

6 August 1957

MEMORANDUM TO: Doctor Wesley R. Fishel, Chief Advisor

FROM: Jack E. Ryan, Acting Chief
Police Administration Division

SUBJECT: Comments Regarding Civil Police Administration
Report, dated 1 May 1957.

The Civil Police Administration Program Report prepared by the staff of police advisors of the MSU Viet-Nam Advisory Group at Saigon, Viet-Nam and dated 1 May 1957, is a report whose principal purposes are to provide a brief review of the American Aid Police Program and to set forth recommended equipment to be furnished the Civil Police Forces of Viet-Nam. *

The United States Government has agreed to support and give technical assistance to three (3) civil police forces only: the Civil Guard, the VBI (Sureté) and to municipal police forces in some twenty-two (22) of the more important communities of Viet-Nam. One of the cardinal prerequisites to American assistance is that these police forces be made up of and controlled by civilians rather than by the military. The total estimated costs for American Aid equipment for FY-56, FY-57 and FY-58 are approximately 10,000,000 U.S. dollars. This includes approximately 4,000,000 U.S. dollars for transportation, \$765,000,000 for ammunition, \$2,700,000 for weapons, \$1,500,000 for communications and over one million U.S. dollars for miscellaneous items, such as training aids, office equipment and various laboratory equipment. The equipment figures for FY-57 and FY-58 have not as yet been approved in Washington. A strong economy drive is being felt in Washington, whose intent is to reduce American foreign aid. There is a possibility that the overall cost estimates included in the MSUG Report may not be approved. An important factor could well be that basic recommendations made to the Vietnamese Government in early 1956 have not been implemented, even on an experimental or trial basis. No legislation has been forthcoming which clearly defines or delimits the responsibilities or the missions of the various civil police agencies in Viet-Nam. The VBI (Sureté) and the Civil Guard

* The figures included in the MSUG Report are based on studies conducted throughout the country during the past two years. They are designed to insure a maximum of efficiency at a minimum cost.

Memorandum to Doctor Wesley R. Fishel

6 August 1957

SUBJECT: Comments Regarding Civil

Police Administration Report, dated 1 May 1957.

have not been properly reorganized. The Gendarmerie has not been transferred to the Civil Guard, or left in the Army of the Republic of Viet-Nam as a military police organization. Full Vietnamese Government support has not been had in the development of a Central Identification Division and a Central Criminal Records Division within the VBI (Surete), whose services would be available to all police agencies in Viet-Nam. The exact mission of the Civil Guard, whether civil or military, has not been clearly defined. This is important because USOM and MSUG cannot support a military organization. It is the consensus of the staff of police advisors of MSUG that, in general, soldiers make very poor police officers by virtue of their training and attitudes. History teaches us this lesson in many, many places.

As a result of the lack of real progress in these matters there may well develop a certain reluctance on the part of ICA in Washington to approve the investment of such a large sum of money for the development of Vietnamese police forces.

The most glaring weaknesses in the Vietnamese police today are: (1) lack of delimitation of responsibility, (2) lack of sound organization, (3) lack of adequate training, (4) lack of proper equipment, (5) an over-abundance of Army officers assigned to the Civil Guard, and (6) too much political interference in routine matters of a police nature. It is firmly believed that frank and willing cooperation between Vietnamese Government officials and MSUG will result in the elimination of these problems in a minimum amount of time, to the benefit of the people of Viet-Nam.

JER/mmd

JACK E. RYAN, Acting Chief
Police Administration Division

Mr. Leland Barrows,
Director of USOM - Saigon

15 August 1957

Jack E. Ryan, Acting Chief, Police Administration Division.

Meeting with Mr. Nguyen-Huu-Chau.

Yesterday afternoon, August 14, I attended a meeting called by Mr. Nguyen-Huu-Chau, the Minister of Interior. The meeting was held for the purpose of briefly discussing the Vietnamese Government's reaction to the MSUG Civil Police Administration Program Report, dated May 1 and revised July 25, 1957. Mr. Chau stated that the Report had been read by the President and others at the Palace. He stated that the Government's reaction was one of approval. However, he pointed out that the present and future status of each police service would be outlined from presentation to MSUG-USOM.

Mr. Chau agreed emphatically that the Civil Guard should be developed as a civil police organization. His remarks regarding the Civil Guard were complimentary and varied widely from those made by the President of late. The matter of defining the exact status of the Civil Guard was pointed out to the Minister in order that certain equipment problems be properly handled on the American side of the matter. Mr. Chau agreed.

The problems of reorganization, delimitation of authority among the police services and the intended status of the Gendarmerie were discussed also. The Minister asserted that certain progress had already been made in studying these matters and that decisions would be forthcoming soon.

At any rate, Mr. Chau intends to call you and General Williams together within the next two weeks for a general meeting on this overall subject. I was told yesterday by Mr. Chapman, of the Embassy, that there is a possibility that the Ambassador will call such a meeting with you two gentlemen before his going to see the President personally. Frankly, in my opinion, the latter solution is the better of the two. Chau might well have a few twists to inject into his reporting to the President. It is better to deal directly with the latter.

Also, I learned that the excess Thompson sub-machine guns are actually in Viet-Nam. The matter was called to General Williams' attention late last week - Saturday, I believe.

Mr. Barrows, I do not believe that we are in as bad a position as we originally thought. The President naturally wants the Self-Defense Corps to be kept up to strength at no cost to his Government - wonder how many of those funds are actually being siphoned off by the Civil Guard?

(Next Page)

Memorandum to Mr. Leland Barrows,
Director of USOM
SUBJECT: Meeting with Mr. Nguyen-Huu-Chau

15 August 1957

A few weeks before his demise, General Oai allegedly gave strict orders that MAAG was not to be given any information regarding either the Civil Guard or the Self-Defense Corps budgets.

I will be in Bangkok during the next few days - will return to Saigon on August 21. Gil Shelby is now Acting Chief and can assist you if needed.

JER/mmd

JACK E. RYAN, Acting Chief
Police Administration Division

Mr. Herb Roberts,
Personnel Officer

24 October 1957

Jack E. Ryan, Deputy Chief, Police Administration

Proposed MSUG Personnel Evaluation Form.

The following comments regarding the proposed MSUG Personnel Evaluation Form are made strictly in the sense of positive criticism. In the whole, I approve of the form. However, there are two points I should like to present here:

(1) A review of the form indicates that no place has been provided for the employee being rated to affix his signature. An evaluation of an employee by his supervisor provides the latter with a golden opportunity to inform the former of his weaknesses and deficiencies. When handled properly, this results in a better employee-supervisor relationship and, consequently, a more efficient organization. In addition, when the employee is afforded an opportunity to read his personnel rating form, he feels that his supervision is sufficiently frank and honest to explain in the open its opinion of his activities. He cannot, therefore, make the charge that secret considerations were utilized in judging his performance during a given period. My experiences both as an employee and as a supervisor for General Mills, the United States Air Force, and the FBI are the bases upon which I advance this recommendation. Each of these organizations require that the employee see and sign his evaluation forms.

(2) In Part III, you have included two questions dealing with the evaluation of the employee's wife and children. As was the case last year, I am strongly opposed to this type of an evaluation. Only those wives or children who are employed by MSUG should be rated - all others should not be rated. If the activities and opinions of a dependent affect the work of an employee, it can be reasonably assumed that this will be reflected in some way and will, consequently, be graded as part of the normal evaluation of said employee. If this is true, there should be no need whatever of attempting to judge the opinions or activities of dependents.

In conclusion, I might add that the basis upon which to judge dependents could easily become one of personal consideration rather than objective fact.

JER/mmd