Rethinking the Vietnam War: Vietnamese representation and the Limits of Superpower Narratives

Wang Yung Yi
Independent Researcher, Taiwan
E-mail: wang.yung@outlook.co.th
(Received: 14 June 2025, Revised: 15 November 2025, Accepted: 17 November 2025)
https://doi.org/10.57260/csdj.2025.281525

Abstract

This study re-examines the Vietnam War through an agent-centered analytical framework, challenging dominant Cold War historiography that positions Vietnam as a passive battleground for superpower competition. Drawing on political science, postcolonial theory, and international relations, the research integrates diplomatic archives, oral histories, and cultural memory studies to recentralize Vietnamese agency and foreground Sino-Vietnamese interactions. The analysis reveals how indigenous political movements, postcolonial state-building imperatives, and small-state survival strategies shaped the conflict's trajectory and outcomes.

Findings demonstrate that while U.S. containment policies and Sino-Soviet rivalries provided structural constraints, Vietnamese political elites, civil society actors, and ordinary citizens actively negotiated, redefined, and ultimately determined the war's meaning and legacy. The study contributes to international relations theory by advancing a decentered geopolitical framework that reconceptualizes minor states and local actors as co-architects rather than passive recipients of global order. Contemporary implications include strategic lessons for small states navigating great-power competition and methodological innovations for writing inclusive, multi-vocal histories of conflict.

Keywords: Vietnam war, Vietnamese agency, Cold war historiography, Small-state strategy, Postcolonial theory, Contested memory, Sino-Vietnamese relations

Introduction

The post-World War II era saw the United States institutionalize containment as a strategic doctrine aimed at halting the global spread of communism particularly movements aligned with the Soviet Union. This doctrine ushered in an era of proxy conflicts that redefined America's global engagements. Among these, the Vietnam War emerged as the most prominent and protracted expression of ideological confrontation, with Washington and Moscow backing rival regimes and insurgent groups across the Global South. U.S. containment policy materialized through multilateral military alliances such as NATO and covert interventions targeting leftist governments (Lewy, 1978). These efforts reflected long-standing ideological anxieties dating back to the Bolshevik Revolution, which had cast both communism and fascism as existential threats to liberal democratic capitalism. Domestically, Franklin D. Roosevelt's New Deal intended to stabilize capitalism and preempt radicalization faced conservative resistance over its perceived socialist inclinations (Thayer, 1985). Roosevelt's strategic alliance with anti-communist Catholic constituencies (Heineman, 2001), followed by

the Red Scare and McCarthyism, further entrenched ideological divisions within American political culture.

While mainstream interpretations often depict U. S. foreign policy as a reaction to external communist threats, this study argues that domestic political dynamics particularly anti-communist paranoia and economic protectionism were key internal drivers of American interventionism. From Truman's Marshall Plan to Kennedy's covert operations in Southeast Asia, Johnson's escalation under the "domino theory," and Nixon's "Vietnamization" strategy, successive administrations adapted Cold War tactics while maintaining a coherent ideological vision.

Despite extensive scholarship over six decades, the Vietnam War remains overwhelmingly framed through an American-centric lens. Dominant narratives focus on U.S. strategic failures and domestic anti- war activism, frequently neglecting the conflict's regional dynamics especially China's strategic interests and Vietnam's internal political struggles. This article proposes a tripartite analytical framework that integrates political science, postcolonial theory, and international relations to recentralize Vietnamese agency and foreground Sino-Vietnamese interactions. By moving beyond Cold War historiography's superpower fixation, the study underscores how indigenous political movements, postcolonial state- building imperatives, and small-state survival strategies shaped the war's trajectory.

Methodologically, the study departs from traditional historiographical gap- filling by advancing a decentered geopolitical analysis. Through an interdisciplinary synthesis of diplomatic archives, oral histories, cultural memory studies, and insurgent narratives, it reconceptualizes minor states and local actors not as passive participants but as co- architects of global order. This approach reveals how contested memories, postcolonial aspirations, and subaltern political decisions in Vietnam intersected with and at times subverted the designs of great powers.

Research Objectives

1. To reassess North Vietnam's ideological autonomy and foreign policy formulation within the Sino-Soviet schism;
2. To examine the contributions of students, religious groups, and intellectuals to South Vietnam's political culture alongside memory construction processes;
3. To analyze China's indirect interventionism through the prism of premodern Sino-Vietnamese relations rather than Cold War binaries;
4. To critique conventional historiography's neglect of Vietnamese decision- making complexity and narrative sovereignty.

Literature Review

Vietnamese Agency and Strategic Autonomy

Contemporary historiography increasingly challenges the paradigm of U. S. - centric Vietnam War scholarship, instead advocating for what might be termed the "Vietnamization" of conflict studies. This epistemological shift prioritizes local actors as primary historical agents, moving beyond critiques of American exceptionalism to reconstruct Vietnamese revolutionary praxis. Thu (2018) occupies a prominent position in scholarship examining the DRV leadership's ideological negotiations during the Cold War. His analysis reveals how Vietnamese communists strategically adapted Marxist- Leninist doctrine through syncretism with Confucian ethics and anti- colonial experiences, asserting intellectual independence from Soviet and Chinese orthodoxy. Scholarly consensus remains elusive regarding Hanoi's operational autonomy. Pierre Asselin (2002) maintains that Chinese logistical support and Soviet military technology constituted necessary conditions for North Vietnamese resilience. Conversely, Zhai (2001) demonstrates Hanoi's capacity for diplomatic triangulation, arguing

that DRV leaders exploited Sino- Soviet rivalry to secure maximum aid while preserving strategic flexibility a phenomenon he terms " revolutionary pragmatism. " This dialectic between dependency and self-determination provides critical insights into small-state survival strategies within bipolar power structures.

Memory, Culture, and Competing Narratives

Schwenkel's (2009) transnational memory studies dismantle the capitalism- communism dichotomy by documenting how Vietnamese war commemoration incorporates American veteran narratives and socialist visual culture. Her work exposes the constructed nature of " heroic resistance" tropes through analysis of museum curatorial practices and memorial landscapes. Kwon (2008) employs anthropological methods to map Vietnam's " ghostly epistemology" commemorative practices where ancestral spirits mediate wartime trauma. By analyzing village rituals and spirit mediumship, Kwon reveals how vernacular memory production challenges state- controlled historical narratives, creating alternative moral economies of remembrance (Kwon, 2006(. The emergent Vietnamese diasporic scholarship further complicates historical understanding. Narratives from former South Vietnamese officials, refugees, and second-generation scholars interrogate the Socialist Republic's official historiography while contesting Western academic paradigms. These polyphonic accounts foreground themes of displacement, divided loyalty, and postcolonial identity reconstruction, injecting necessary moral complexity into war scholarship.

Methodology

This study employs a qualitative, cross- disciplinary research design that integrates methods from political science, international relations, and cultural history. The methodology operationalizes the research objectives by combining structural analysis of geopolitical constraints with interpretive analysis of agency, memory, and identity formation.

Research Design

The research adopts a case study approach centered on Vietnam's wartime experience (1955-1975), with comparative reference to concurrent Cold War conflicts. The temporal scope encompasses the escalation phase (1960- 1968) , the Vietnamization period (1969- 1973) , and immediate post- war consolidation (1975- 1979) . This periodization enables analysis of how Vietnamese agency evolved across different strategic contexts and power configurations.

Data Sources and Collection

The study triangulates multiple source categories to balance official perspectives with subaltern voices:

Diplomatic archives: Declassified U. S. State Department cables, Pentagon Papers, National Security Council memoranda, and Vietnamese Communist Party internal documents provide insight into strategic decision-making at the state level.

Oral histories: Interviews with former combatants, civilians, and diaspora community members (Conducted 2010- 2023) capture experiences marginalized in state narratives, including those of South Vietnamese soldiers, re- education camp survivors, and female combatants.

Cultural memory studies: Analysis of memorials, museums, literature, and commemorative practices in Vietnam, the United States, and diaspora communities reveals how the war's meaning has been contested and renegotiated across generations.

Secondary scholarship: Engagement with historiographical debates across Vietnamese, Chinese, Russian, and Western scholarship provides multilingual, Mult perspectival context.

Analytical Framework

The analytical framework integrates three theoretical lenses:

Agent-structure dialectic: Drawing on constructivist international relations theory, the study examines how Vietnamese actors exercised agency within structural constraints, focusing on the interplay between material capabilities and ideational factors such as nationalism, revolutionary ideology, and anti-colonial consciousness.

Postcolonial theory: The framework applies postcolonial concepts of hybridity, strategic essentialism, and subaltern resistance to analyze how Vietnamese elites and movements negotiated between competing modernization models while asserting distinct national trajectories.

Memory studies: Analysis of contested memories employs frameworks from collective memory scholarship, examining how state narratives, counter-memories, and silenced voices compete to define the war's historical significance and contemporary relevance.

Limitations and Scope

Several limitations warrant acknowledgment. First, archival access in Vietnam remains restricted, particularly regarding internal Communist Party debates and Sino-Vietnamese military coordination. Second, oral histories reflect selection bias toward English-speaking interviewees and those who survived the war. Third, the study's geographic focus on northern and southern Vietnam necessarily marginalizes central highlands ethnic minorities' experiences. Finally, the analysis emphasizes political and military dimensions, with less attention to economic and environmental dimensions of the conflict. These limitations underscore the need for continued multilingual, multiperspectival research.

Results

The findings are organized according to the tripartite analytical framework, examining U. S. containment dynamics, Sino-Vietnamese strategic interactions, and indigenous Vietnamese political processes. Each subsection demonstrates how external pressures and internal agency intersected to shape the war's trajectory.

U.S. Containment Policy

American involvement in Vietnam reflected both external strategic calculations and domestic political imperatives. The containment doctrine, formalized in NSC-68 and operationalized through SEATO, positioned Southeast Asia as crucial to preventing communist expansion. However, U.S. policymakers fundamentally misread Vietnam's political landscape, conflating nationalist aspirations with communist expansionism and underestimating the depth of anti-colonial sentiment.

Kennedy's counterinsurgency strategy (1961-1963) introduced Special Forces and strategic hamlet programs designed to separate guerrillas from population bases. These initiatives failed due to South Vietnamese government corruption and the programs' coercive implementation, which alienated rural communities rather than securing their loyalty. Johnson's escalation (1964-1968) marked a transition to conventional warfare, with Operation Rolling Thunder and ground deployments reaching 536,000 troops by 1968. The Tet Offensive demonstrated the limits of military superiority: despite tactical defeat, the NLF and North Vietnamese forces achieved strategic victory by undermining American public support and exposing the fragility of pacification claims.

Nixon's Vietnamization (1969-1973) attempted to transfer combat responsibilities to South Vietnamese forces while reducing U.S. casualties (Melanson, 2000). This strategy

preserved the Saigon regime temporarily but could not resolve its fundamental legitimacy crisis. Unlike North Vietnam's fusion of nationalism and communism, the Republic of Vietnam struggled to articulate a compelling national vision beyond anti-communism. Corruption, political instability, and heavy dependence on American support eroded popular trust, rendering the regime unsustainable once U.S. military and economic assistance declined after the Paris Accords.

Comparative analysis reveals a crucial asymmetry: while U.S. intervention provided vast material resources and military technology, it could not manufacture domestic legitimacy or nationalist credibility. In contrast, North Vietnamese leadership leveraged limited resources through superior mobilization strategies rooted in decades of anti-colonial resistance. This finding challenges realist assumptions that material capabilities determine outcomes, instead highlighting the constitutive role of legitimacy, ideology, and political organization.

Sino-Vietnamese Strategic Interactions

Chinese involvement in the Vietnam War extended beyond material support to encompass complex political, ideological, and strategic dimensions. Beijing provided critical military assistance including anti-aircraft batteries, engineering troops, and railway construction teams at peak involvement, over 320,000 Chinese military personnel operated in northern Vietnam (1965-1969). However, this support served multiple objectives beyond solidarity with socialist allies.

First, Chinese assistance functioned as an instrument in Sino-Soviet competition for leadership of the communist world. Beijing sought to demonstrate superior revolutionary commitment compared to Soviet "revisionism," positioning itself as the authentic standard-bearer of anti-imperialist struggle. This rivalry created leverage for Vietnamese leaders, who skillfully played Beijing and Moscow against each other to maximize autonomy while securing material support from both.

Second, China's strategic calculus included territorial and geopolitical considerations. Preventing U.S. bases along China's southern border represented a core security interest, making Vietnamese victory instrumentally valuable regardless of ideological affinity. This pragmatic dimension became explicit after 1972, when Sino-American rapprochement created tensions with Hanoi over Vietnamese alignment with the Soviet Union Union (Chen, 1995).

Third, ideological tensions complicated Sino-Vietnamese relations despite surface solidarity. Ho Chi Minh's leadership balanced Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy with pragmatic adaptation to Vietnamese conditions, sometimes diverging from Maoist models. During the Cultural Revolution (1966-1976), Chinese pressure for radical ideological conformity created friction, with Vietnamese leaders resisting attempts to subordinate national strategy to Beijing's revolutionary timeline. The 1979 Sino Vietnamese War revealed the limits of socialist internationalism. Territorial disputes, treatment of ethnic Chinese minorities, and Vietnamese intervention in Cambodia transformed former allies into adversaries. This outcome demonstrates that Vietnamese agency extended beyond wartime resistance to include postwar assertions of sovereignty that violated Chinese expectations of deference and alignment.

Vietnamese Political Processes and Domestic Dynamics

Vietnamese agency manifested through multiple dimensions: elite strategic decision-making, mass mobilization, ideological adaptation, and post-war memory politics. Each dimension reveals how indigenous actors shaped outcomes rather than merely responding to external pressures.

Elite strategic autonomy: North Vietnamese leadership under Ho Chi Minh and later Le Duan demonstrated sophisticated navigation of great-power constraints. The decision to accept the 1954 Geneva partition reflected temporary accommodation of unfavorable power

balances while preserving long-term reunification objectives. Similarly, the choice to pursue protracted guerrilla warfare rather than conventional offensives (until conditions favored the latter) reflected indigenous strategic calculation rather than Chinese or Soviet direction. Hanoi's rejection of several ceasefire proposals throughout the 1960s underscored commitment to reunification on Vietnamese terms, even when external patrons advocated compromise.

Mass mobilization and revolutionary culture: The war's outcome hinged not on technology or firepower but on popular mobilization sustained over decades. The Communist Party developed organizational structures reaching village level, integrating military resistance with land reform, literacy campaigns, and nationalist education. This created a revolutionary culture that legitimized sacrifice and maintained morale despite enormous casualties. In contrast, South Vietnam's failure to match this mobilization capacity reflected its inability to root governance in authentic popular support rather than merely external patronage. Vietnamese communism represented neither pure Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy nor simple adoption of Chinese or Soviet models. Instead, Party intellectuals synthesized Confucian ethics, Buddhist compassion, and revolutionary modernization into a distinctly Vietnamese socialist ideology. Ho Chi Minh's emphasis on moral exemplarity and collective discipline drew explicitly on Vietnamese cultural traditions while serving revolutionary objectives. This ideological hybridity enabled the Party to claim both revolutionary legitimacy and cultural authenticity a combination South Vietnamese governments could not replicate. However, Vietnamese wartime experiences were far more heterogeneous than official narratives acknowledge. South Vietnamese perspectives including those who fought against reunification have been systematically marginalized in postwar historiography. Re-education camps detained hundreds of thousands of former Republic of Vietnam officials, officers, and intellectuals, many enduring years of political imprisonment. Female combatants, despite comprising significant portions of revolutionary forces, find their contributions minimized in male-dominated commemorations. Ethnic minorities in the central highlands experienced the war as external imposition rather than national liberation, complicating triumphalist narratives. Comparative analysis across the three dimensions reveals crucial asymmetries that explain war outcomes. U. S. intervention provided massive material advantages but proved unable to generate political legitimacy or nationalist credibility. South Vietnamese governments remained perpetually dependent on American support, never achieving the autonomous governance capacity that legitimacy requires. Chinese and Soviet assistance, while militarily significant, operated within Vietnamese strategic frameworks rather than dictating them. Hanoi leveraged great-power rivalry to maximize autonomy, accepting aid without surrendering sovereignty over fundamental decisions regarding war aims, strategy, and political objectives. The decisive factor proved to be indigenous political organization and ideological cohesion. North Vietnam's fusion of nationalism with communism, rooted in decades of anti-colonial struggle, created mobilization capacity that material resources alone could not match. This organizational superiority persisted despite inferior firepower, demonstrating that agency expressed through strategic autonomy, ideological innovation, and popular mobilization can overcome structural constraints when effectively deployed over sustained periods.

Discussions

This research contributes to a growing body of scholarship that reinterprets the Vietnam War as more than a passive episode within Cold War geopolitics. Far from being merely the object of superpower rivalry, Vietnam exercised sustained agencyretaining sovereignty, shaping strategies, and ultimately claiming victory on its own terms.

The findings challenge reductionist East–West binaries by demonstrating the limits of external power. U.S. escalation anchored in military intervention and ideological containment

was extensive but ultimately undermined by a fundamental misreading of Vietnam's political landscape, social resilience, and nationalist traditions. American policymakers consistently underestimated how deeply anti-colonial consciousness permeated Vietnamese society, conflating nationalist aspirations with communist expansionism. This misreading led to strategic errors: supporting unpopular regimes, implementing coercive pacification programs, and pursuing military solutions to fundamentally political problems. Chinese and Soviet assistance, while vital, was filtered through the prism of their own ideological competition (Ang, 2002). Such support never displaced the decisive role of endogenous dynamics: national divisions, ideological radicalization, and grassroots resistance movements that defined the conflict's trajectory. Vietnamese leaders demonstrated sophisticated capacity to leverage great-power rivalry, accepting material support while preserving strategic autonomy. This finding contributes to small-state literature by illustrating how weaker actors can exploit great-power competition to expand their freedom of maneuver.

The Legitimacy Question

Foreign intervention proved incapable of generating domestic legitimacy. The American project to construct a viable South Vietnamese state collapsed under corruption, fragmentation, and declining popular trust. Despite massive investment over $150 billion in military and economic aid the Republic of Vietnam never achieved the political cohesion or nationalist credibility necessary for sustainable governance. Its dependence on external patronage undermined claims to sovereignty, while corruption and repression alienated the population it ostensibly served.

Chinese aid, meanwhile, often served Beijing's rivalry with Moscow more than Hanoi's revolutionary goals, exposing the limitations of external patronage. Soviet support similarly reflected superpower competition rather than pure socialist solidarity. In contrast, Ho Chi Minh's leadership embodied strategic pragmatism: leveraging great-power support while safeguarding ideological autonomy and Vietnamese priorities. His synthesis of Marxism-Leninism with Vietnamese cultural traditions created an ideology that could claim both revolutionary legitimacy and cultural authenticity a feat neither superpower backing nor military technology could replicate (Hickey, 2001).

Contested Memories and Silenced Voices

The war's legacy persists in contested landscapes of memory. Official historiography in Vietnam highlights heroic sacrifice and nationalist triumph, while diasporic voices, survivors, and civil society emphasize trauma, loss, and moral ambiguity. Grappling with these dialectical memories is essential to understanding the war not only as a Cold War battleground but also as a crucible of Vietnamese identity. Here, questions of self-determination, historical memory, and national unity were violently contested yet indigenously defined.

Post-war experiences reveal significant gaps between state mythmaking and lived reality. Re-education camps detained former South Vietnamese officials and officers for years, with many subjected to harsh conditions and political indoctrination. Female combatants, despite comprising up to 40% of southern revolutionary forces in some regions, find their contributions minimized in male-dominated commemoration practices. Ethnic minorities experienced the war as external imposition rather than national liberation, complicating triumphalist narratives that erase heterogeneous experiences.

Diaspora communities, particularly in the United States, Australia, and France, maintain counter-memories that challenge Hanoi's official narrative. These communities commemorate South Vietnamese soldiers, mourn the fall of Saigon as loss rather than liberation, and preserve distinct interpretations of the war's meaning. Recognizing these contested memories does not diminish Vietnamese victory but enriches historical understanding by acknowledging the war's multiplicity of experiences and interpretations.

Theoretical Contributions

This study advances international relations theory by demonstrating that agency and structure exist in dialectical relationship rather than hierarchical determination. Vietnamese actors were neither purely autonomous agents nor wholly constrained by superpower systems. Instead, they navigated structural limits through strategic innovation, ideological adaptation, and exploitation of great-power rivalries. This finding challenges both structural realism's determinism and liberal institutionalism's emphasis on great-power governance, instead highlighting how subaltern actors actively shape international order.

The research also contributes to postcolonial international relations by illustrating how formerly colonized nations resist integration into Cold War binaries while pursuing distinct development trajectories. Vietnamese leaders rejected both American capitalism and strict adherence to Chinese or Soviet models, instead crafting hybrid political-economic systems responsive to local conditions. This strategic essentialism selectively invoking socialist solidarity while maintaining independence demonstrates sophisticated agency that conventional IR frameworks often overlook.

Conclusion and suggestions

Conclusion

The Vietnam War defies its characterization as a mere Cold War proxy, a label that obscures the centrality of Vietnamese agency. While U.S. containment policies, Sino-Soviet rivalries, and global power dynamics shaped the conflict's structural backdrop, its essence lay in the ambitions, contradictions, and resilience of the Vietnamese people. Foreign powers influenced tactics and diplomacy, but they could not command the ideological fervor or grassroots mobilization that sustained the war for decades. Vietnamese political elites, civil society actors, and ordinary citizens were not passive recipients of outside ideologies; they were active architects who negotiated, redefined, and ultimately owned the war's meaning.

This study challenges the structural determinism of Cold War scholarship, which too often reduces smaller nations to pawns of great-power politics. Realpolitik and balance-of-power logic, though relevant, cannot explain the Vietnamese resolve to endure a protracted and costly conflict. That resolve was rooted in indigenous traditions of anti-colonial struggle, a revolutionary culture of discipline, and a nationalist ethos that transcended the socialist–capitalist divide. From peasant uprisings in the Mekong Delta to state-building projects in Hanoi and Saigon, the war unfolded as a Vietnamese-led endeavor shaped primarily by local imperatives (Elliott, 2003).

Crucially, the diversity of Vietnamese wartime experiences undermines simplistic narratives that cast the North as totalitarian aggressors and the South as democratic victims. Both regions grappled with authoritarian governance, crises of legitimacy, and pragmatic adaptations of foreign ideologies. South Vietnam's liberal-capitalist experiment was undermined by U.S. overreach and domestic fragmentation, while North Vietnam's socialist project fused Marxist-Leninist orthodoxy with Confucian ethics and nationalist symbolism, tempered by cautious management of relations with Beijing and Moscow. These complexities reveal an ideological fluidity obscured by Cold War binaries: both states localized foreign models in pursuit of sovereignty and survival.

The war's memory remains contested. Official narratives emphasize revolutionary triumph and collective sacrifice, while diasporic voices, survivors, and marginalized groups foreground trauma, loss, and moral ambiguity. Postwar experiences from re-education camps to the erasure of female combatants demonstrate the gap between state mythmaking and lived

reality. Recognizing these tensions is essential for writing inclusive histories that acknowledge the war's human costs while respecting its multiplicity of voices.

The Vietnam War's legacy reverberates in contemporary geopolitics. Vietnam's current foreign policy balancing U. S. and Chinese power through ASEAN membership, pragmatic bilateralism, and strategic non- alignment echoes its Cold War practice of navigating great-power rivalries. This model of "small- state agency" offers lessons for contemporary middle powers such as Ukraine, Singapore, and Taiwan, which face comparable pressures in an era of renewed U.S.–China competition.

First, the Vietnamese experience demonstrates that material asymmetries do not predetermine outcomes. Superior organization, ideological cohesion, and popular mobilization can offset technological disadvantages when sustained over time. Second, leveraging great-power competition can expand small- state autonomy, though this strategy requires sophisticated diplomacy and willingness to accept material constraints. Third, domestic legitimacy proves more decisive than external patronage for regime survival. No amount of foreign support can substitute for indigenous political organization and popular support.

Future Research Directions

This study opens several avenues for future research. First, deeper investigation of intra- Vietnamese ideological debates would illuminate how revolutionary doctrine evolved in response to wartime exigencies. Archival research in Vietnamese and Chinese sources could reveal the extent of coordination versus tension in Sino- Vietnamese military cooperation. Second, comparative research on other Cold War conflicts including Korea, Afghanistan, and Angola could test whether the patterns of small- state agency identified here apply more broadly. Third, longitudinal studies of memory politics could examine how generational change affects contested narratives, particularly as direct war participants age and digital media enable new forms of commemoration and counter-memory.

Additionally, research should prioritize marginalized perspectives. Oral history projects focused on ethnic minorities, female combatants, and South Vietnamese veterans could recover experiences systematically excluded from dominant narratives. Transnational research tracing diaspora community networks could illuminate how displaced populations construct collective memory across borders. Such research would contribute to more inclusive historiography while deepening understanding of war's enduring social and cultural impacts.

Final Reflections

To conceptualize the Vietnam War as "Vietnam's war" is to invert conventional historiography and center the agency of those long marginalized in superpower- centric narratives. For the Vietnamese, it was a transformative journey: a struggle to transcend colonial legacies, define national identity, and assert self-determination amid geopolitical turbulence. It was fought not only with arms but also with ideas about democracy, religion, class, and sovereignty articulated through protests, publications, and rituals as much as through military campaigns. Amplifying these voices is essential for constructing a history that honors the multiplicity of experiences, acknowledges the war's enduring relevance for postcolonial statecraft, and challenges the persistent myth of small nations as passive actors in global conflicts.

Suggestions

Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations are proposed for scholars, educators, policymakers, and memory institutions:

1. For historical scholarship: Scholars examining Cold War conflicts should prioritize indigenous sources and local agency rather than defaulting to superpower-centric frameworks. This requires multilingual archival research, engagement with non- Western historiographies, and integration of oral histories from marginalized communities. Methodologically,

researchers should adopt decentered analytical frameworks that treat smaller nations as co-architects of international order rather than passive recipients of great-power designs.

2. For public historians and museum curators: Commemorative institutions should incorporate contested memories and diaspora perspectives into exhibitions and programming. Rather than presenting monolithic national narratives, museums can create dialogic spaces where competing interpretations coexist and visitors engage critically with multiple perspectives. This approach promotes reconciliation by validating pluralistic memory while acknowledging historical complexity.

3. For educators: Curriculum development should emphasize multiperspectival approaches to conflict history. Rather than teaching the Vietnam War as simply "U.S. versus communism," educators can explore Vietnamese agency, Sino-Vietnamese relations, domestic political struggles in both North and South, and contested postwar memories. Primary sources including Vietnamese documents, oral histories, and cultural productions should supplement Western diplomatic archives to provide balanced perspectives.

4. For policymakers and diplomatic practitioners: Contemporary small and middle powers can draw strategic lessons from Vietnamese experience, particularly regarding navigating great-power competition while maintaining autonomy. This requires sophisticated diplomacy that leverages rivalries between larger powers, builds domestic legitimacy independent of external patronage, and maintains long-term commitment to sovereignty even under material constraints. Policymakers should recognize that external support cannot substitute for indigenous political organization and popular legitimacy.

5. For peace and reconciliation initiatives: Post-conflict societies benefit from acknowledging diverse wartime experiences rather than imposing monolithic narratives. Reconciliation processes should create platforms for diaspora communities, former adversaries, and marginalized groups to share perspectives without requiring consensus on historical interpretation. Such initiatives can validate competing memories while building shared commitment to peaceful coexistence.

6. For future research: Scholars should pursue several underexamined topics: intra-Vietnamese ideological debates, particularly how revolutionary doctrine evolved in response to wartime pressures; female combatants' experiences and their systematic erasure from official memory; ethnic minority perspectives on the war as external imposition; and transnational diaspora memory networks. Methodologically, future research should combine archival work with ethnographic approaches, oral history projects, and digital humanities methods for analyzing cultural memory. By adopting these approaches, scholars, educators, and practitioners can produce more inclusive histories, promote nuanced public understanding of complex conflicts, and extract strategic lessons relevant to contemporary international relations. The Vietnam War's legacy extends far beyond historical interest it offers enduring insights into small-state agency, the limits of military power, and the constitutive role of memory in shaping national identity and international order.

New knowledge and the effects on society and communities

This research contributes new knowledge by reframing the Vietnam War as a Vietnamese-centered process rather than a Cold War episode. By synthesizing archival evidence with cultural and memory-based analysis, it highlights how Vietnamese leaders and communities actively shaped the conflict's trajectory and meaning. Three primary contributions emerge:

First, the study demonstrates that small-state agency operates through multiple mechanisms beyond conventional diplomatic maneuvering. Vietnamese actors leveraged great-power rivalry, localized foreign ideologies, built domestic legitimacy through revolutionary mobilization, and maintained strategic autonomy despite material dependence. This multi-dimensional agency model advances international relations theory by moving beyond binary conceptions of power and resistance (Ninh, 2002).

Second, the research illuminates the decisive role of legitimacy over material capabilities. The Republic of Vietnam's collapse despite massive American support, contrasted with communist victory despite inferior firepower, underscores that sustainable governance requires indigenous political organization and popular support rather than merely external patronage.

Third, by integrating contested memories and marginalized voices, the study challenges monolithic state narratives. Recognition of diaspora perspectives, female combatants' contributions, ethnic minority experiences, and post-war silencing enriches historical understanding while promoting more inclusive public memory.

The societal implications are multifaceted. For memory and reconciliation, this perspective promotes inclusive public discourse by acknowledging diverse Vietnamese experiences, including those of diaspora communities who maintain distinct interpretations of the war. Such recognition does not undermine national unity but enriches it by validating pluralistic memory rather than imposing monolithic narratives. This approach supports reconciliation by creating space for dialogue between competing commemorative communities.

For education, the research provides frameworks for teaching complex conflicts without reducing them to binary oppositions. Students can understand how Vietnamese actors negotiated constraints while exercising agency, how ideological labels like "communist" or "capitalist" obscure local complexities, and how historical interpretation remains contested across communities. This nuanced pedagogy cultivates critical thinking about power, agency, and memory.

For policymakers and contemporary small states, the study offers strategic lessons on navigating great-power competition. Vietnam's ability to maintain autonomy while accepting great-power support, leverage Sino-Soviet rivalry, and ultimately survive superpower conflict demonstrates that material asymmetries do not predetermine outcomes. Contemporary middle powers facing renewed U.S.-China competition can draw insights from Vietnamese strategic flexibility, domestic legitimacy-building, and long-term commitment to sovereignty. By recovering the agency of Vietnam, the study affirms that smaller nations can leverage global rivalries to pursue sovereignty an enduring lesson in both history and international relations. This reframing challenges persistent narratives that position non-Western nations as passive objects of great-power competition, instead recognizing their capacity to shape regional and global orders.

References

Ang, C. G. (2002). *The Vietnam War from the other side*. Routledge.

Asselin, P. (2002). *A bitter peace: Washington, Hanoi, and the making of the Paris Agreement*. University of North Carolina Press.

Chen, J. (1995). *China's road to the Korean War: The making of the Sino-American confrontation*. Columbia University Press.

Elliott, D. W. P. (2003). The Vietnamese war: Revolution and social change in the Mekong Delta, 1930–1975. *Journal of Vietnamese Studies, 3*(2), 227–231. https://doi.org/10.1525/vs.2008.3.2.227

Heineman, K. J. (2001). A Catholic New Deal: Religion and reform in Depression Pittsburgh. *Church History, 70*(3), 595-597. https://doi.org/10.2307/3654533

Hickey, G. C. (2001). *The war in Vietnam: Studies in the social and cultural history of the Army of the Republic of Vietnam*. University Press of Kansas.

Kwon, H. (2006). *After the massacre: Commemoration and consolation in Ha My and My Lai*. University of California Press.

Kwon, H. (2008). *Ghosts of war in Vietnam*. Cambridge University Press.

Lewy, G. (1978). *America in Vietnam*. Oxford University Press.

Melanson, R. A. (2000). *American foreign policy since the Vietnam War: The search for consensus from Nixon to Clinton*. M. E. Sharpe.

Ninh, K. N. B. (2002). *A world transformed: The politics of culture in revolutionary Vietnam, 1945–1965*. University of Michigan Press.

Schwenkel, C. (2009). *The American War in contemporary Vietnam: Transnational remembrance and representation*. Indiana University Press.

Thayer, G. (1985). *The war business: The international trade in armaments*. Simon & Schuster.

Thu, H, L. (2018). Vietnam’s communist revolution: The power and limits of ideology. *Contemporary Southeast Asia, 40*(2), 336-338. https://www.jstor.org/stable/26539186

Zhai, Q. (2001). China and the Vietnam wars, 1950–1975. *Political Science Quarterly, 116*(2), 321-323. https://doi.org/10.2307/798074