clearly showed how vulnerable it is to rely on realist ethics (at least its crude interpretation), especially for a democracy like the US. Just like in the war, despite the attainment according to US perception of what needed to be done, it was against what the public had in mind.

CONCLUSION

The US involvement in the Vietnam War can be understood through the realist lens upon considering the many factors involved back then. Such factors that influenced the US back then were those like the ongoing competition for power and influence with the USSR, the extended understanding of national security along with the interest to show and gain more

power which was also related to its security. In regard to the construction of the relevant policy, it can be concluded that the US took drastic as measures as apparent in its confrontative approach following the considerations of its selected goals, problem definition and the options it had identified before hand. Moving to the way the operations and approaches were conducted during the war, a return to realism can be noted. The resort to realist values (like the realist ethics) were prominent throughout the Vietnam War, albeit inconsistent at times. Unfortunately, the many conducts imbued with realism would eventually be the downfall of US involvement in the Vietnam War. Such were the cases for the US where the American public's outcries for an end to the war as a result of the atrocities the US did and how long the war had been going back then.

REFERENCES

- Booth, L. S. (2009) *The Vietnam and Iraq Wars: The Antithesis of Realism. Lethbridge Undergraduate Research Journal*, 4(1).
- Brown, W. (1976). *The Last Chopper: The Denouement of the American Role in Vietnam, 1963 - 1975*. London: Kennikat Press.
- Bryman, A. (2012). *Social research methods* (4th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Buzan, B. (2016). *People, States and Fear an Agenda for International Security Studies in the Post-Cold War Era*. United Kingdom: ECPR Press
- Cawthorne, N. (2010). *Vietnam a War Lost and Won*. London: Arcturus Publishing Limited.
- Dougherty, K., & Stewart, J. (2016). *Kronologi Perang Vietnam: Konflik yang Mengguncang Sejarah Perang Amerika*. Jakarta: PT Elex Media Komputindo.
- Herr, M. (1991). *Dispatches*. United States: Vintage Books.
- Jacobs, A. (2014). Realism. In S. Schieder & M. Spindler, *Theories of International Relations*. New York:

- Routledge.
- Jørgensen, K. E. (2018). *International Relations Theory: A New Introduction* (2nd ed.). London: Palgrave.
- Lin, M. (2009). China and the Escalation of the Vietnam War: The First Years of the Johnson Administration. *Journal Of Cold War Studies*, 11(2), 35-69. <https://doi.org/10.1162/jcws.2009.11.2.35>
- Manullang, A. J. (2021). *Limited War: US Diplomacy Instrument during the Vietnam War*. Ir Corner. Retrieved 8 September 2022, from https://www.ircorner.com/limited-war-us-diplomacy-instrument-during-the-vietnam-war/#_ftn1.
- Mearsheimer, J. (2013). Structural Realism. In T. Dunne, M. Kurki & S. Smith, *International Relations Theories Discipline and Diversity* (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ramadani, S., & Trisni, S. (2019) Analisis Kebijakan Luar Negeri Filipina Terkait Sengketa Laut Cina Selatan pada masa Duterte. *Intermestic: Journal of International Studies*, 4(1). 46-47. <https://doi.org/10.24198/intermestic.v4n1.4>
- Resky, M. (2015). *Kegagalan Politik Luar Negeri Amerika Serikat di Vietnam, 1965 - 1975*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish Publisher.
- Schuman, F. (1969). *International Politics Anarchy and Order in the World Society*. Tokyo: Toshio Printing Co., Ltd.
- Shapcott, R. (2014). International Ethics. In J. Baylis, S. Smith & P. Owens, *The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Politics* (6th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Šimko, J. (2019). Vietnam War - The New Aspect of Warfare. *International Conference KNOWLEDGE-BASED ORGANIZATION*, 25(1), 144-149. <https://doi.org/10.2478/kbo-2019-0024>
- Turse, N. (2013). *Kill Anything that Moves: the Real American War in Vietnam*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Utama, B., Pattipeilhy, S., & Windiani, D. (2019). Towards Perpetual Peace: The Dynamics of US and Vietnam Relations Since The Settlement of Agent Orange Case in 2000. *Global: Jurnal Politik Internasional*, 21(2), 198. <https://doi.org/10.7454/global.v21i2.394>
- Wicker, T. (1991). *Ghosts of Vietnam*. Nytimes.com. Retrieved 10 September 2022, from <https://www.nytimes.com/1991/01/26/opinion/in-the-nation-ghosts-of-vietnam.html>.
- Windrow, M. (2003). *The French Indochina War 1964 - 54*. China: Osprey Publishing.