



Mohamed Khider University of Biskra  
Faculty of Letters and Languages  
Department of Foreign Languages

## **MASTER DISSERTATION**

Letters and Foreign Languages  
English Studies  
**Literature and Civilization**

---

### **A Comparison between American withdrawals from Afghanistan and Vietnam Similarities & Differences**

---

Submitted by  
**TORCHI NADJETTE**

Supervised by  
**Mrs. Meriem Djaalal**

#### **Board of Examiners**

<b>Mr.BoulegrouneAdel</b>	<b>University of Biskra.</b>	<b>Examiner</b>
<b>Mrs.MeriemDjaalal</b>	<b>University of Biskra.</b>	<b>Supervisor</b>
<b>Mrs.Bougoufa Zeyneb.</b>	<b>University of Biskra.</b>	<b>Examiner</b>
<b>Mrs.ElHemel Lamjed</b>	<b>University of Biskra.</b>	<b>Examiner</b>

**Academic Year 2021-2022**

## **Dedication**

I dedicate this modest work to

Dear father who gave me strength, encouragement and help

My beloved mother who gave me love, patience and hope

My husband who gave me support and care

My brothers the source of support

Aymen, Rochdi, Bachir, Khaled

My sisters

Hanane, Leila, Hayat,

My soul friends who have always been a source of motivation

Sonia, Rayanne, Romaissa

To all those who prayed for me and besought God to help me

## **Acknowledgments**

Special thanks and enormous gratitude go to my supervisor Mrs. Mariem Djaalal for her guideness. I also would like to thank the board of examiners: Mrs. Bougofa Zeineb, Mr. Adel Boulgroune and Mr. Lamjed Elhamel who have kindly accepted to examine this dissertation.

I am so grateful to my husband for his help and support to finish my studies and his whole family without exception.

I would thank everyone has a touch in this work

Thank you so much.

## **Abstract**

The United States of America is the world last staying superpower. Nevertheless, this was not constantly the case, The United States worked in relative obscurity on an international scale for the majority of its history. As the world developed, so too did the young nation. The United States tried to avoid world's affairs, but a time came when that was no longer possible. Need determined that the united states end up being a significant gamer at the global level. Aside from this, the citizens of the United States did not really have the stomach for foreign powers.

This could be better start than it was by George Washington, the first president of the United States, in his farewell address in 1796. «The great rule of conduct for us in regard to foreign nations is in extending our commercial relations, to have with them as little political connection as possible. As far as we have already formed engagements, let them fulfilled with perfect good faith. According to that we dealt with, we can't forget to talk about American foreign policy that defined as international relations policy or set of goals about how the country will work with other countries economically, politically ,socially and military. It includes such matters as international trade, foreign aid, military alliances and war as Thomas Wolsey said. Millions of European soldiers eagerly marched to a war they assumed would be brief.

New technology available to the newly industrialized nations gave military planners unfounded optimism about their military prospects. American politics does not stop at the water's edge, not even during wartime. It goes abroad; following the flag onto the battlefield, attending both the commitment of the nation is fighting forces. Vietnam those two countries and the tale of withdrawal of America from this problem that we should discussed and proposed in this paper.

## **List of Abbreviations**

**NATO:** North Atlantic Treaty Organization

**UN:** The United Nations

**CIA:** Central Intelligence Agency

## List of Figures

**Figure 1:** Vietnam map

**Figure 2:** A South Vietnamese Marine, severely Wounded in a Viet Cong ambush, comforted by a comrade in a sugar-cane field at Duck Hoe about 12 miles from Saigon on August 5, 1963.

# Table of Contents

Dedication.....	I
Acknowledgment.....	II
Abstract.....	II
I	
List of Abbreviations.....	4
List of Figures.....	5
General Introduction.....	8.
Statement of the Problem.....	9
Research Questions.....	10
Research Aims.....	11
Research Methodology.....	11
Literature Review.....	12

## Chapter One: Background of the Two Conflicts

Introduction.....	13
1.1. Main Fractures of American Foreign Policy.....	15
1.2. Overview of the Vietnam War.....	19
2. 1.3. Overview the Afghanistan War.....	21

## Chapter Two: American Withdrawal from Vietnam

Introduction.....	27
1.1. A General Overview of the American Withdrawal from Viet.....	28
1.2. Causes of the Withdrawal.....	33
1.3. Results of the Withdrawal.....	39
Conclusion.....	40

## Chapter Three: American Withdrawal from Afghanistan

Introduction.....	42.
-------------------	-----



3.1. A General Overview of the American Withdrawal from Afghanistan.....	43
3.2. Causes of the Withdrawal.....	44
3.3. Results of the Withdrawal.....	47
3.4. Similarities and Differences of the two Withdrawals.....	51
Conclusion.....	5
3	
WorksCited.....	
55	
ملخص	
البحث.....	58

## **1. General Introduction**

The US considered the first democracy of the world. It has its independence in 1776. Since this moment, the Americans started the formation of the nation and with them the statement of American and political values that define the country, values like the equality and individualism determine the road of the US and determine the political and the economic model for more than 200 years. Although the Americans appreciate a lot the American values, the application of those values cannot be equal for all. The blacks and other minorities were not consider as citizens until one century of the independence of the US and now they have been always discriminated.

The Americans continue to see the country with an open mind overview, but blindness when it refers to the diversity of their population. In other words, America is one country in the books and another in practice. Clinton thinks that the US have one checklist of values, and with them, he can resolve all the problems of the country. This is controversial, America was a country since 200 years ago, however some things have been change, the population is compose by Blacks, Hispanics, Jewels and this change should be signal for look the American values with another eyes.

In addition, it is not possible to express a feeling of respect to the American values if the values cannot recognize the diversity of visions inside the country. For them, it is necessary to look the diversity and make new list of values and in this sense the Americans don't have a country in the books and another in the real life? This shows that the American people truly want to progress to towards a better future, not just for the old white man but every race, gender and creed known to man.

## **2. The research problem**

When we mention America today, we can relate to the word superpower economically, socially and even military. We will discuss the debates surrounding the grand strategy of the United States, it introduces a neoclassical realist model of grand strategy formation in which ideas are considered in conjunction with considerations of power in the international system. As the Basic Books (Max Boot, 2014) notice while the major conflict in American history has become all too familiar, Americas small wars have played an essential but little-appreciated role in the country's growth as a power world. First published in 2002, this was a key volume in the case for a new policy of interventionism. Max Boot shows how America's smaller actions- such as the recent conflict in Bosnia, Somalia, Vietnam and Afghanistan have made up the vast majority of our military engagements.

The basic problem that we will study in our dissertation is concerning America and her leaving from the two nations Afghanistan and Vietnam.

The chief question I will investigate here is:

- Comparison between American withdrawal from Afghanistan and Vietnam

### **3. Research question**

One the basic of what mentioned above, we try to answer the following questions:

- a) Comparing between American Withdrawal from Afghanistan and Vietnam.
- b) What are the motives of this withdrawal in both nations?
- c) What are the similarities and differences between the two withdrawals?

#### **4. Research aims**

So to precise and realize the goal from this study, we try to compare the motives and the causes of American withdrawal in both countries Afghanistan and Vietnam, and then work on the similarities and differences.

#### **5. Research methodology**

The theoretical approach of this study is the comparative analysis, which is the appropriate one to adapt. It conducted mainly to explain and gain a better understanding of the causal processes involved in the creation of facts. In this research, I will use Books and sites from Google scholar to collect sources and literary reviews that are relevant to my research field. I will also use analytical study by giving causes about Americas leaving from Afghanistan and Vietnam then end my work with the effects of this withdrawal on the two countries or as we call them gains and losses.

My research method will include an overall reading of the primary source American foreign policy by different presidents and each president with his own perspectives and achievements for the states, I will use the historical material that would help me come up with helpful and important information about America. The pre-mentioned findings will supported by reliable books, articles and sites, which would serve to give a credible outcome to the research

#### **6. Literature Review**

Before the World War II, the US policy was a compound of cooperation and isolation towards the world's affairs and the US has no direct link in Southeast Asia. This area was under British influence. The main reason was lack of American commercial interests in Afghanistan, which obviated an early meaningful relationship between the two countries. Therefore, the history of US-Afghan relations is not very long. The efforts of the Afghan government for establishing relationship not cherished up until 1934, and formal diplomatic relations established in 1942.

Afghanistan continued its traditional and preferred role as buffer state, which prevented it from going into the orbit of any superpower or joining any military alliance. The US adopted

flexible approach in its relations, which totally alerted the geo-strategic situation. Pakistan became a frontline state and the US arranged to supply military assistance to resistance groups without its direct involvement. In 1981, President Reagan took power with his tough anti-communist stance and made Moscow pay a high military and political price for the intervention in Afghanistan ([US Afghan Relations: A historical Perspectives of events](#))

Moving to Vietnam, while its war raged roughly two decades worth of bloody and world changing years, compelling images made their way out of combat zones. On television screen and magazine pages around the world, photographs told a story of a fight that only got more confusing, more devastating, as it went on. As Jon Meacham describes in this week's issue of TIME, the pictures from that period can help illuminate the demons of Vietnam, and in the decades since, the most striking if, those images have retained their power.

My picture of the US corpsman carrying an injured child away from the battle in Hue is a rare occasion to show the true value of human kindness and the dignity of man. The child found wandering the previous night between the Vietnam and American firing line. Upon arriving in Vietnam, American soldiers found themselves in a strange land of watery fields and dense jungles. In the early years of the war, some US soldiers expected the south Vietnamese people to greet them as heroes. As MICHAL H.HUN said, the overall situations for American troops became wars, race relations within US military also deteriorated.

This paper meets to guidelines in overall two wars Vietnam and Afghanistan and the American war on both them with more details we dealt with in each chapter focusing on the comparison between the two countries when America leaving both.

# **CHAPTER ONE**

## **Background of the Two Conflicts**

## Introduction

The US considered the first democracy of the world. It was obtain their independence in 1776, since this moment the Americans started the formation of the nation and with them the statement of American and political values that define the country, values like the quality and individualism determine the road of the US and determine the political and the economic model for more than 200 years. Although the Americans appreciate a lot the statement the American values, the application of those values cannot be equal for all. The blacks and other minorities did not consider citizens until one century of the independence of the US and now they have been continue discriminate. Some things are in contradiction.

The Americans have been continue the express like the country with an open mind overview, but blindness when it refers about the diversity of their population, in little words America is one country in the books and another in practice. Clinton thinks that the US have one checklist of values, and with them, he can resolve all the problem of the country. This really controversial, America was a country 200 years ago, however some things have been change, the population is compose by Blacks, Hispanics, Jewels and this change should be signal for look the American values with another eyes.

In addition, is not possible express a feeling for respect the American values if the values cannot recognize the diversity of visions inside the country. For them, is necessary look the diversity, make new list of values and in this sense the Americans don't have a country in the books and another in the real life? This shows that the American people truly want to progress to towards a better future, not just for the old white man but every race, gender and creed known to man.

### 1. Main Features of American Foreign Policy

The foreign policy of the US, like that of all the nations has always resulted of a mixture of self-interested considerations and an endeavor to behave in accordance with widely held principles. Self-interested considerations have frequently been dressed with the rhetoric of great principles, as

they have in other countries. However, a number of features specific to the United States have prompted many Americans to regard their foreign policy as exceptional.

The first is the country's geographical location. When Americans look at the globe with the United States in the middle, two truths that have colored much of US foreign policy become evident. To begin with, the Americans separated from other continents by vast oceans. Second, the vast majority of the world's population and farmland, as well as all of the great powers located in Europe and Asia.

Foreign policy, in general refers to the broad aims that influence a country operations and relationships with other countries. Domestic reasons, as well as the actions or behavior of other states, affects the evolution of foreign policy in order to advance specific geopolitical agendas.

The relative physical isolation provided by the oceans encouraged those migrating to North America to feel they were leaving behind anything they despised in their home civilizations for over 300 year. The assumption that Americans could withdraw from participation with the rest of the world and focus on domestic matters was the foundation for US isolationism. As the country grew in size across the continent, provided reason for people to believe the US was big enough for them.

Americans ambitions fueled by their success in bringing them westward, and they felt they had a destiny to civilize the continent. Both World Wars should recognized by the US because of threats to its dominance in the continental sea approaches. When John Winthrop spoke of a "city on a Hill that the eyes of all people are upon," he was referring to a religiously reformed community that would serve as an example for reformation in England. Later American leaders, from George Washington to Ronald Reagan, echoed Winthrop's sentiments, reaffirming Americans that they had a unique mission to set an example for the rest of the world by exporting American freedom and democracy and conduct a foreign policy unlike any other nation ([Winthrop](#)).

The United States was a political and economic pygmy in 1800. It surrounded on three sides by British colonies to the north, French Louisiana to the west. During the colonial period, every war between European powers had an American component. In his so-called Farewell Address 1796, George Washington, after serving as the nation's first president, described his current philosophy in



broad terms. Its basic premise was to avoid political and military entanglements while fostering personal relationships.

Although America was too weak to resist European influence, the Monroe Doctrine, which may reduce to three main fundamentals. The first known as (non-colonization) which refers to the US opposition to any new colonies in the Americas. The second demand (non-intervention) was that European powers stay out of the problems of New World countries. In exchange for European compliance with these principles, the US agreed to the third feature (non-interference), allowing the residual European colonies in the Americas to exist while remaining detached from European politics. The Monroe Doctrine returned American neutrality into isolationism, combining it with the country's perception of having a unique role in the world. For nearly three years, the United States pretended that the First World War was a European battle that had no bearing on the United States. The neutral President Woodrow Wilson matched the conventional isolationist beliefs of the American electorate. However, neutrality could not be maintained for three reasons.

Free trade, freedom of the seas, global disarmament and the prohibition of secret alliances were the second category of principles for guiding international conduct following the war. Wilson's proposal for the League of Nations, which would put self-determination and the other principles into actions, described in the remaining points. Throughout the rest of 1920, US foreign policy focused on removing trade barriers. International peace and stability were crucial, in part to ensure that once established, US trade would be unaffected.

Finally, in 1928, it established the Kellogg-Briand pact, which saw sixty-two countries sign a vow not to use war as a tool of national policy. Critics dubbed this deal, as well as others signed by the US at the time "paper peace" because it was based solely on voluntary compliance. His modest internationalism was superseded by isolationism in 1930. More than four-fifths of those polled in a Gallup poll in March 1941 opposed US intervention. President Franklin Roosevelt had just obtained legislative approval for the Lend-Lease act, a veiled give-away plan he devised in response to spread home opposition to opening supplies to the Allies. Under the lend-lease agreement, the president may sell war supplies while also allowing the Allies to borrow or lease them.

Roosevelt's vision for post-war international order encapsulated in his "four freedoms" and the United Nations plan. Because they were rights contained in the American bill of rights (freedom of religion, speech and expression) or broad extensions to the interpretation of the American ideal, the four freedoms stripped of benefits to US businesses

At Yalta conference in February 1945, Roosevelt obtained Stalin and Churchill's backing for the UN. Roosevelt was unable to persuade the other European leaders to abandon the concept of "sphere of influence". He believed, however, that they had consented to the development of democratic governments in Eastern Europe under. All three presidents agreed that post-war Germany should not become a military power too rapidly, but they could not agree on how to keep that from happening.

Anti-communism was part of the old district of foreigners that stretched, in some forms, all the way back to the Alien and Sedition of anti-communist hysteria. Important turning points in US foreign relations came when President Nixon opened talks with the leaders of mainland China. While most Western European countries joined the European Union and are less reliant on America for their trade and military needs, newly independent Eastern European countries are pounding on NATO, and there repeated military conflicts within the Russian federation and newly independent neighboring nations. It may seem appropriate for the US and Western Europe to assist these poorer nations with their reconstruction, just as the Marshall Plan done. The alliance for Peace's loose cooperation was the first attempt to do this of the partnership for peace. The North American Free Trade Agreement between Canada, Mexico, and the US ratified by 1995, despite its human rights violations, President Clinton visited Japan and China to promote more open and fair trade.

In the following years, American policy was less concerned with military control, and especially since the Carter presidency, more emphasis put on supporting human rights in other countries. The Vietnam war became traumatic experience for the American people, and it has, therefore, colored later involvement in other countries low intensity warfare and short engagement executed with greater precision through technological weaponry which have replaced the prolonged military engagement of the Vietnam war and form part of America's foreign policy goals today.

## **2. Overview of Vietnam War**

The Vietnam War was a long, costly and divisive conflict that pitted North Vietnam's communist government against South Vietnam and its main ally, the United States. Opposition to the war in the US was bitter, even after president Richard Nixon signed the Paris Peace Accords and ordered the withdrawal of forces in 1973. In 1975, Communist forces took control of South Vietnam, bringing the country to get her as the socialist Republic of Vietnam. Vietnam, as we know, is a country in Southeast Asia on the eastern edge of the Indochinese peninsula that ruled by French since the 19<sup>th</sup> century (source).



**Figure 1:** Vietnam map (source).

However, in 1955 the anti-communist politician Ngo Dinh Diem succeeded Emperor Bao as president of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam (GVN), also known as South Vietnam. The Vietnam War was the second longest war in United States history, after the war in Afghanistan. Truman administration made promises and commitments to the people and government of South Vietnam to keep communist forces from seizing them. Eisenhower sent military advisers and CIA operatives in Vietnam, while American soldiers sent by John F. Kennedy. Richard Nixon ended the Vietnam War after Lyndon Johnson ordered the first serious battle by American forces.

Only two members of the United States congress voted against giving Johnson broad authority to wage the war in Vietnam, and the majority of Americans backed the bill. In 1965, the antiwar movement was small, and knowledge of its operations buried in the back pages of newspapers. Public opinion did not turn against the war until later in the conflict. It was difficult to print point the enemy that involved conventional forces. The Viet congress camouflaged in with the local

population and launched bombing campaigns that hit their targets, but the North Vietnamese refuse to give it .

In January 1973, President Nixon signed a ceasefire that officially ended the war. In same year, communist armies from the north invaded the south and declared the country united. Cambodia and Laos also became communist dictatorship. Readjustment and even acceptance were though for returning Vietnamese veterans at home. The wounds of Vietnam would take a long time to heal for the United States. The bitterness of the past divided the American people and shaped foreign policy in the twenty- first century. (Hill 220)



**Figure 2:** A South Vietnamese Marine, severely wounded in a Viet Cong ambush, comforted by a comrade in a sugar –cane field at Duck Hoe about 12miles from Saigon on August 5, 1963.

### 3. Overview of Afghanistan War

The Afghan war was an internal battle in Afghanistan that began in 1978 between anticommunist Islamic insurgents and the afghan communist government (supported by soviet forces from 1979to 1989) culminating in the collapse of the government in 1992. More broadly, the term refers to military activities in Afghanistan after 1992, as distinct from Afghanistan War, as U.S led invasion conducted in response to the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks on the United States. Many commentators believe that the internal Afghan War will go well into the 21<sup>st</sup> century overlapping with the U.S led Afghanistan War .

The Afghan war became a quagmire for the Soviet Union by the late 1980s. In 1988, Pakistan, the United States, Afghanistan and the Soviet Union struck a deal, under which the latter would remove its troops and Afghanistan would become nonaligned (completed in 1987). In April 1992, a coalition of rebel groups and suddenly rebellious government forces assaulted Kabul's city and deposed communist ruler, Najibullah, who had succeeded in 1986.

An Islamic Republic declared by a transitional government backed by several rebel factions, but it was short-lived. President Burhannudin Rabbani of the Islamic society, a key mujahedeen organization, refused to step down in compliance with the power-sharing arrangement reached by the new government.

Because Afghanistan has never undertaken a throughout census, it is difficult to estimate the number of casualties that killed in the nation since the conflict began. According to the best estimates, 1.5 million Afghans killed before 1992, while the exact number of people died during the fighting and because of the conflict remains unknown. After 1992, the casualty rate is considerably less precise. Hundreds of thousands of detainees and tribal, ethnic, or other religious rivals executed civilians and a considerable number of soldiers, murdered during the US offensive. Moreover, tens of thousands perished of famine or a variety of ailments, many of which could have easily been treated in less stressful times. (Updated by Adam Augustin)

The vast majority of Americans gave almost nothing during the wars in Afghanistan, and few families were directly touched because the wars were conducted with an all-volunteer military. Only a small percentage of upper-middle class or rich families have close relatives fighting in combat zones. The wars estimated to have cost more than 4 trillion dollars, for each American household. However, because large tax cuts enacted and implemented under George Bush's presidency. The expenses passed on to future generations. During World War II, Americans effectively paid nothing for the conflicts conducted in their name, and their taxes actually decreased despite rising war costs.

Despite the fact that the wars directly influenced only a small number of American families in terms of (blood and treasure), the war in Afghanistan became a significant issue in the political life of the country and how it was viewed across the world. Americans separated from most of the big direct

costs, but they forced to act by the conflicts. Though the afghan wars did not generate the kind of antiwar protests that baby boomers remember from the Vietnam War era.

This war did not enlist the support of millions of people in the United States and around the world. The nearly decade-long war in Afghanistan, in particular, shifted the Democratic Party trajectory by mobilizing new citizen activists at the grassroots and on the internet, while also undermining the national Republican Party credibility among voters on national security issues, all of which contributed to Barak Obamas election. People in the United States and around the world reacted to the American wars in Afghanistan and Vietnam in diverse ways.

Expressed skepticism and even outright opposition to the United States choice to fight the Taliban in Afghanistan, particularly Islamic populations. They did so with a low level of intensity. While some people protested the American effort in Afghanistan, such demonstrations lacked widespread support and rarely sustained.

People all throughout the world saw the link between the American war in Afghanistan and terrorist attacks. People deeply affected by the assaults, even in countries where strongly skeptical opposed the American administration. People in Russia, for example, whose anti-Americanism remained a potent force a decanter the Soviet Union fell apart, reacted viscerally to the Twin Towers collapse, which Russians watched live on CNN. Similar scene of passionate anchoring and solidarity repeated around Europe, both countries with long-standing links to the US, such as the United Kingdom, and in post-cold war ones, such as Poland

In general, the afghan war was more popular in the United States than it was elsewhere in the globe. According to a Gallup Poll taken just hours after the first bombs fell in Taliban strong olds in October 2001, Americans overwhelmingly approved of the Bush administration's decision to attack the Taliban, some 90% of Americans said they approved of the action, while only 5% said they disapproved. While acceptance ratings gradually declined as the war stretched on for more than a decade, a large majority of people, at least according to public opinion polls, convinced that the war was the correct thing to do, at least until the conflicts final days in 2003.

Many individuals are distrustful of America's assertive role in the Middle East, particularly in nations with strong Islamic populations. They believe pro-Israel attitudes and a desire for Arab oil are driving the rush to war. Almost everyone ignored President Bushs claims that America had no

choice but to invade Afghanistan to combat terrorism and weapons of mass destruction while also bringing democracy and human rights to the country.

Many of the actions and organizers who were initially active in the tremendous street protests and public demonstrations against the war shifted to new types of political organization as the war in Afghanistan progressed. Key antiwar activists used both conventional grassroots and newly developed communication and information dissemination medium to mobilize a new progressive political base within the Democratic Party, leveraging new communication and information dissemination media.

Focused on the unified opposition to the Bush administrations war in Afghanistan, while not exclusively so, would play a critical role in securing dark horse candidate Barak Obamas Democratic Party presidential candidacy and helping him win the 2008 presidential election. To the chagrin of many of his progressive supporters, Obama did not promptly end the war in Afghanistan or other important Bush administration programs in the global war on terror, which he had to abolish.

The venerable Robert Byrd, a relatively moderate democratic senator from West Virginia, was perhaps the most vociferous opponent of the war. Invoking his decades of public service, he claimed that the war motivated by political fears of appearing ahead of the 2002 congressional election.

Marilyn Katz, a pioneer in the 1960s new left flagship organization students for a democratic and later a campaign organizer and communication specialist for candidates from Puerto Rican and Africa. The war in Afghanistan, which took place in an area of media saturation, was the first fought entirely on the internet. Journalists could quickly update their reports, and the blogosphere gave columnists a new platform to discuss wars and international affairs .

In an address to a joint session of Congress, President George Bush proclaimed his determination to wage a war on terror. Congress never issued a formal declaration of war, but it did have the authority to deploy military force in Afghanistan on september 14, 2001. Air strikes on Taliban and AL Qaeda targets were the initial attacks. American, British, and other ally forces collaborated with the Northern Alliance, which attacked on the ground while coalition forces struck from the air. They assaulted Northern Afghanistan and fought their way south

## Conclusion

According to what we dealt in this chapter, we notices that the conflict of America in both Vietnam and Afghanistan was military war under the two presidents of the two natiions.



## **CHAPTER TWO: American Withdrawal from Vietnam**

## Introduction:

We will explore and illuminate a crucial subject in this chapter: the American departure from Vietnam. In addition, of course, with an examination of the causes for this event, we will complete our discussion with the outcomes and central notion that America gained because of this retreat.

To begin, the Vietnam War was a nearly two-decade-long conflict. The military and leadership of the United States appear to have learnt some lessons from the Vietnam War. Neither the Americans nor the Vietnamese were eager to negotiate or compromise. Millions of people died as a result of the refusal to negotiate, and the Vietnam war could have prevented much sooner if the negotiations taken place.

The presidential leadership styles, as well as the cabinet members, differ from one president to the next.

From Eisenhower to Nixon, each president had their own approach to handling negotiations and winning the war in North Vietnam. Military training supplied to South Vietnam by presidents Eisenhower and Kennedy.

President Johnson sent military personnel to South Vietnam, and Nixon negotiated the troop departure from Vietnam by promising him "peace with honor" (Devry University, 2011).

One of most important lessons that our presidents leadership has taught US is the importance of admitting mistakes. Although no one wants to confess that they wrong, the public is more forgiving when the truth told. United States losing the Vietnam War, but no president ever wanted to concede defeat or go all- in.

The rules of engagement were so tight in Vietnam that winning the war was nearly impossible. Culture and social milieu the Vietnam War influenced how Americans felt.

Americans were conflict over their involvement in Vietnam. One of the lessons learnt was that resourcefulness and persistence may defeated technology. With guns and explosives, the American leader believed that battle could won.

The Vietnamese were not all in for the fight, but the Americans were, they were entirely committed to their cause, while the American people were unsure, and various protests conducted

across the country as a result. However, as the conflict progressed and American troops deployed to Vietnam, the restriction imposed on them made it extremely difficult for men to combat. Furthermore, many soldiers only enlisted for a year, leaving groups with inexperienced personnel. This resulted in a lack of cohesion. President Johnson never wanted to concede defeat, but it cost him the chance to run for re-election. Studying history is quite beneficial when we investigate.

## **2.1. General Overview of American Withdrawal from Vietnam**

The Vietnam War, as we all know, was a long struggle in Southeast Asia. It started in 1954, when Vietnam divided into two sections, North Vietnam and South Vietnam. North Vietnam desired to reunite the country under communist rule, including its political and economic systems. South Vietnam tried hard to prevent this. Although the United States aided South Vietnam, North Vietnam ultimately won the war in 1975. Vietnam became a united communist country.

The Vietnam War cost many people their lives. Over 1.3 million Vietnamese soldiers and approximately 58,000 American forces killed. Over 2million, civilians (those who were not fighting the war) died as well. The country was a member of the British Empire in the early 1900s. In, japan annexed the colony and controlled it until 1945.the Viet Minh, a Vietnamese fiction, announced Vietnam's independence. The French, on the other hand, aspired to dominate Vietnam as a colony. The Indochina war lasted eight years, and the Vietnamese Minh eventually conquered the French in1954.

After that, France and the Viet Minh met to decide what would happen to Vietnam. Participants came from the United States, the Soviet Union, and number of other countries. The summit separated Vietnam into two parts: north and South. North Vietnam taken over by the Viet Minh. The president was Ho Chi Minh. South Vietnam taken over by the Vietnamese who backed the French. Ngo Dinh Diem, a communist opponent, led the south. South Vietnamese rebels began battling Diem's administration in 1957.

They know as the Viet Cong, and they concealed during the day and attacked at night. The Viet Cong trained and backed by the North Vietnamese army. Communist fighters from the Soviet Union joined the fight, because American authorities despised communism and backed Diem.

The South Vietnamese trained by US military advisers. Nevertheless, in the early 1960s, the Viet Cong seized control of much of South Vietnam. Meanwhile, Diem's popularity in South Vietnam was dwindling. Diem's harsh treatment of Buddhists was one of the reasons, although most Vietnamese were Buddhists. People began to turn against him in increasing numbers in the south in 1963.

The United States continued to assist South Vietnam. The North Vietnamese launched an attack on US destroyers in the Gulf of Tonkin in August 1964. After that, President Lyndon B. Johnson gave the authority to expand the US engagement in the war by the US Congress.

The United States had more than 500,000 troops in Vietnam by 1968. South Korea, Australia, New Zealand, Thailand, and the Philippines sent small troops to assist the South Vietnam.

In North Vietnam, the United States bombed and dropped bombs on roadways and bridges. The Ho Chi Minh Trail, a Viet supply route in Laos and Cambodia, was also bombed by the US. Soon after, American bombers struck Hanoi and other North Vietnamese cities. During Tet, a Vietnamese holiday, communists attacked around 30 cities in South Vietnam in February 1968. The Viet Cong suffered devastating losses in these clashes. However, many American men died.

In addition, some began to believe that the war could not be won, because others objected to the war.

Lyndon Johnson progressively ceased the bombing of North Vietnam in 1968. Peace talks began, and Richard Nixon was elected president in 1969. Nixon began to withdraw US soldiers from Vietnam, but he also resumed bombing of North Vietnam and widened the war to include Cambodia and Laos.

In Cambodia and Laos, US and South Vietnamese troops attacked North Vietnamese and Viet Cong hideouts. In January 1973, North and South Vietnam, the Viet Cong, and the United States signed an agreement to stop fighting. The United States withdrew almost all its troops from Vietnam, but the war continued. The United States continued to provide South Vietnam with funds and weaponry.

The United States reduced its military assistance to the south. After that, the South Vietnamese army quickly disintegrated, and the north began an invasion of South Vietnam on 1975.

On April 30, 1975, North Vietnamese troops entered Saigon, the capital of South Vietnam. The communists triumphed in the war and merged north and south into one country in 1976. Hanoi became the capital while, Saigon was renamed Ho Chi Minh City in honor of Ho, who died in 1969. Richard Nixon, the incumbent US president, recommended the "vietnamization" of the war, with south Vietnamese troops taking command of the fighting while receiving American aid and if necessary air and naval support.

The Vietnamization of the war policy put to the first major test during the Easter Offensive of 1972. Despite the fact that the South Vietnamese forces eventually won, they bailed out by a timely intervention from the superior US air force, demonstrating that South Vietnamese could not prosecute a full-scale war against the northern forces out significant aid from the west.

In neighboring Cambodia and Laos, US soldiers were also instrumental in dismantling Viet Cong bases. Despite the fact that both countries were nominally neutral and gave no active help to North Vietnam, the northern forces allowed to build up camps in their soil.

The final American combat soldiers leave South Vietnam on March 29, 1973, two months after the signing of the Vietnam peace agreement, as Hanoi releases the remaining American prisoners of war held in North Vietnam.

The United States eight-year direct involvement in the Vietnam War ended. Approximately 7,000 U.S civilian personnel from the US department of defense stayed in Saigon to assist South Vietnam in conducting what appeared to be a violent ongoing battle with communist North Vietnam.

After two decades of indirect military assistance from the US, president John Kennedy dispatched the first significant force of U.S troops to Vietnam to support the ineffective authoritarian role of South Vietnam against the communist north. President Lyndon Johnson launched limited bombing assaults on North Vietnam three years later, as the South Vietnamese government crumbled and Congress authorized the use of US soldiers.

The North Vietnamese advance in 1965 forced President Johnson to choose between increasing US participation and withdrawing, Johnson commanded.

The former quickly followed by the later when the US air forces launched the greatest bombing campaign in history. The wars length, the huge number of US deaths, and the exposure of the Japanese during the following few years would all play a role in the next few years.

The prolonged length of the war, the large number of US losses, and the discovery of US involvement in war crimes such as the slaughter at My Lai helped turn many Americans against the Vietnam. The communist Tet Offensive of 1968, dashed American hopes of a quick end to the war and mobilized American resistance. In reaction, Johnson announced in March 1968 that he would not run for reelection, citing what he saw as his role in fomenting a dangerous national divide over Vietnam.

In January 1973, delegates from the US, north and South Vietnam, and the Vietnamese Cong signed a peace accord in Paris, thus ending U.S military involvement in the Vietnam War. a cease-fire throughout Vietnam, the departure of U.S forces, the release of prisoners of war, and the reunification of north and South Vietnam among the essential stipulations. The South Vietnamese administration was to stay in power until new elections held and North Vietnamese soldiers were not to advance or reinforced in any way.

As Saigon fell to communist forces on April 30, 1975, the last few Americans remaining in South Vietnam airlifted out of the country. North Vietnamese colonel Bui Tin, accepting the surrender of South Vietnam later that day remarked, "You have nothing to fear, because there are no victorious or defeated Vietnamese. Only the Americans are capable of defeated". The Vietnam conflict was the United States longest and most unpopular overseas war, costing 58,000 American lives. Two million Vietnamese soldiers and civilians slain.

## **2. 2.Motives of American withdrawal from Vietnam**

For many years, American been financially and energetically involved in Vietnam. After the Second World War, the French returned to Indochina, but despite financial support from United States, Viet Minh defeated them. In Geneva 1954, it agreed that Vietnam would divided in two parts: North Vietnam led by the communist Chi Minh, and South Vietnam led by Ngo Dinh Diem.

President Eisenhower stated unequivocally that America would support Diem in his fight against communism, and in 1960, president John Kennedy agreed to send military soldiers and equipment to South Vietnam in an effort to halt the expansion of communism. By 1968, 536,000 American forces were fighting in the harsh conditions of Vietnam.

The fundamental reason for the United States disengagement from Vietnam in 1973 was media and public pressure. The massive antiwar demonstrations put enormous pressure on the US government to retreat. People also felt compelled to protest due to higher taxes, drafting policies, and the fact the war seemed to have little bearing on the American people. The protests were violent, which heightened the tension. The authority's violent suppression of the protesters further added to the rage. Because the American economy was struggling and the army was stuck in a deadlock in Vietnam, Nixon also intended to complete his campaign promises.

The western media's coverage of Vietnam was unfiltered allowing them to report and comment on whatever they pleased; the media was the public's only source of information about what was going on in Vietnam. Although the media distorted information from Vietnam, they cannot hold entirely Alleviate poverty.

Increases in taxation were obviously popular, but cuts to the poverty reduction program sparked outrage, particularly among ethnic minorities. At the time, black people in the United States were the racial group experiencing the most poverty. This however, was not the only reason why black people opposed to the war. People at college were not eligible for conscription, which meant that the working class, including many black people, forced to fight. The inequity of the situation compounded by the fact that many people believed it would be more appropriate to struggle for their own rights in their own nation. It is hardly surprising that black people staged numerous violent riots in the late 1960s.

The draft continued to inflict grief on those who had already lost friends and family members to the war because they were compelled to fight. Many soldiers sent home emotionally unwell or physically crippled, which added to the tension. Others returned home with experiences life-changing experiences. "I sent them a good body, and they made him murdered", the mother of the soldier accused of involvement in the Mai Lai massacre said.

The conflict appeared to be out of control, full of horrible atrocities, costing the United States an enormous sum of money, and many people lost their lives. All of this happened in the midst of what appeared to be a never-ending battle. The Americans went into Vietnam because they were scared of Asia becoming a communist threat, not because of a direct threat to their own country.

The American administration was a firm believer in the domino theory, which stated that if one country went communist, its neighboring would follow suit. It was for this reason that America invaded Korea in 1950, killing 142,000 American soldiers. Some Americans were understandably skeptical about going to Vietnam, and as the conflict progressed, more and more people joined in the opposition.

In 1946, 25,000 people participated in the first anti-war march. As the battle progressed, thought, the number of demonstrators climbed to 500,000. Men publicly burning their draft cards was one of the most popular forms of protest. There were many who willing to lay down their lives in protest. In 1965, three American citizens followed in the footsteps of Thick Quang Duck, a Buddhist monk who immolated himself in protest of Diem's oppressive dictatorship in South Vietnam. The ferocity with which they protested reflects their displeasure with the United States engagement in Vietnam.

When US soldiers invaded neutral Cambodia in 1970 to destroy the Vietcong facilities, the public assumed that the situation would quickly grow into a situation similar to Vietnam. Student protests erupted across the United States, with four students dead when the National Guard opened fire on the demonstrators at Kent State University in Ohio. This sparked such fury that it promoted even more protests and strikes. It is certain that the administrations and strong American opposition put pressure on the government to stop its engagement.

were other factors at play, the Vietnam War cost billions and billions of dollars. Furthermore, before to the conflict, the government provided financial assistance to South Vietnam.

American army trapped in war of attrition with no immediate prospect of success in the deep forests of Vietnam; the Vietcong used guerrilla tactics that were exceedingly effective. They had no faith in the conflict, whereas their adversary fighting for their independence with zeal for years.

President Richard Nixon, who served from 1968 to 1974 and was elected one of the promise of withdrawing from Vietnam, was the final factor in the departure. If he wanted to be re-elected,



he need to keep this promise. The first troops taken home in 1969 and his process continued until the remaining troops brought home. ([International history, 1945-1991 p 69](#)).

President John F. Kennedy of the United States committed financial and military aid to the faltering South Vietnam government in the early 1960s. As political turmoil and support for a war in North Vietnam mounted, President Johnson decided that in order to maintain the United States containment, he would have to send a large number of young soldiers to Vietnam to assist in combating the Vietcong's growing power.

For nearly 10 years, the United States promised thousands of young troops and billions in financial help until public opinion and guerilla tactics pushed the US to leave Vietnam, claiming that they had not been defeated but had departed on their own accord. In actuality, less economically developed country had triumphed.

This was due to number of short and long-term factors, including political turmoil in the US, military tactics, and lack of trained cohesiveness among US forces. As we know, the Japanese government lost control of Vietnamese colony in 1941, and a communist and nationalist liberation movement led by Ho Chi Minh arose, yearning for Vietnam to gain independence. As battle erupted between Ho Chi Minh forces in the north and loyalists in the south, China began to back him up, and North Vietnamese considered a Chinese ally and a threat to the US. Fear of communism and the need to prevent it from spreading dominated US foreign policy at the time. McCarthyism with hunts and warmongering ensured that the American people feared the communists spread and believed that the Vietnam war was a tool they could use to stop the "Domino Effect", which predicted that communist states would eventually control all of Asia, similar to what happened in eastern Europe under Joseph Stalin. This theory serves as an explanation for American foreign policy.

As the combat became more intense, the US poured \$500 million dollars into the French war effort, hoping that they would establish a democratic government in the south. Following the 17<sup>th</sup> parallel and the precedent of Korea, the Geneva Peace Agreements divided the country in two. This war only designed to be temporary, and the countries merger put to a referendum in 1956. The United States foreign policy characterized by both ignorance and resolve. In actuality, the 1956 election canceled due to US influence, which feared that the public would vote for Ho Chi

Minh. According to Eisenhower, 80 percent of the population would have voted for communists, if the deal establishing a new democratic administration in the south.

Several long-term issues hampered US efforts to defeat the Vietcong during the Vietnam conflict. Vietnam's victory was unexpected and unusual; the US entered the Vietnam combat expecting it to last only a few months. They were, drawn into a war from which they could not escape. The US marines and infantry had never trained in guerilla warfare, just conventional warfare, but the Vietcong were primarily a guerilla movement, and the US troops struggled to oppose something they had never prepared to fight, especially in sticky, damp, hot and alien surroundings.

According to this, the evacuation of American forces influenced by several variables, the first is military.

Their tactics were ineffective and cruel, and they were employing advanced technology weapons of mass destruction. One of their approaches was to hammer the economy. Between 1969 and 1970, United States dropped 100,000 tons of bombs every month on South Vietnam, and the Americans utilized mother bombs, napalm, white phosphorus and Agent Orange, which were all quite damaging.

The Agent Orange, which used to kill crops and cut off the food supply for both the V.C and the population, alienated civilians and caused just as much destruction to innocent Vietnamese people as the VC. The VC and civilians dressed alike, and the Americans had no way of knowing whom was "friend or foe", resulting in civilians deaths.

This gave the Americans the mistaking impression that they were successful in murdering V.C. Brutal massacre and constant bombardment did not help them win the hearts and minds of the Vietnamese people they were fighting for, and civilians frequently became communists themselves. "If they werent pro V.C when we got there, they sure as heck were by the time we left", a war veteran remarked. This source should be trusted because it comes from an American soldier who admits to mistreating villagers. If the source skewed, the soldier might try to justify their action. Treating civilians well is what helped the communists to gain their success.

To summarize, the fundamental reason for American forces treat was their ineffective tactics in comparison to those of communists. It was the first television war, and this certainly had an impact

on their success, reducing moral, confidence, and moral of the American people as well as that of the American military. American are unprepared for war, and they want to go about the wrong way, using brutality instead of trying to win people's hearts and minds. The communists had a significant impact on the wars result. Their drive, strategy, and inventiveness all contributed significantly to America's defeat. ([American withdrawal from Vietnam, Lauren Anderson p.289](#))

### **2. 3. Results of American withdrawal from Vietnam**

The Soviet Union rearmed North Vietnam, while the United States dropped out of the cold war. North Vietnam, as well as communists in South Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia, broke the ceasefire. The next two decades, the communists killed over five million Southeast Asians, imprisoned and displaced millions more, and solidified their position in what had French Indochina. The Vietnamese saw the RVN as a puppet government of a foreign force, and the war as more of a patriotic effort to free Vietnam from foreign dominance than an explicit embrace of communism.

In fact, despite communist pretense, the United States has fully adopted a capitalist consumer culture so won the economic philosophy battle. The government that dissolved South Vietnam still rules. Although the US denies it, there is still Agent Orange pollution. The economy of Saigon (now renamed Ho Chi Minh city) has developed fast in recent years ,but it nowhere near where it would had the city continued to flourish with American aid and Vietnam itself. Rather than what occurred four decades ago, when the United States

Implemented military reforms based on its Vietnam War experience, culminating in its successful exhibition for strength in Vietnam.

The US withdrawal pullout from Vietnam had the following direct consequences:

The fall of South Vietnam in 1975 marked the end of a protracted conflict.

two decades, long refugee exodus from Vietnam has resulted in huge overseas Vietnamese populations, particularly in the United States.

The rapprochement between United States and china, resulted in the demise of communist insurrection movements throughout Southeast Asia as china withdraw assistance.

The American withdrawal would create a political vacuum in Vietnam, given the country's deep ethnic and religious divisions.

Between 1964 and 1975, the Vietnamese War claimed the lives of an estimated 2 million Vietnamese (both sides, military and civilians) and 50 thousand Americans.

### **Conclusion**

The extent of this chapter demonstrated by listing the key themes included, from Ho Chi Minh's early career and covers rising nationalist leaders from the commencement of the French colonial period. The American problems with Ngo Dinh Diem in the 1950s, particularly from 1954 to 1961 were crucial. The conflict and its impact on villages, the rise of political discourse and anti-war sentiment, the end of the war and later Vietnamese comments on the fight

# **Chapter three: American withdrawal from Afghanistan**

## Introduction

The first authoritative history of Americans longest war by one of the world is leading scholar-practitioners. The American war in Afghanistan, which began in 2001, is now the longest armed conflict in the nation's history. American troops are likely to leave soon, yet there has seemed to be no clear argument for continuing the war for almost two decades. They did not find a clear reason to stay in this war. Unilateral withdrawals in counterinsurgency wars uncommon, especially if the other party involved viewed as nondemocratic.

This qualitative case study has investigated the withdrawal of the United States from Afghanistan and guided by the key concepts of national interests, balance of power and security from realism, and the concepts of democratic peace theory. This essay argues that it was mainly due to the decrease of the American national interest of Afghanistan, as the attention turned towards the changing power structure (the American war in Afghanistan, Carter Malaysian. Oxford University Press2021).

This paper, would investigate a major points that need a deep discussion from different perspectives and points of views. Provide the withdrawal reasons and effects of the United States moving to the final core of idea, which is the similarities, and differences of the two withdrawals of America in both of Vietnam and Afghanistan.

The United States Armed Forces completed their withdrawal from Afghanistan on 30 August 2021, marking the end of the 20-year long war in Afghanistan.un February 2020, Trump administration and the Taliban, without participation by Afghan government signed the Agreement for Bringing Peace to Afghanistan, also known as the Doha Agreement. Which provided for the withdrawal of all foreign forces from Afghanistan in return for a Taliban pledged to prevent al-Qaeda.

The United States decision to withdraw their troops from Afghanistan will have implications for the Afghans, the entire region and the US standing in the world. Because of the emerging competition between the US and china, which could lead to a Cold War-style confrontation with Russia.

The intra-afghan conversation to bring peace to the war-torn country has been progressing at a snails pace as the US withdrawals. The Taliban and the administration of President Ashraf Ghani are both active in Afghanistan. To defeat each other, they used gambling. The United States has requested bases in Pakistan to monitor the situation and Afghanistan might become a major source of friction in bilateral relations, which would necessitate caution.

To keep the country afloat and ensure that extremist groups are defeated, the exit of American and NATO troops should have preceded by long-term interactions with the future dispensation in Afghanistan that cannot reorganize.

As the memories faded, the US presence in Afghanistan began to yield decreasing returns from regional perspectives. Because of increasing American expectations on Pakistan to do more, the American military presence in Pakistan has lost its luster. This was more of a cover-up for their failings in Afghanistan.

The impact of the US soldier withdrawal on the afghan situation and the area is the subject of this research. The paper examines the Taliban facto and the fate of Pakistan's current regime, after 20 years Afghanistan's political evolution of Ashraf Ghani.

President Joe Biden's plan to pull all American forces out of Afghanistan by September 11 will have ramification for all the players in the game, Pakistan. His administration was pleased with the Taliban, according to his statement assurances that terrorists will not have a safe haven.as a result; the United States troops would be voluntary according to certain reports.

By the end of the year, NATO partners and US troops plan to leave Afghanistan through mid-July, far before President Biden's departure. (Steven Holland and Phil Stewart, "Time to end Forever War": Biden to start U.S Afghanistan pullout on May, p 3).

### **3.2. Causes of American withdrawal from Afghanistan**

Mohammad Hameed Atmar, Afghanistan's former foreign minister, summarized the international community's attempts to stabilize Afghanistan over the previous two decades in early august 2021: to be fair, they rebuilt the completely state system that the Taliban destroyed no police, army, public administration or social services. The Taliban governments total health budget was less than any tiny non-profit working in this field in Afghanistan. The minister said that Afghanistan vastly improved since September 10, 2001, when Taliban taken control of 90% of the

country and were on the approach of capturing the Punisher Valley after assassinating Ahmad Masood.

This short report seeks to explore significant assessments of strategic causes and implications. By definition, any estimate given within a week after the collapse is speculative. Even preliminary assessment can recognize that in order to find and draw the appropriate lessons, we must first ask the appropriate questions. To that purpose, the paper investigates both the immediate and long-term causes, concentrating on how a cascade withdrawal occurred and why.

It distinguishes three approaches to defining the conditions that must be met in each following a cascading crisis precipitated by western military withdrawal, the governments and Afghan National Security Forces refusal to fight. Mission expansion that results in unreachable strategic goals and regional players incapacity to efficiently and positively support Afghanistan's stabilization are structural factors for the collapse. When measured in terms of "blood and treasure" costs vs advantages and potential future threats, the Taliban's takeover appears to be a clear-cut strategic failure for the US and NATO. It appears to be a watershed event for pay America, as it represents the collapse of western state building attempts.

There are assumptions embedded in these narratives, which this study clarifies and puts to the test front-line regional powers- Iran, China, Russia, the five central Asian states, India, and Pakistan; will only be able to stabilize Afghanistan if they engage positively and constructively with an Afghan government that has the most internal legitimacy. It is uncertain whether the Taliban is a more moderate version of the original or if regional actors will be more effective in stabilizing Afghanistan, they are motivated to do so because their essential national interests are on the line. With friends and allies, a strategically ruthless US may now refocus its foreign policy to pursue strategic competition with China and Russia in more relevant geographies and contexts. The new US National Security strategy would plainly reflect such a rest.

When considering the Taliban takeover, a significant lesson learned is the limits of an external actor's capacity to transform a country from the outside without the backing of the local populace, rather than premature pronouncement of a weakening of the US worldwide position and general collapse. Kabul hit by a perfect storm of interconnected proximate and structural causes including a high dose of psychological elements and unexpected second and third order effects. (Interview



with Mohammad Hameed Atmar, Afghan Minister of Foreign Affairs, by Natalia portyakova; in Russian, August3, 2021.)

Political factors in the United States also played a role. Obama felt obligated to begin discussing departure because he was concerned about the wars electoral viability. Cholet, he was Assistance Secretary of Defense for International Security Affairs in the Obama administrations security affairs, wrote that the "yet " the president acknowledged, "the risks of the pullout schedule".

Such transparency they argued was required to maintain public support for the sake of the mission.

Obama described the pullout as a necessary approach to force the afghan government to take responsibility for the country's security and execute required reforms. In his remarks, Obama said, when announcing the surge and withdrawal," it would be obvious to the afghan government that they will not abandon their country". Cooperating with the afghan government with a feeling of urgency it must made clear that Afghans will held accountable, their safety and that American has no desire to combat them(Obama, "The new Way Forward").

President Biden announced that all US troops would withdraw from Afghanistan by september11, 2021. With the US troop withdrawal imminent, it is now up to the afghan government and the Taliban to forge a sustainable peace. Frances Z .brown diagnoses what went wrong in Afghanistan and explains what the United States can still to do to promote a peaceful transition (<https://bit.ly/38sljH>).

So on the international community side; I would say that there were a lack of coordination and coherence in the strategy pretty much throughout the entire conflict, while also facing a challenging situation on the ground. There were some decisions that made right after the fall of the Taliban in 2001that have turned out to have really bad effects, so the choice to make

The afghan presidency a powerful office, combined with the initial light footprint of international support, and on the US side. I would say that by the standards of peace processes, which are always halting, there was a lot of good work that happened. However, it often undermined by the mercurial nature of president Trump.

### **3.3. Results of the withdrawal**

It has been the United States longest running war, but now it looks set to end. President Joe Biden plans to withdraw all US troops from Afghanistan. That is exactly 20 years after the invasion ordered by then president George Bush, following the attacks on New York City. The US has 2,500 soldiers in Afghanistan as part of a NATO mission. It spent trillions of dollars on the conflict and lost more than 2,000 service members since 2001. Washington says it will reposition its troops in the region to keep an eye on Afghanistan. However, some US officials have criticized the decision as a grave mistake that could embolden the Taliban and lead to more violence (<http://aljazeera.com>).

- Other North Atlantic treaty organization forces will leave as well, according to our estimates.
- presence of civilians from the United States and other countries drastically reduced.
- Kabuls government begins to lose power and legitimacy from the core to the periphery, power flows.
- Regional militias are increasingly taking up security responsibilities.
- The Taliban lost interest in negotiating a peace deal with the US, the Taliban expands their authority over land and resources.
- Afghanistan becomes embroiled in a broader civil conflict.
- Civilian deaths are on the increasing, as are refugee flows.
- Extremist organizations such as Al-Qaeda and the Islamic states.
- The Islamic state gains more room to organize and, recruit terrorists and plan terrorist strikes against the United States with regional and national goals (JAMES DOBBINS, JASON H.CAMPBELL. consequences of a precipitous US withdrawal from Afghanistan, P12).

It has become common knowledge that there is no military solution to the afghan war, but this is only half-true at best. It is possible that winning is not an options.

The afghan situation complicated because, like Nixon in Vietnam, Obama intensified the war while also announcing departure plans. Because of Obamas ambiguity and inconsistency, because of the agreement the US adopted a usual policy.

Between 2010 and 2012, Obama has deployed more troops than he has in the past, needed for a counter-terrorist operation, but not as many as previously thought as proposed by his top commander for a stronger. After following through on his campaign promise to raise civilian spending, he reversed himself in the first year of his presidency.

In a democracy, maintaining public support for military operations is critical (not because the military can't win without it, but because presidents face political risks and the military faces political risks). The use of withdrawal deadlines appears to be counterproductive, reducing ["withdrawal" p.26](#)).

At the same time, there was little evidence that the withdrawal sparked reform or that the Afghan government had improved its performance, as Obama claimed. The majority of indices were static or even regression, Afghanistan trend that accelerated as the international community became more involved. According to a report published by the World Bank, Afghanistan made little progress in terms of governance measures since 2009. Major advancements in political stability or rule of law and almost imperceptible improvements in government efficiency, controlling corruption or ensuring regulatory quality.

In 2016, 66 percent of Afghans believed their country was on the wrong track, up from 27% in 2010. The Afghan economy began in the 1990s to slow with growth only 0.8 percent in 2015 and 2% in 2016.

The year of 2016, reflected a reduction in foreign presence as well as the Obama administration cut reconstruction expenditures. The component of the US intervention in Afghanistan that has the most successful, the Afghan army was the net result of Obama's strategy (["Afghanistan Index", Brookings, 13](#)).

In the last two decades, life expectancy, literacy, and per capita income of people increased in Afghanistan. The economic in Afghanistan highly depends on foreign aid ([Haqbin, 2018](#)) a higher proportion of the Afghan population agonizes from the scarcity of water, energy, corruption, and feeble governance. The living standard of Afghanistan is the lowest in the world ([Birch 2017](#)).

The aforementioned aspects of US evacuation are one side that will influence the economy yet on the other side, these will create many opportunities. It is believed that Afghanistan's neighbors would also join forces with it; the biggest issue with external economic crises will be a lack of

economic and security help. The United States and NATO previously gave their full support of the safety of their troops; after troops removed, their interests will wane. The Kabul government, lost confidence, will be unable to maintain its legitimacy (Dobbins 2019, Zahid 2018).

Regional militias and local warlords also anticipated to replace US and NATO troops. Pakistan and Afghanistan will play a larger role in his environment; there have various reports about the current scenario and ongoing interference between Pakistan and India.

After the US troops and NATO leave, the neighbors influence will grow as well. Most of the aid that the rest of the world sent to Pakistan to help with the Afghan war has now halted. Pakistan, on the other hand will open its doors to Afghanistan due to the Afghan peoples.

As evidenced by data, the Afghan situation has improved over the previous two decades because of continued international donor support. The presence of NATO forces and a lack of independence caused psychological and mental problems among Afghans. All of the 2017 economic figures, as mentioned in the analysis section, improved. In 2017, all economic indicators were marginally stronger than they were in 2014, because the existing Afghan government was not involved in the negotiations between the Taliban and US, the withdrawal will inevitably cause additional anarchy. This was key strategic standpoint that contributed to militant groups dominance. The US withdrawal also being slowed that the lockdown scenario. Experts predict that it will happen eventually. In the end, it will aid Afghanistan in improving its relations with its neighbors and forging strong bonds in the region, allowing the country to thrive and prosper.

According to the Afghan Ministry of Public Health, two-thirds of Afghans suffer from mental health issues. Afghan society has been highly exposed to the reverberation impacts of the current war due to previous wars and civil turmoil in the nation. Increases in disease rates due to a shortage of safe drinking water, starvation, and limited access to health care are among the war's repercussions. The ongoing war exacerbates nearly every factor linked to premature death, including poverty, malnutrition, and inadequate sanitation, a lack of access to health care and environmental degradation.

Since 2001, around 241,000 individuals have died in the Afghanistan and Pakistan combat zones. Civilians account for more than 71,000 of those killed.

### 3.4. Similarities and Differences of the two withdrawals

Thousands of desperate Vietnamese citizens mounted the walls of the American embassy in Saigon in April 1975, trying to board any helicopter that would whisk them away to safety.

In August 2021, similarly frantic afghans climbed the walls of Kabul's Hamid Karzai International Airport and strewn across the runways, seeking to find a way out.

Many observers, including James Willbanks, a military adviser to the South Vietnamese in 1972 who wrote a key US Army textbook on the Vietnam War, saw parallels between the final hours of two wars that dragged on for years at a huge cost and great loss of life.

Willbanks told *Politico*, "The evacuation of Saigon and Kabul seems pretty much the same to me."

For some who fled Vietnam in 1975, such as Thuan Le Elson, it brought back painful memories. She penned the following piece for *USA Today*, where she works as a journalist: "former Vietnam war refugees have been starting in terror at Kabul". Alternatively, unable to watch at all because they do not want to relive the collapse of Saigon nearly five decades ago: US military advisers, and combat soldiers leaving after a couple of decades. A crooked administration that failed its citizens, US embassy personnel being evacuated by helicopter. Long lineups of desperate people waiting for exit visas at several embassies, while a cowardly president attempting to flee the country ([White House, Remarks by President Biden on Afghanistan, August 16, 2021](#)).

Even if their outcomes were identical, the two wars arose from different geopolitical settings. The Vietnam War was a turning point in the Cold War, the post-World War II worldwide fight between capitalism and communism, led by the Soviet Union.

Since 1954, when rebels with the Vietnamese communist party expelled the French, who ruled the country for a century, Vietnam divided into north and south. The United States canceled plans for a nationwide election to reunify the country and established a government in the south instead. The United States' recent involvement in Afghanistan, on the other hand, promoted by the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001 against the United States.

Following the assaults, the US teamed up with Afghan partners to depose the al-Qaeda-aligned governing Taliban and finally establish a more inclusive administration ([Army University Press, Vietnam: The Course of a Conflict, 2018](#)).

To be very basic the differences as following:

- The Taliban were anti-communists who backed by the CIA to fight the soviet-backed communist regime in Afghanistan in the 1970s and 1980s.
- The Taliban were religious fanatics and Islamists, the enemy in Vietnam were Vietnamese nationalists and communists who were largely non-religious.
- Vietnam never attacked the US or instigated war with US. The Taliban harbored and aligned itself with Osama bin Laden and al-Qaeda.
- Most of Vietnamese population is ethnically and have a collective sense of a unified national identity. Afghanistan has always a complex network of clans and tribes that are constantly forging and breaking alliances with one another.

Moving to the similarities:

- The US backed various corrupt puppet regimes in Saigon that never had any power or sway over the people in South Vietnam. In Afghanistan, we created and installed a corrupt puppet regime in Kabul that had never control over the rest of the country.
- In both cases, these governments fell as soon as we pulled out.
- In both cases, the well-trained security forces and military were full of undercover operatives working against US. The remainder largely dropped their guns and fled when we left them to do the fighting on their own (Evan Godowsky, in Boston).

As we end our conflict in Afghanistan, many similarities and parallel can be dawn between the two. The intent is not to judge either conflict, just point out the similarities and results.

## **Conclusion**

Many Americans believe that Vietnam was a national policy blunder that cost the lives of around 58,000 Americans and billions of dollars as it divided the country at a time when unity was critical, leaving pockmarks that have yet to stitch up. Others believe that the Vietnam War fought on moral grounds, similar to the UN's commitment to keep South Korea free. A cursory examination of the conflict reveals that it began quietly enough, with American advisors sent to assist the South Vietnamese in training their nascent army. The

stated goal was to allow the South Vietnamese army to reject North Vietnamese belligerence in order to protect their sovereignty as a democratic republic.

### **Biography / Preliminary Reading**

## CHAPTER THREE: American withdrawal from Afghanistan

- ✓ (US Afghan Relations: historical Perspectives of events) 2010.
- ✓ Afghanistan Index, booking. p13
- ✓ American withdrawal from Vietnam. Lauren Anderson p289
- ✓ Army university press,vietnam:the course of a conflict,2018
- ✓ Daddi withdrawal, 47.
- ✓ DeVry University,2011
- ✓ Dobbins,2019,Zahid 2018
- ✓ Evan Godowsky, in Boston
- ✓ Fukuyama, Francis. The New York Times. Ferry 19,2006
- ✓ Henry Kissinger, Ending the Vietnam War: A history of America's involvement and Extrication from the Vietnam War (New York Simon and Schuster).
- ✓ History34, 3(2010).
- ✓ [Http://aljazeera.com](http://aljazeera.com)
- ✓ <http://bit.ly/38sljH>
- ✓ International History,1945-1991p 69
- ✓ Interview with Mohammad Hameed Atmar, Afghan Minister of Foreign Affairs, by Natalia portyakova, in Russia, August 3,2021
- ✓ James Dobbins,JasonH,CAMPBELL consequences of a precipitous US withdrawal from afghanistan,p12
- ✓ John Meacham, this week issue of TIME.
- ✓ Keefer and Yee," Foreign Relations of the United States, 1969-1976, Volumedocuments87, 114 and 199:
- ✓ LA mouth Dan 6 January-the new geographic shows the state of the US war in Afghanistan
- ✓ Max Box, 2014 politiqua books.
- ✓ Melvin Small, at the water's edge; American politics.
- ✓ Memorandum from Kissinger to Nixon, Jun 23.
- ✓ Michael Chapel Hill, University of North Carolina Press,2010,p 220



- ✓ Mohammed Hassan Kakar, My Selected Essays (Kabul: Afghanistan Cultural Community, 2010).
- ✓ Nixon, Address to the Situation in Southeast Asia.
- ✓ Norman Angel, the great illusion-New York; Cosimo
- ✓ Robert Jervis, The politics of troops Withdrawal, the commitment Trap, and Buying Time. Diplomatique
- ✓ Steven Holland and Phil Stewart, "Time to end Forever war" :Biden to start US Afghanistan pullout on May,p3
- ✓ The American War in Afghanistan, Carter Malkasian,Oxford University Press 2010
- ✓ Thomas Barfield, Afghanistan: A Cultural and Political History (Princeton, NJ university press, 2010).
- ✓ Understanding the wars in Afghanistan and Vietnam ,p 195-96 edited by Beth Bailey and Richard H.Immerman
- ✓ West, Tom. «Leo Strauss and American Foreign policy. «Claremont Review of Books, Summer2004.[http://www. Claremont .orge/](http://www.Claremont.org/)
- ✓ White house, remarks by president Biden on Afghanistan, August 16,2021

✓

### ملخص الأطروحة

هدفت هذه الدراسة إلى محاولة تسليط الضوء على أسباب انسحاب أمريكا من كلا أفغانستان و الفيتنام، مع التطرق إلى المقارنة بينهما في العديد من الجوانب وهذا ما نلاحظه في كل فصل تناولناه من خلال هذه الأطروحة تطرقنا في الفصل الاول خلفية هذا النزاع في كلا المنطقتين أما في الفصل الثاني فعالج موضوع انسحاب أمريكا من الفيتنام مراعيًا الأسباب والنتائج المترتبة عليها وهذا ما نلاحظه أيضا في الفصل الثالث بخصوص أفغانستان في الكشف على أوجه التشابه والاختلاف بينهما

