The Withdrawal of U.S. Forces from Vietnam under the Nixon Administration (1969–1973)

Tran Thi Ngoc Han [1], Ho Thanh Tam [2]

1 PhD Candidate, University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam
Vietnam National University, Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam
Lecturer, Ho Chi Minh City University of Education, Vietnam
Corresponding Author: Tran Thi Ngoc Han.
2 Lecturer, Ho Chi Minh City University of Education, Vietnam

DOI: https://doi.org/10.56293/IJMSSSR.2026.6111

IJMSSSR 2026
VOLUME 8
ISSUE 2 MARCH - APRIL **ISSN: 2582 – 0265**

Abstract: Drawing on historical and documentary analysis, this study examines the process of U.S. troop withdrawal from Vietnam between 1969 and 1973 within the strategic context of Vietnamization, the domestic political situation in the United States, and the course of the Paris negotiations. The findings demonstrate that U.S. withdrawal was not merely a purely military measure but a policy continuously adjusted in order to simultaneously reduce the burden of direct military involvement, maintain international credibility, and serve domestic political objectives. The withdrawal process unfolded in two principal phases: (1) July 1969–April 1971, during which troop reductions were implemented cautiously and conditionally, closely linked to testing the capabilities of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam within the framework of Vietnamization; and (2) May 1971–March 1973, when the pace of withdrawal accelerated in order to adapt to mounting pressure from U.S. public opinion and Congress. By 1972, withdrawal had become the overriding priority, pursued despite the limitations of Vietnamization and directly tied to the objective of terminating U.S. military involvement. This article also clarifies how practical constraints shaped and redefined U.S. foreign policy, highlighting the structural limitations of Vietnamization in the context of an irreversible withdrawal process.

Keywords: Vietnam War; Vietnamization; Nixon administration; U.S. troop withdrawal; Nixon Doctrine

INTRODUCTION

After more than two years of directly deploying U.S. combat forces to South Vietnam in an effort to prevent the collapse of the Republic of Vietnam (RVN) amid intensified offensives by the National Liberation Front (NLF) and continuing political instability following the November 1963 coup, the American military presence no longer commanded broad support from the U.S. public or Congress. Its strategic effectiveness remained uncertain, while casualties continued to rise. The 1968 offensives—most notably the Tet Offensive—compelled the Johnson administration in its final months, and subsequently the incoming Nixon administration, to confront a central challenge: how to withdraw U.S. forces from Vietnam.

This withdrawal, however, had to be carried out in a manner that would not be interpreted by adversaries as evidence of American weakness or decline, nor perceived by Asian allies as a retreat from strategic commitments. In 1969, within the framework of what became known as the Nixon Doctrine, the new administration introduced a revised Vietnam policy aimed at achieving "peace with honor." This policy was premised on the phased withdrawal of U.S. forces while seeking to ensure the continued viability of the RVN government.

Focusing on the process of U.S. troop withdrawal during President Nixon's first term (1969–1973), this study examines the factors shaping the withdrawal decision, the substance of the withdrawal strategy, its implementation, and its implications for the broader Vietnam policy of the administration. It addresses two central questions: (1) whether the formulation and execution of withdrawal represented strategic initiative or a reactive response to mounting constraints; and (2) how this process was connected to Vietnamization in particular and to U.S. Vietnam policy under Nixon more generally. On this basis, this article contributes to a deeper understanding

of U.S. Vietnam policy during the period of détente in the Cold War, as well as the scope of presidential authority and the structural determinants of foreign policy decision-making within the American political system.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Scholarship on U.S. troop withdrawal from Vietnam under President Richard Nixon (1969–1973) has developed along three principal lines of inquiry.

First, a substantial body of research situates withdrawal within the broader recalibration of U.S. grand strategy in the late 1960s. Within this perspective, the Nixon Doctrine is interpreted as the strategic foundation for reducing direct military involvement and transferring security responsibilities to regional allies. Vietnam is frequently treated as an illustrative case within this wider strategic shift; however, the specific process of withdrawal from Vietnam is rarely examined as a phased and evolving adjustment in its own right. This approach is reflected in works such as Jeffrey Kimball, *Nixon's Vietnam War* (1998); John Lewis Gaddis, *Strategies of Containment: A Critical Appraisal of American National Security Policy during the Cold War* (2005); and Robert Dallek, *Nixon and Kissinger: Partners in Power* (2007).

Second, another strand of scholarship emphasizes the military dimension, viewing Vietnamization as the central instrument of the withdrawal strategy introduced in 1969. These studies elucidate efforts to reduce U.S. troop levels and transfer combat responsibilities to the Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN). They tend, however, to assess Vietnamization primarily in terms of operational effectiveness and battlefield performance, while giving comparatively less attention to the extent to which the withdrawal process became increasingly shaped by domestic political pressures in the U.S. and gradually departed from its initial strategic assumptions. Representative works include Lewis Sorley, *A Better War: The Unexamined Victories and Final Tragedy of America's Last Years in Vietnam* (1999); and James H. Willbanks, *Abandoning Vietnam: How America Left and South Vietnam Lost Its War* (2008).

Third, some studies analyze the Paris Peace Agreement either as the culmination of Vietnamization or as a diplomatic achievement examined largely apart from developments in troop withdrawal. As a result, the interactive relationship among withdrawal, negotiation, and strategic recalibration is not always fully clarified. This perspective can be seen in Larry Berman, *No Peace, No Honor: Nixon, Kissinger, and Betrayal in Vietnam* (2001); and Lien-Hang T. Nguyen, *Hanoi's War: An International History of the War for Peace in Vietnam* (2012).

In sum, existing scholarship has approached U.S. withdrawal from Vietnam from the perspectives of grand strategy, military policy, and diplomatic outcome. The present study instead conceptualizes withdrawal as a dynamic strategic process unfolding through distinct phases and shaped simultaneously by changes in the balance of forces on the battlefield, diplomatic negotiations, and domestic political constraints in the U.S. On this basis, it analyzes the strategic logic and inherent limitations of Vietnamization in a context where withdrawal became an increasingly imperative course of action for the U.S.

METHODOLOGY

This study is grounded in the systematic use of U.S. government archival sources, particularly the *Foreign Relations of the United States* (FRUS) series published by the U.S. Department of State and the *Public Papers of the Presidents of the United States*. These primary sources provide the documentary foundation for analyzing the formulation and implementation of withdrawal policy under the Nixon administration.

Methodologically, the study adopts a chronological historical approach in conjunction with qualitative document analysis. The chronological approach reconstructs events in sequence in order to delineate the phases of U.S. troop withdrawal and to situate policy decisions within their broader historical context. Qualitative analysis of official documents is employed to identify key policy components, patterns of implementation, and the outcomes of policy execution.

On this basis, the study examines the interrelationship among troop withdrawal, the Vietnamization strategy, domestic political pressures in the U.S., and the Paris Peace negotiations. Through this analytical framework, it

argues that the withdrawal of U.S. forces from Vietnam during President Richard Nixon's term (1969–1973) constituted a dynamic process of strategic adjustment rather than a linear or purely military disengagement.

RESULT & DISCUSSION

1. Factors Influencing the U.S. Decision to Withdraw from Vietnam under President Richard Nixon

1.1. U.S. Losses in the Vietnam War (1965–1968)

Upon assuming office in November 1963, President Lyndon B. Johnson inherited the Vietnam conflict amid a profound political and social crisis in the RVN, marked by successive coups d'état and persistent internal fragmentation following the overthrow of the First Republic. Despite expanded U.S. assistance, the RVN's structural fragilities—combined with the growing military capabilities of the NLF and the People's Army of Vietnam (PAVN)—led Washington to commit ground combat forces beginning in March 1965. By 1968, the U.S. had become deeply enmeshed in a protracted and increasingly costly war.

The financial burden was substantial. The war required expenditures of approximately $17 billion annually (U.S. Department of State, 2006, p. 364), diverting resources from domestic priorities, notably President Johnson's Great Society program. The Vietnam War was a major contributing factor to the economic strains evident in early 1968, as it aggravated persistent balance-of-payments deficits and contributed to the weakening of the U.S. dollar. In 1969, the final Chairman of the Council of Economic Advisers under Johnson acknowledged: "There's no dimension of the American economy in the last three-and-a-half years, which hasn't been touched by Viet Nam; Viet Nam changed the entire budget posture. It took all the elbow room away" (Collins, 1996, p. 401).

Parallel to the mounting fiscal costs, rising casualties intensified domestic political pressures. In the latter half of 1968, U.S. combat deaths averaged roughly 200 per week, with 14,592 American servicemen killed in that year alone (Kissinger, 2003, p. 41). As of April 30, 1969, U.S. combat fatalities in South Vietnam totaled 34,538 (Thayer, 1977, p. 143), in addition to 5,803 non-combat deaths resulting from accidents, illness, and aircraft losses. By 1968, U.S. military intervention in Vietnam had imposed severe material and human costs, eroding national resources and directly constraining the implementation of domestic priorities, including President Johnson's Great Society program. With more than half a million American troops still deployed in early 1969, escalating casualties transformed the war into an acute political and social crisis, fueling intensified opposition within both the American public and Congress.

1.2. The Antiwar Movement in the United States in the Late 1960s

1.2.1. The Surge of Public Opposition

Beginning in 1965, following the deployment of U.S. ground combat forces to Vietnam, the antiwar movement emerged as an increasingly influential force in American political life. As the war escalated and troop deployments and draft calls expanded, opposition to the conflict broadened both in scope and intensity. At the same time, the growing prominence of television and mass media coverage amplified the immediacy of war reporting, exposing the American public to vivid images and firsthand accounts from the battlefield. This heightened visibility underscored the widening gap between official governmental statements and conditions on the ground. Perceptions that the Johnson administration had not been fully candid in its representation of the war effort eroded public confidence in Washington's credibility and policymaking competence, thereby accelerating the consolidation and diffusion of antiwar sentiment.

In early 1968, news of the Tet Offensive and the growing perception of U.S. military stalemate generated increasing skepticism among the American public regarding the prospects for military victory in Vietnam. A Gallup poll conducted in late February 1968 indicated that 49 percent of respondents believed the U.S. had erred in sending troops to Vietnam, while 41 percent disagreed (Gallup, 1971, p. 2109).

During the first half of 1969, antiwar activity intensified markedly. There were at least 84 incidents of bombings, attempted bombings, and arson on university campuses—double the number recorded in the fall of 1968—as well

as 27 attacks or threats directed at high schools nationwide (Prentice, 2013, p. 333). The movement reached a peak with the Moratorium protest of October 15, 1969, which mobilized approximately three million participants in a nationwide campaign demanding an end to the war (Zunes & Laird, 2010, p. 3). The scale of the demonstrations drew extraordinary public attention, with the three major national television networks—ABC, CBS, and NBC—devoting extensive evening coverage to antiwar activities.

Although the antiwar movement did not exert a decisive or direct impact on the military balance in Vietnam, it profoundly reshaped the domestic political environment in the U.S. In this context, the Vietnam War ceased to be merely an overseas conflict and increasingly evolved into an internal political crisis, reflecting mounting tensions between the objective of sustaining America's global role and the constraints imposed by domestic political consensus.

1.2.2. Congressional Criticism

The surge of public opposition exerted a substantial influence on the U.S. Congress, which was increasingly seeking to reassert institutional balance vis-à-vis the presidency in foreign policy decision-making and to undertake a more critical reassessment of American involvement in the Vietnam War.

In 1968, reports concerning the Tet Offensive intensified congressional skepticism toward the President's war strategy and the broader U.S. effort in Vietnam, particularly within the Senate. On March 7, during a plenary session of the U.S. Senate, Senator J. William Fulbright, Chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, expressed grave concern regarding the legal authority of the executive branch to expand the war absent congressional consent: "This issue is the authority of the administration to expand the war without the consent of Congress and without any debate or consideration by Congress" (U.S. Congress, 1968, pp. 5644–5645). This position was shared by other senators and emerged as a significant and increasingly influential current of opinion in congressional deliberations.

Whereas between 1965 and 1968 the balance of authority in managing the Vietnam issue had largely favored the President, by this juncture Congress began moving toward reclaiming its constitutional prerogatives. One early manifestation of this shift was the indication by several senators to Secretary of Defense Clark Clifford that they would not support a large-scale troop increase in Vietnam. By March 1968, the Senate was increasingly insistent on being consulted regarding any major decision on Vietnam, and Congress would likely have opposed any additional deployment of forces (Schandler, 1977, pp. 206–217).

This sentiment was not confined to the Senate. On March 18, 1968, the House of Representatives asserted its position when 139 members supported a resolution calling for an immediate congressional review of U.S. policy in Southeast Asia (Finney, 1968, p. 32).

Thus, in the final months of his administration, President Johnson confronted increasingly explicit congressional resistance to the continued prosecution of the war. This opposition stemmed from perceived deficiencies in the effectiveness and management of the war by the executive branch, while also reflecting a broader institutional effort to restore congressional influence over foreign policy in general and Vietnam policy in particular. The deepening crisis in Vietnam intensified resistance within both public opinion and Congress—an important factor contributing to the subsequent recalibration of U.S. foreign strategy and Vietnam policy under President Nixon.

1.3. The Recalibration of U.S. Grand Strategy under the Nixon Administration (1969–1973)

By the late 1960s, the U.S.' entanglement in the Vietnam War had not only strained domestic resources but also contributed to mounting concerns about America's relative position in the global balance of power, particularly as strategic parity with the Soviet Union became increasingly evident. At the same time, the fragmentation of the once-unified communist bloc—highlighted by the Sino-Soviet clashes of 1969—created a new international context for the formulation of President Nixon's global strategy.

In November 1969, R. Nixon articulated what became known as the Nixon Doctrine. Under this framework, the U.S. would reassess its strategic commitments to allies, recalibrate the scope of its global military engagement, and

encourage allied states to assume primary responsibility for their own defense rather than depend predominantly on direct American combat involvement. Within this approach, the U.S. role would emphasize economic and military assistance, along with advisory support, rather than the large-scale deployment of American ground forces. The purpose of this adjustment was to preserve American credibility while reducing the burdens of manpower and financial expenditure, thereby reallocating resources to address domestic challenges and mounting opposition to the war.

Concurrently, the Nixon administration expanded diplomatic engagement with both the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China (PRC) to a degree not previously pursued. Guided by a realist orientation, Nixon adopted a more pragmatic foreign policy, subordinating ideological considerations to calculations of power, national interest, and security. The policy of détente with the Soviet Union and rapprochement with China enhanced U.S. strategic leverage and encouraged both powers to reconsider their positions, creating diplomatic conditions more conducive to ending U.S. military involvement in Vietnam. The administration's strategy of "linkage" and its emphasis on "reciprocity" reflected an effort to manage superpower relations while safeguarding American interests at both the regional and global levels.

These strategic adjustments were most clearly manifested during President Nixon's first term (1969–1973), when Vietnam became a principal arena for the implementation and testing of this recalibrated grand strategy.

Thus, whereas the Truman Doctrine had emphasized broad containment and sustained commitments in regions considered vulnerable to communist expansion, the Nixon Doctrine redefined containment in more restrained terms—favoring selective engagement and greater reliance on regional allies in the conduct of anti-communist defense efforts.

1.4. The Nixon Administration's Vietnam Policy (1969–1973)

Consistent with the principles later associated with the Nixon Doctrine, the U.S. recalibrated its Vietnam policy in an effort to preserve core strategic interests while reducing the costs of direct military involvement.

As early as 1968, during his presidential campaign, Richard Nixon sought to persuade the American electorate that he could end the Vietnam War through "peace with honor." In his acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention in Miami Beach, Florida, on August 8, he declared: "And I pledge to you tonight that the first priority foreign policy objective of our next Administration will be to bring an honorable end to the war in Vietnam. We shall not stop there—we need a policy to prevent more Vietnams" (Nixon, 1968).

To pursue this objective, the Nixon administration adopted three interrelated lines of action. First, through expanded economic and military assistance tied to the transfer of equipment, the U.S. sought to sustain the basic defensive capacity of the RVN. Second, by deploying advisers, organizing training programs, and supporting military modernization, Washington aimed gradually to enhance the combat effectiveness of the ARVN. Third, by progressively adjusting the scale of U.S. force deployments and military bases, the administration encouraged greater South Vietnamese self-reliance while reducing the direct American military burden.

This orientation was institutionalized in the strategy of Vietnamization, adopted as a guiding framework in early 1969 and rooted in the earlier concept of "de-Americanization" advanced during the final phase of the Johnson administration. Vietnamization was designed to prepare ARVN to assume increasing responsibility for combat operations in South Vietnam as U.S. forces were progressively withdrawn. Its ultimate purpose was to reduce and remove U.S. combat forces under mounting congressional and public pressure while enabling the RVN to sustain itself and strengthening the U.S. negotiating position vis-à-vis the Democratic Republic of Vietnam (DRV).

Parallel to the implementation of Vietnamization, negotiations with the DRV—initiated in mid-1968—resumed under the Nixon administration in January 1969. The administration pursued two primary objectives: (1) the withdrawal of U.S. forces and the return of prisoners of war; and (2) the preservation of the Nguyen Van Thieu government, a matter closely tied to American credibility.

In addition, to increase leverage over the DRV, the U.S. pursued diplomatic initiatives aimed at improving relations with the Soviet Union and the PRC, seeking to encourage the DRV concessions at the Paris negotiations. By 1969, therefore, Vietnam's priority within overall U.S. foreign policy was increasingly subject to reassessment. The earlier strategic concern regarding communist expansion from the Soviet Union through China into Southeast Asia, as articulated in the logic of the domino theory, no longer occupied the same primacy in American strategic calculations as in earlier phases of the conflict. While maintaining strategic rivalry with the Soviet Union, the Nixon administration adopted a more flexible and pragmatic approach. The Vietnam War came to be viewed as a constraint delaying broader diplomatic initiatives. Accordingly, U.S. Vietnam policy centered on withdrawal with honor: the removal of American forces from Vietnam while ensuring the continued viability of the RVN government—an outcome regarded as essential for preserving U.S. credibility in the eyes of both adversaries and allies.

2. The Substance of the U.S. Withdrawal Strategy (1969–1973)

Reducing American involvement in the Vietnam War was not merely a matter of disengagement; it was closely intertwined with considerations of honor and credibility. As Henry Kissinger observed, "We could not simply walk away from an enterprise involving two administrations, five allied countries, and thirty-one thousand dead as if we were switching a television channel" (Kissinger, 1979, p. 225). Accordingly, during its initial phase, the Nixon administration approached the formulation of a withdrawal plan with considerable caution.

The withdrawal strategy unfolded in distinct phases.

From July 1969 to early 1971, prior to Operation Lam Son 719, withdrawal remained largely conditional, calibrated to the progress of training and equipping the ARVN. This was despite limited diplomatic breakthroughs during the period, as the Paris negotiations remained stalemated and rapprochement with the Soviet Union and China had yet to produce tangible results. The plan for the first troop reduction drew substantially upon Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird's report of June 2, 1969. On that basis, during his meeting with President Nguyen Van Thieu on Midway Island on June 8, President Nixon formally announced the withdrawal of 25,000 troops, to be completed by the end of August (U.S. Department of State, 2006, p. 443). The administration emphasized that subsequent withdrawals would remain flexible and contingent upon multiple considerations, including the political and psychological climate in South Vietnam, ARVN's combat effectiveness, developments in the Paris negotiations, and the broader military situation in Southeast Asia.

In this phase, withdrawal did not represent a simple termination of the war but rather a controlled adjustment in the level of U.S. involvement. It formed part of a broader strategic calculation aimed at preserving American international credibility, sustaining the viability of the RVN government, and facilitating negotiations in Paris. The continued presence of substantial U.S. forces in South Vietnam was considered necessary for a transitional period, as rapid disengagement or premature compromise was perceived to risk undermining longer-term American interests.

From the spring of 1971 onward, particularly following Operation Lam Son 719, the balance between strategic planning and domestic political considerations shifted. Amid renewed antiwar mobilization and intensified congressional pressure, decisions regarding troop reductions increasingly reflected domestic political imperatives alongside battlefield assessments. By 1972, as the presidential election approached, withdrawal assumed heightened priority within the Nixon administration's Vietnam policy. The original conditions attached to withdrawal in 1969 became progressively less decisive, and the process took on an increasingly irreversible character. Enhancing ARVN's combat capability increasingly ceased to function as the primary determinant of the pace of withdrawal and instead operated as a complementary measure intended to facilitate a more rapid drawdown under mounting domestic pressure in the U.S.

3. The Process of U.S. Troop Withdrawal from Vietnam (1969–1973)

3.1. The Initiation of Vietnamization and the Initial Troop Withdrawals (July–December 1969)

Following the Midway announcement in June 1969, the Nixon administration moved to implement the process of

U.S. troop withdrawal within the framework of Vietnamization.

Between July and December 1969, the withdrawal proceeded cautiously, with both scale and tempo determined by clearly defined conditions. These included safeguarding the political stability of the RVN, maintaining the security capacity of the ARVN as U.S. forces were gradually reduced, and avoiding adverse consequences for the U.S. position in the Paris negotiations. This conditional approach was reflected in memoranda submitted to President Nixon on July 7, 1969, by National Security Adviser Henry Kissinger; on July 21, 1969, by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Earle Wheeler; and on September 4, 1969, by Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird. Kissinger cautioned that an excessively rapid withdrawal could "seriously shake the Thieu government" and render the process irreversible (U.S. Department of State, 2006, pp. 286–287). From a military perspective, Wheeler projected that a complete withdrawal before 1971–1972 would be unlikely absent a reciprocal pullback by the PAVN, and that a substantial residual U.S. support force would probably remain in South Vietnam (U.S. Department of State, 2006, p. 314). Similarly, Secretary Laird emphasized concerns regarding the psychological effects of withdrawal on the South Vietnamese population.

Despite mounting public pressure in the latter half of 1969, the administration tightly controlled the pace of troop reductions. The first two withdrawals—25,000 troops (July–August 1969) and 40,500 troops (September–December 1969)—reduced total U.S. troop strength to approximately 484,000 by the end of the year (Clarke, 1988, p. 524). These reductions were sufficient to signal a policy shift to domestic audiences and Congress while minimizing the risk of political and military destabilization in South Vietnam during the initial phase of Vietnamization.

Concurrently, in late 1969 the Nixon administration developed contingency plans to ensure that ARVN could maintain security as U.S. forces were incrementally withdrawn and to prepare for eventual disengagement under varying wartime scenarios. These measures laid the practical groundwork for the controlled implementation of Vietnamization. Notable among them were: (1) the Phase III Improvement and Modernization Plan (November 1969), designed to maintain minimum security levels for ARVN as U.S. troop levels declined to approximately 190,000–260,000 by 1971 and transitioned toward a predominantly advisory role by 1973 (Clarke, 1988, p. 355); and (2) operational plans OPLAN 183-69, 186-69, and Plan 208, which structured phased reductions and prepared for subsequent withdrawals, including contingencies in the event of a cessation of hostilities (Cosmas, 2006, p. 171).

In sum, during its initial stage, withdrawal primarily reflected a strategic initiative undertaken within the broader framework of Vietnamization and in parallel with diplomatic efforts. It served both to fulfill domestic political commitments—thereby alleviating pressure from public opinion and Congress—and to advance the longer-term objective of gradually reducing the scale of U.S. military involvement in Vietnam and, more broadly, in Asian security commitments. Throughout 1969, the withdrawal process largely followed the timetable devised by the Nixon administration and had not yet been fundamentally reshaped by domestic political constraints.

3.2. The Expansion of Withdrawal in Conjunction with Testing ARVN's Combat Capacity under Vietnamization (February–December 1970)

In early 1970, amid the absence of significant military or diplomatic breakthroughs—either in relations with the Soviet Union and China or in the stalled Paris negotiations—the Nixon administration moved to expand the scale of troop withdrawals from Vietnam. Accordingly, between February and April 1970, prior to the Cambodian incursion, the U.S. implemented its third withdrawal, removing 50,000 troops—substantially larger than the second withdrawal of 1969 and double the initial reduction of July–August 1969.

This expansion was grounded primarily in favorable assessments by the Department of Defense regarding the initial progress of Vietnamization. In memoranda to President Nixon dated February 17 and April 4, 1970, Secretary of Defense Melvin Laird asserted that Vietnamization had achieved measurable gains, permitting a cumulative reduction of approximately 115,500 personnel by mid-April 1970 (U.S. Department of State, 2006, p. 584). Laird further reported that he had reassessed the Phase III Improvement and Modernization Plan for ARVN in preparation for subsequent withdrawals and proposed continuing troop reductions at an average rate of approximately 12,500 per month (U.S. Department of State, 2006, p. 758).

Nevertheless, internal concerns emerged regarding the military implications of large-scale reductions. At a senior advisory meeting in April 1970, Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs Alexander Haig cautioned that rapid troop cuts had reduced U.S. flexibility in responding to North Vietnamese military activity during the late spring and early summer of 1970. In light of ARVN's evolving performance, Laird subsequently recommended moderating the pace to approximately 10,000 per month, seeking to balance withdrawal objectives with battlefield stability (U.S. Department of State, 2006, pp. 808–809).

In April 1970, roughly one year after the formal adoption of Vietnamization, the U.S. launched the Cambodian incursion, which effectively served as a major test of ARVN's operational capacity within the framework of Vietnamization. Although the operation achieved certain military gains, it reignited antiwar protests domestically[1] and prompted more assertive congressional intervention through legislative measures. The public dissent of approximately 250 State Department officials and the Senate's passage of the Cooper–Church Amendment on June 30, 1970—prohibiting further U.S. military operations and assistance in Cambodia—marked a significant escalation in executive–legislative tensions over the war[2].

Amid mounting domestic political pressure, Nixon convened senior advisers on May 31, 1970, to reassess the situation in South Vietnam. Laird reported that troop withdrawals would be temporarily suspended through July 1970 and limited to no more than 60,000 for the remainder of the year, while emphasizing the need to secure congressional appropriations for the forthcoming fiscal year. Nixon concurred with this assessment but underscored that continued force reductions remained an unavoidable political imperative, targeting a withdrawal of approximately 150,000 troops in the following year. Accordingly, between July and October 1970, the fourth withdrawal removed 50,000 personnel, equivalent in scale to the third phase (Clarke, 1988, p. 524).

On October 11, 1970, Laird reported that the fourth withdrawal would be completed by October 15 and that from October 15 to December 31, 1970, the United States would further reduce troop ceilings by an additional 40,000 (U.S. Department of State, 2010, p. 126). This implied a total reduction of 90,000 personnel during 1970, with a further 60,000 scheduled for withdrawal between January and May 1971[3]. The following day, October 12, Nixon publicly announced an additional reduction of 40,000 troops to be completed by Christmas (OFR-NARA, 1971, p. 836). These measures reduced total U.S. troop strength in Vietnam to fewer than 205,500 by the end of 1970 compared with the level at the time of Nixon's inauguration.

In total, during 1970 the United States conducted three major troop withdrawals, removing approximately 140,000 personnel and reducing overall force levels in Vietnam to about 344,000 by the end of the year. The Cambodian incursion—viewed by the Nixon administration as a test of the ARVN's combat capacity within the framework of Vietnamization—contributed significantly to the intensification of antiwar sentiment among both the American public and Congress. In this context, Congress adopted increasingly assertive measures to circumscribe presidential war powers, with the result that the withdrawal process not only expanded in scale but also became progressively shaped by domestic political pressures.

3.3. The Acceleration of Withdrawal under Intensifying Domestic Political Pressure (January 1971–January 1972)

In 1971, as the ARVN assumed most responsibilities previously borne by U.S. ground forces, the Nixon administration further accelerated troop withdrawals while simultaneously undertaking military operations

[1] On May 4, 1970, the Ohio National Guard opened fire on a protest at Kent State University, killing four students. A wave of campus-based antiwar demonstrations spread across the United States; by May 10, nearly 450 colleges and universities had closed (Daddis, 2011, p. 211). A major demonstration in Washington, D.C., took place from May 9 to 10, 1970. Students at 350 universities went on strike, and 500 educational institutions were shut down in an effort to prevent further violence (Herring, 2008, p. 470).

[2] Subsequently, on December 22, 1970, the Cooper–Church Amendment became law, prohibiting the use of authorized funds to deploy U.S. ground forces into Cambodia or to assign American advisers there (Campbell, 2014, p. 35). Through this legislation, Congress limited presidential authority to expand the war in Indochina. In January 1971, Congress formally repealed the Gulf of Tonkin Resolution.

[3] Earlier, on April 20, 1970, Nixon addressed the American public and announced that an additional 150,000 troops would be withdrawn by the spring of 1971, reducing U.S. force levels in Vietnam to 265,500 personnel (OFR–NARA, 1971, p. 375).

intended to assess South Vietnam's capacity for autonomous security. Withdrawal thus increasingly functioned not only as a reduction of U.S. presence but also as a means of demonstrating the operational viability of Vietnamization amid a diminishing American combat role.

Within this framework, in early February 1971 the U.S. supported Operation Lam Son 719, an incursion into North Vietnamese base areas in Laos. ARVN forces assumed primary combat responsibility, while U.S. forces provided firepower and logistical support. The course of the campaign exposed significant weaknesses in ARVN performance, particularly in command, coordination, and dependence on American assistance. Although Vietnamization had reduced the U.S. military footprint, it had not yet produced a force capable of sustaining a stable military balance against the PAVN in the context of continued American withdrawal. Lam Son 719 therefore constituted an important indicator of the gap between the strategic assumptions of Vietnamization and ARVN's actual combat capacity.

Simultaneously, domestic political pressures intensified markedly from late April to early May 1971, as Congress tightened budgetary and manpower constraints on the war and pressed President Nixon to clarify a final withdrawal timetable. In the context of impending presidential elections in both the U.S. and the RVN, domestic political considerations assumed increasing weight in strategic decision-making.

Internal National Security Council discussions from September 1971 concluded that battlefield conditions permitted further acceleration of withdrawal, targeting a reduction to approximately 184,000 U.S. personnel by the end of 1971 in order to strengthen leverage in the Paris negotiations (U.S. Department of State, 2010, p. 937). Subsequent assessments in October projected that U.S. troop strength could be reduced to roughly 50,000 by mid-1972, largely composed of air and support units, and that Thieu had expressed no significant objections to this plan (U.S. Department of State, 2010, p. 983). From the beginning of 1971 to that point, four withdrawal phases had removed approximately 160,000 personnel, of whom 113,647 were Army troops (Clarke, 1988, p. 524). At a press conference on November 12, 1971, Nixon stated that approximately 365,000 U.S. troops—about 80 percent of the force present at the time of his inauguration—had been withdrawn. He further announced plans to reduce an additional 45,000 troops over the next two months, including 25,000 in December 1971 and 20,000 in January 1972 (OFR-NARA, 1972, pp. 1101–1102). Nixon indicated that the scale and timing of further withdrawals would depend on three principal factors: the level of North Vietnamese military activity, the progress of Vietnamization, and prospects for achieving two core objectives—comprehensive prisoner-of-war repatriation and a ceasefire throughout Southeast Asia. When questioned about maintaining a residual force of 40,000–50,000 troops pending resolution of the POW issue, Nixon acknowledged that the ultimate U.S. negotiating objective was complete withdrawal from South Vietnam; absent a negotiated settlement, any remaining forces would serve primarily to facilitate negotiations over prisoners (OFR-NARA, 1972, pp. 1107–1108).

In December 1971, General Abrams initiated a further withdrawal phase and prepared additional reduction lists for early 1972, aiming to bring U.S. troop strength down to approximately 60,000 (Cosmas, 2006, pp. 167–168).

Thus, during 1971 and early 1972, the withdrawal process accelerated markedly under mounting domestic political pressure, particularly from Congress and within the electoral context. The dual imperatives of responding to domestic opinion and employing troop reductions as leverage in negotiations led the Nixon administration to prioritize withdrawal and prisoner repatriation, thereby highlighting the structural limitations of Vietnamization in securing a durable military equilibrium in South Vietnam.

3.4. The Final U.S. Withdrawals in the Context of War Termination (February 1972–January 1973)

By early 1972, amid continued military uncertainty and persistent deadlock in the Paris negotiations—while the PAVN sustained infiltration into the South Vietnam—the Nixon administration accelerated the final withdrawal phases as a strategic priority in resolving the conflict. By early January 1972, only sixteen maneuver battalions remained in South Vietnam, while most programs to expand and modernize the ARVN had been completed (Daddis, 2011, p. 215).

Throughout 1972, the administration intensified troop reductions and prioritized prisoner repatriation under mounting pressure from Congress, domestic opinion, and President Nixon's reelection campaign. On January 13,

1972, Nixon announced that an additional 70,000 troops would be withdrawn within three months, reducing U.S. strength to 69,000 by May 1 (OFR–NARA, 1974, p. 30). In his January 24 budget message to Congress, he emphasized the reduction from 549,500 personnel in January 1969 to 69,000 by May 1972 as a basis for reallocating federal expenditures to civilian priorities (OFR–NARA, 1974, p. 85).

Simultaneously, the Military Assistance Command, Vietnam (MACV) implemented further reductions while preparing for renewed North Vietnamese offensives. By late January 1972, the tenth withdrawal phase removed 45,000 troops, lowering MACV's authorized ceiling to 139,000 and actual strength to approximately 136,500 (Cosmas, 2006, p. 353). This marked the initial stage of OPLAN J208A, which aimed to reduce U.S. forces to 60,000 by July 1, 1972. Allied contingents likewise began withdrawing combat units during this period.

On April 26, 1972, Nixon announced an additional reduction of 20,000 personnel, bringing the ceiling to 49,000 by July 1, while sustaining air and naval strikes against military targets in North Vietnam[4] to preserve military and diplomatic leverage (OFR–NARA, 1974, p. 552). By April, U.S. troop strength had declined to 69,000, and by late June to 49,000 (Daddis, 2011, p. 218), underscoring that withdrawal had become the foremost priority even as Vietnamization continued to encounter operational constraints.

The process continued during the latter half of 1972. On August 29, the White House announced a further reduction of 11,500 troops, leaving 27,500 in Vietnam, and declared that the U.S. had "completely finished the American ground combat role"[5] (OFR–NARA, 1974, pp. 829–831). Concurrently, the U.S. accelerated equipment transfers to ARVN through Operations Enhance (May 1972) and Enhance Plus (October 1972), seeking to maximize matériel delivery prior to a ceasefire.

Overall, U.S. troop strength declined from 549,500 in January 1969 to 27,400 by the end of 1972, with virtually no remaining combat forces (Kort, 2017, p. 166). Upon the signing of the Paris Agreement in January 1973, most American forces had already departed; of the 27,000 personnel authorized to remain, only 23,335 were present, primarily logistics and air units (Cosmas, 2006, p. 397). The final withdrawals occurred from March 27–29, 1973, concurrent with the repatriation of the last American prisoners of war, formally concluding direct U.S. military involvement in Vietnam.

By early 1973, the Nixon administration had made the termination of direct U.S. military presence its overriding strategic objective despite ongoing battlefield volatility and protracted negotiations. This trajectory reflected intensifying domestic political pressures and electoral considerations, as well as a decisive strategic shift from sustained military engagement to war termination through withdrawal, transferring the primary security burden to the RVN under increasingly unfavorable military conditions.

4. The Impact of Troop Withdrawal on the Effectiveness of the Nixon Administration's Vietnam Policy (1969–1973)

The U.S. withdrawal process between 1969 and 1973 exerted direct and multidimensional effects on the implementation of Vietnamization, particularly in the relationship between long-term strategic objectives and the Nixon administration's short-term political imperatives. Rather than functioning primarily as a supportive instrument for the transfer of security responsibilities, withdrawal increasingly functioned as a decisive variable shaping the pace and scope of Vietnamization, thereby redefining the substantive content of the policy itself.

From a military perspective, withdrawals conducted according to publicly announced timetables weakened the linkage between the reduction of U.S. forces and ARVN's readiness to assume expanded combat responsibilities. Although Vietnamization aimed to build an autonomous South Vietnamese security capacity, the accelerated drawdowns—especially from mid-1971 onward—outpaced improvements in ARVN's command structure,

[4] In mid-April 1972, Nixon ordered Operation Linebacker I—a bombing campaign against North Vietnam—to prevent the DRV from reinforcing its forces in the South. Diplomatically, the campaign signaled U.S. resolve to the Soviet Union and the PRC and sought to compel North Vietnam to accept American proposals in the Paris negotiations. The operation, particularly U.S. air operations, played an important role in supporting the ARVN at this stage of the war.

[5] As a result of these outcomes, a public opinion poll in September 1972 showed that 46 percent of Americans (compared to 44 percent opposed) believed that Nixon had fulfilled his 1968 pledge to end the Vietnam War (Haldeman, 2010, p. 241).

operational coordination, and logistical sustainability. As a result, the transfer of responsibility increasingly assumed a quantitative rather than qualitative character, measured in troop levels more than in corresponding gains in combat capability.

Strategically and politically, withdrawal altered the operational logic of Vietnamization. What had initially been conceived as a strategy to preserve a viable post-withdrawal balance of forces gradually evolved into a mechanism serving the priority of terminating direct U.S. military involvement. Intensifying pressure from Congress and public opinion increased the weight of withdrawal as a policy objective, even when battlefield conditions and ARVN capabilities did not fully align with the policy's original assumptions. Consequently, the original strategic rationale of Vietnamization became progressively attenuated as it was increasingly conditioned by domestic political exigencies.

In the diplomatic arena, withdrawal produced complex effects on U.S. bargaining leverage. On the one hand, large-scale troop reductions were employed as leverage to encourage the DRV to accept negotiated terms, particularly during 1971–1972. On the other hand, the public commitment to complete withdrawal narrowed the range of sustainable military options available to Washington should negotiations fail to yield desired outcomes. Under these conditions, Vietnamization ceased to function as a flexible intermediary solution and instead became tightly linked to an increasingly irreversible withdrawal trajectory.

Ultimately, the withdrawal process directly affected the overall effectiveness of U.S. Vietnam policy in pursuing its core objective: the establishment of a stable security structure in South Vietnam following American disengagement. The RVN had not achieved this objective even with the support of nearly half a million U.S. troops. As American forces departed—while units of the PAVN remained south of the 17th parallel following the Easter Offensive and continued reinforcement through the Ho Chi Minh Trail—the ARVN had not attained full operational self-sufficiency. Under such conditions, structural vulnerability became increasingly evident. While multiple factors contributed to subsequent developments, in practice, after the signing of the Paris Agreement, the RVN endured for approximately twenty-seven months before collapsing in April 1975 under a renewed large-scale offensive by the PAVN.

CONCLUSION

The U.S. troop withdrawal between 1969 and 1973 was not merely a technical military measure to reduce American presence in South Vietnam; it constituted a central variable shaping the practical effectiveness of the Vietnamization policy pursued by the Nixon administration. Although Vietnamization was initially conceived as a conditional strategy of disengagement, those conditions were progressively redefined under mounting domestic political pressures in the U.S.

During 1969–1970, withdrawals proceeded with relative caution, premised on the assumption that the ARVN could gradually assume expanded combat responsibilities while a residual U.S. force continued to provide a significant deterrent. From 1971 onward—particularly under intensifying congressional pressure, public opposition, and the presidential electoral cycle—the pace of withdrawal accelerated markedly. This shift weakened the already fragile linkage between the timetable of U.S. force reductions and the consolidation of ARVN's substantive combat capabilities. Operation Lam Son 719 in 1971 highlighted the structural limitations of Vietnamization in the context of accelerated withdrawal. Although ARVN assumed primary operational responsibility, its continued dependence on U.S. firepower, air support, and logistics underscored the incomplete nature of the security transfer. As U.S. withdrawals intensified in 1972, deficiencies in ARVN's command, coordination, and strategic cohesion became increasingly apparent, while the People's Army of Vietnam retained the capacity to reinforce and expand military operations.

By mid-1972, withdrawal had become the overriding priority of the Nixon administration, increasingly taking precedence over the original long-term objectives of Vietnamization. The termination of the U.S. ground combat role, coupled with successive large-scale withdrawals, reflected a transition from seeking a sustainable military equilibrium to pursuing disengagement in order to meet domestic political imperatives and facilitate the signing of the Paris Agreement. Efforts to bolster ARVN through Operations Enhance and Enhance Plus provided material reinforcement but were insufficient to reverse the increasingly unfavorable military balance following U.S.

disengagement.

In aggregate, the withdrawal process enabled the Nixon administration to achieve decisive short-term objectives—namely, the complete removal of U.S. forces and the repatriation of prisoners of war—thereby establishing the political basis for ending American involvement in the Vietnam War. Yet the increasing subordination of withdrawal to domestic political imperatives simultaneously undermined the strategic coherence of Vietnamization, as ARVN was not transformed into a force capable of sustained self-defense absent direct U.S. intervention. Withdrawal thus functioned both as the necessary condition for ending the war and as a factor highlighting the structural limitations of the Nixon administration's strategy for resolving the Vietnam conflict during 1969–1973.

References

1. Campbell, K. K. (2014). *The great silent majority: Nixon's 1969 speech on Vietnamization*. Texas A&M University Press.
2. Clarke, J. J. (1988). *Advice and Support: The final years, 1965-1973*. U.S. Army Center of Military History.
3. Collins, R. M. (1996). The economic crisis of 1968 and the waning of the "American Century". *The American Historical Review, 101(2),* 396–422. https://www.jstor.org/stable/2170396
4. Cosmas, G. A. (2006). *MACV: The Joint Command in the years of withdrawal 1968-1973*. U.S. Army Center of Military History.
5. Daddis, G. A. (2011). *No sure victory: Measuring U.S. Army effectiveness and progress in the Vietnam War*. Oxford University Press.
6. Finney, J. (1968, March 19). *139 in House support drive for a review of policy in Vietnam*. *The New York Times*, p. 32.
7. Gallup, G. H. (1971). *The Gallup poll: Public opinion 1935-1971* (Vol. 3). Random House.
8. Haldeman, W. E. (2010). *Vietnamization: an interdisciplinary study of Nixon Administration decision making* (Doctor thesis). American University.
9. Kissinger, H. (1979). *White House Years*. Little, Brown and Company.
10. Kissinger, H. (2003). *Ending the Vietnam War: a history of America's involvement in and extrication from the Vietnam War*. Simon & Schuster.
11. Kort, M. G. (2017). *The Vietnam War Reexamined*. Cambridge University Press.
12. Nixon, R. M. (1968, August 8). *Presidential nomination acceptance speech at the Republican National Convention, Miami Beach, Florida*. Gerald R. Ford Presidential Library.
13. Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration (OFR-NARA). (1971). *Public papers of the Presidents of the United States: Richard Nixon – Containing the public messages, speechs, and statements of the President 1970*. U.S. Government Printing Office.
14. Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration (OFR-NARA). (1972). *Public papers of the Presidents of the United States: Richard Nixon – Containing the public messages, speechs, and statements of the President 1971*. U.S. Government Printing Office.
15. Office of the Federal Register, National Archives and Records Administration (OFR-NARA). (1974). *Public papers of the Presidents of the United States: Richard Nixon – Containing the public messages, speechs, and statements of the President 1972*. U.S. Government Printing Office.
16. Prentice, D. L. (2013). *Ending America' Vietnam War: Vietnamization's domestic origins and international ramification, 1968-1970* (Doctor thesis). The College of Arts and Sciences, South Carolina.
17. Schandler, H. Y. (1977). *The unmaking of a president: Lyndon Johnson and Vietnam*. Princeton University Press.
18. Thayer, T. C. (Ed). (1977). *A system analysis view of Vietnam war 1965-1972, volume 8, Casualties and loses*. The Southeast Asia Analysis Report.
19. U.S. Congress. (1968). *Congressional Record* (Vol. 114, Pt. 5, March 6–15, 1968). U.S. Government Printing Office.
20. U.S. Department of State. (2006). *Foreign Relations of the United Sates (1969-1976). Volume VI: Vietnam, January 1969 - July 1970*. U.S. Government Printing Office.
21. U.S. Department of State. (2010). *Foreign Relations of the United Sates (1969-1976). Volume VII: Vietnam, July 1970 - January 1972*. U.S. Government Printing Office.
22. Zunes, S. & Laird, J. (2010). *The US anti-Vietnam war movement (1964-1973)*. International Center on Nonviolent Conflict.