

June 14, 1960

Mr. A. F. Brandstatter, Director  
School of Police Administration & Public Safety  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Dear Art:

This is just a hasty note after returning from my vacation to alert you about our plans out here.

We understand that Mr. Gardiner will be visiting the East Lansing campus during the latter part of June or early July. We are just about finished with the participant report and hope to get it in the mail by June 22 or 23, which should put it in your hands prior to your departure for Washington. I am also preparing material for briefing President Hannah on the situation out here which he will use in his meetings with Gardiner. This will be in the mail by June 18.

I realize that your schedule for Washington reserve officer duty cannot be changed; however, we all think it most important that you be present when Gardiner is on campus. If this is absolutely impossible, I hope you can arrange to see him while you are in Washington.

We had an excellent vacation and are looking forward to hearing from you about your trip home.

Sincerely,

RALPH F. TURNER, Chief  
Police Administration Division

cc: Musolf  
Austin

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC SERVICE  
SCHOOL OF POLICE ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC SAFETY

June 9, 1960

Mr. Ralph F. Turner, Chief  
Police Administration Division  
MSUG, Box 34  
APO 143  
San Francisco, California

Dear Ralph:

Enclosed is the corrected copy of the certificate for  
Truong Duc Trieu. I shall appreciate it if you will forward  
it to him.

Very shortly, I plan to send you a long letter. At the  
moment, I am trying to get caught up on the work which  
accumulated during my absence from the office.

Yours sincerely,



A. F. Brandstatter  
Director

br  
Enc.

*P.S. I'll also have  
a reply for Walton  
memo in few days*

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING

---

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC SERVICE  
SCHOOL OF POLICE ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC SAFETY

June 9, 1960

Mr. Ralph F. Turner, Chief  
Police Administration Division  
MSUG, Box 34  
APO 143  
San Francisco, California

Dear Ralph:

Just a short note to respond to Walton's memo. I shall write a longer letter in a few days.

On previous trips to Saigon, I was not requested by USOM or M.S.U. to make written reports. I was informed that it was not necessary, in view of the nature of the visit, and in subsequent correspondence with Howard Hoyt, we confirmed discussions with each other. During previous visits, we were primarily concerned with recruitment problems and plans for the immediate future in terms of the total program, as well as specific projects. Our decisions and conclusions were reflected in subsequent planning reports and other types of reports submitted by Howard Hoyt. To keep USOM fully informed on the occasion of each previous visit, I met for at least one and a half or two hours with Leland Barrows, USOM Director. We discussed in great detail the purpose of my visit, the conclusions we had reached, and the fact that Howard Hoyt was informed and would maintain the liaison Mr. Barrows felt necessary. A written report was not requested, although I would have been pleased to submit one, if desired. Frankly, during Barrows' administration of the USOM program, there was complete trust and confidence between our respective groups, and the feeling that USOM must look over our shoulder all the time and re-examine our work did not exist nor was it necessary. Further, there has not been any evidence presented to me to support Walton's attitude toward our program.

Regarding Walton's memo of May 24, 1960, if you try to comply with it, I have a few suggestions to offer, as follows:

1. What does he mean by "significant portions of such conversations"? What does he consider significant?
2. Does he want a representative on every field trip, including the trips to Rach-Dua, and if so, for what purpose? It seems to me this is costly and unnecessary.
3. If we are to have a representative of P.S.D. at our staff meetings, we should have one of our staff at their meetings for the same reasons.

Mr. Turner

-2-

June 9, 1960

Also, as long as Walton is merely suggesting we make the arrangements he has outlined, I suggest we counter with our own suggestions.

Good luck.

Cordially,



A. F. Brandstatter  
Director

AFB:br  
cc: Ruben Austin

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY EAST LANSING

---

COLLEGE OF BUSINESS AND PUBLIC SERVICE  
SCHOOL OF POLICE ADMINISTRATION AND PUBLIC SAFETY

June 15, 1960

Mr. Ralph F. Turner, Chief  
Police Administration Division  
MSUG, Box 34  
APO 143  
San Francisco, California

Dear Ralph:

This letter will be an attempt to bring you up to date on my trip home, as well as a few things that have happened since my arrival in East Lansing.

Initially, let me answer the questions you asked about the Volkswagen:

1. The cost of the Volkswagen Micro Bus, Lansing, is \$2408, which includes sales tax, license, and title; this is not the deluxe model.
2. The cost of the Karmin Ghia coupe is \$2622 and the convertible is \$2895. Both of these prices include sales tax, license, and title.
3. To obtain a Karmin Ghia in July 1961 in Lansing, it will be necessary to place your order at least four months in advance and make a \$100 deposit, which will be returned if the order is cancelled.

This information has been obtained from the Volkswagen authorized sales and service, Continental Imports, 226 East Kalamazoo.

I got a letter dated June 1 over your signature which was apparently dictated by Handville, requesting information about anti-counterfeiting methods and identification cards. I have asked Bob Sheehan to offer some suggestions regarding this request; his reply is enclosed. Perhaps it would be better for me to contact some of these agencies Sheehan lists; however, it occurred to me you may know more about them than he does. If you will let me know which ones to contact and the type of questions to ask, I shall do so.

Enroute home, I stopped in Bangkok and made arrangements for Mr. Siranak, Director of Customs, to meet you, as well as Frank Skobern, Deputy Chief, PSD/USOM. Both of these gentlemen knew Thavi Vatanasook and promised to get word to him of your arrival and requesting that he meet you, also. I hope they all kept their promise. Please let me know if they did.

My trip home was highlighted by two visits I made, namely, to the University of Cambridge and the University of Glasgow. At Cambridge, I had an appointment with Dr. Radzinowicz, the director of the Institute of Criminology. I had an extremely fruitful visit with him and learned in considerable detail the plans and developments that are taking place at Cambridge regarding undergraduate and graduate

courses in criminology, as well as research that is being contemplated in this field. They are beginning a seminar in July for high-ranking police officials in Britain. Incidentally, the entire concept of the institute is being supported by the highest ranking police officials in the British Government, as well as by the academicians at Cambridge. Radzinowicz has been successful in obtaining a grant of funds from the Ford Foundation to support very generous fellowships to be granted to American educators and/or law enforcement administrators who are qualified to lecture or conduct research at the University of Cambridge. The first fellowship is being granted to Professor Thorstin Sellin of the University of Pennsylvania, who will be at Cambridge in 1961. At the University of Glasgow, I met with Sir Hector Hetherington, Principal, and Professor John Mack, a sociologist who is engaged in extensive research involving crime statistics in Scotland, especially in the City of Glasgow. The rest of the trip home was pretty much routine, visiting officials, being shown facilities, with the exception of my visit to Ankara, Turkey. Needless to say, everything was in the state of turmoil and an eight o'clock curfew had been imposed by the Government. However, I was able to meet all the ranking police officials, including the Minister of Interior, Dr. Gedik, who committed suicide a few days later.

The most important news I have to report to you is the deep concern that exists on campus regarding the relationship between MSUG and USOM. Since my return, I have reported in detail to Ruben Austin, Ralph Smuckler, Glen Taggart, and to Seelye. President Hannah has written me a note, asking me to report to him, also, and I am momentarily waiting for an appointment to see him. Ruben Austin was in Washington last weekend and received information that Gardiner is carrying on his campaign against Michigan State University in Washington. Gardiner has been invited to come to East Lansing and I understand he has accepted the invitation; we expect him to be here the latter part of this month or the first week in July. It is Seelye's intention to have Fishel, Weidner, Taggart, Smuckler, Austin, and myself present at the meeting with Gardiner. He intends to ask very bluntly what is bothering Gardiner and, also, to put all our cards on the table. Therefore, I understand that a request has been made of Musolf and yourself to offer documentary evidence of the problems that you have encountered which would reflect the lack of integrity or the lack of faith and confidence in the Michigan State personnel and/or program. I hope you will supply Seelye with all the information you can, as I think it is important that the matter of relationships be clarified as Michigan State's reputation, as well as individual members of the staff who have served in Vietnam, may be jeopardized by the allegations that are being made by Gardiner and others from Saigon. I do not believe there is any intent on the part of either Al Seelye or President Hannah to create any problems for you, but, rather, to attempt to resolve them and to perhaps make the next two and a half years easier for all of us. It is Seelye's full intention to continue to remain in Saigon until our contract terminates; however, there is no desire to continue beyond June 1962, in view of the present strained relationships.

For your information, I have submitted a special report of my observations and conclusions of the relationships between Michigan State and USOM and have placed the full responsibility for these problems on USOM. I addressed myself in this report specifically to Walton's attitude and based my statements primarily on the meeting we had with Coster and Walton and information I picked up from Public Safety officials in other countries, one of whom informed me Walton had made the statement he intended to discredit the MSU police program in Vietnam.

This latter information is confidential and I urge you not to reveal it to anyone, as it was given to me in confidence; but it is another bit of information that I believe confirms our suspicion of Walton's motives. Incidentally, I did not solicit this information from the person who gave it to me, who was appalled by this attitude and stated that in his opinion Americans were not overseas for the purpose of discrediting other American programs. I have extracted the following excerpt from a letter I received from Ralph Smuckler dated December 5, 1958, in which he reflects Theo Hall's comments about our program:

"My main reason for writing is to pass along some of the comments Theo Hall made while he was here. He stated in the presence of Gardiner and others that this police project is probably the best any place in the world. He feels that our training work has gone along very well and that in many respects we have refined our advisory and training work beyond that in other countries. Of course, Howard Hoyt, Jack Ryan, and the others who have participated in the project can feel very proud of the accomplishment. I am sure that the work out here will serve your Department in very good stead over the years ahead. It was very good to get these compliments from Theo Hall since he is very experienced in these things and has been in close touch with many of the police advisors in different parts of the world over the last year."

I have called Mr. Ruppard in Washington for the purpose of making an appointment with him in order to present my report regarding the participant program. He informs me that he will not be available, except on the 7th or 8th of July, and I am not certain I can be in Washington on those dates. In any event, if I cannot be there, he has asked me to report to Colonel Kimberling, which I shall do, but I would prefer to report to Ruppard, as you know. I will be on military duty in Washington for the period of July 10 to 22 and had hoped to see Ruppard on July 25 or 26. If you can send the report that both you and Vic are drawing up for me to East Lansing by July 1, I believe I can be prepared and perhaps rearrange my schedule to permit me to be in Washington on the 7th or 8th of July.

Regarding NewMarch, I have interviewed him and, also, uncovered some information which is most disturbing. Therefore, I have seen him, again, and have been reassured by him that the information I have should not be disturbing, as he has conquered his problem. Frankly, he was an alcoholic about five years ago; however, he has not had a drink since then, and in checking with State Police officials, this has been confirmed. He is a member of A.A. and has been very active in Masonic and DeMolay organizations in Lansing. This is the only problem, if it can be stated as such, with NewMarch, and I am torn by the risk involved in his appointment. At the moment, I do not know what my decision will be, as we are making some further checks, in view of this new information; but, if it is in his favor and we decide to hire him, I know that if anyone understands my dilemma, you will appreciate my position more than anyone else and will realize that I have reached a conclusion that this man can do the job and that I have faith in his moral strength to continue to control his problem. Needless to say, this is a calculated risk, but I am willing to take it; however, if we hire him, you will be forewarned and can exercise the supervision necessary in a situation of this kind.

May I close by expressing my sincere thanks to both you and Arnella for the most generous hospitality accorded me while in Vietnam. I hope your visit to

Mr. Turner

-4-

June 15, 1960

Bangkok and Malaya was pleasant and interesting. Regards to everybody.

Yours sincerely,

af

A. F. Brandstatter  
Director

AFB:br  
Enc.

P.S. The cable asking us to stop recruitment of Newmarch arrived this morning, so we are delaying any decision. We have also ched with AA & everybody gives him a clean bill of health reflecting the utmost faith in him -

af  
-



June 16, 1960

Dear Art:

The enclosed document is a resume of MSU-USOM relationships which I prepared at Lloyd's request in answer to Austin's memo for background information to brief Pres. Hannah prior to his meeting with Gardiner. We have urged Austin, and I also urge you to cull it very carefully so Pres. Hannah will not be airing dirty linen with Gardiner, however, we feel he should have this information in addition to more formal reports so that he can get a reasonable picture of the situation out here.

Enclosed also please find an account of some of the more trying incidents which make daily working relationships with USOM difficult. No copy of this is going to Austin. We feel that the incidents are so petty and childish that they should not be preserved in E.L. files, however, they again illustrate the nature of our difficulties. Knowing your relationship with Pres. Hannah, I trust you will handle this in a manner which will not become embarrassing to you, me, and MSU at some later date. Who, knows, Walton may someday be working for MSU, or vice versa. Stranger things have happened. I want the record to indicate that I personally am very reluctant to put these items down in writing, and would personally see USOM-MSU differences settled on a higher plane, however, Lloyd feels that we have to fight fire with fire. We generally suspect that Walton carries incidents of this type to Gardiner...all of which result in further charges of non cooperation on the part of MSU. As Lloyd has indicated in his memos, Gardiner seems willing to accept this sort of thing.

You had one little example how Walton seems prone to jump to conclusions and is willing to report rumor and hearsay to his superiors. The unfortunate thing about this is that my meetings with him generally are satisfactory, I don't get mad, and usually have evidence to support any propositions which I may present. Most of the time he agrees with the presentation, sets out a course of action, but all too frequently he will change his mind several times after an initial agreement.

As you know also, I have no personal animosity toward him, and have a high regard for his professional experience. The difficulty seems to be that he is an unpredictable administrator.

Anyway, you use your own judgement as to how much of this you wish to discuss with Pres. Hannah. I hope that Hannah can resolve problems with Gardiner without getting into this type of discussion.

We out here feel that Gardiner may take one of several courses. Knowing Pres. Hannah's stature in Washington, and considering that he is a guest of MSU, Gardiner may be very non committal....or he may still be mad at MSU and really give you a lecture as he has given us out here. The thing we know nothing about is Pres. Hannah's contemplated future relations with ICA. If he wants to get tough with Gardiner, fine....only then we expect Gardiner will take it out on us ( unless he respects Hannah's prestige ). On the other hand, Hannah may feel the Viet Nam project, now nearing completion, is expendable in view of future long range relationships between ICA and MSU. If so, we understand. In any event, I hope you will be present for the meetings and will give me a full report. Incidentally, you may wish to talk with Jack and see if he wants to confront Gardiner about the Colgrove-Lucas allegations. This could be interesting.

I was very sorry that I missed the Commencement Day address. How did my good friend do? I'm waiting to hear from you, Jack and Mary.

More letters will be forthcoming as soon as the current crisis is over. The participant report, 100 pages or more, will be in the mail in a few days. Hope it gets there while Gardiner is around. If he asks about it, tell him its finished ...and we're loaded for bear.

Sincerely,

1. Sometime in late Oct. or early Nov., 1959 Walton told me that he had heard that a USOM auditor, (Viet Nameese) had been threatened, abused, intimidated, etc. by the VBI. I was to do something about this immediately. Investigation showed that he had received the story third hand, completely garbled, with no truth whatsoever to the incident.
2. Nov. 24, 1959. Walton stated the in his ~~opion~~ opinion he thought Smuckler felt MSU was not responsible to USOM for its actions. "Thank God he's (Smuckler) leaving".
3. Nov. 24, 1959. Gardiner mentioned to me a a farewell dinner for Smuckler, "I'm going to Hong Kong regional USOM Directors meeting to find out 'What's wrong with contractors' ".
4. Dec.1, 1959. Gardiner made statement to Smuckler re: his suspicions about Ryan.
5. Dec. 18, 1959. E-1 Form (personnell and budget projection for forthcoming fiscal year) changed by Walton without consultation with MSU. He assigned 5 USOM technicians to supervise and coordinate MSU program. This matter brought to Gardiner's attention Dec. 19. See Musolf report.
6. Dec. 23, 1959. Hemmye presents MSU proposal for radio communications program. Walton agreeable to proposals. Following this Walton called subsequent meetings with other radio consultants. End result was that he decided to reject Hemmye and Simek (USOM) proposals. Vernon told me to leave this part out of Dec. monthly report. "Walton would hit the ceiling if it were reported in this manner."
7. Feb. 12, 1960. See Austin report of his meeting with Gardiner.
8. Feb. 16, 1960. Walton and Gardiner make unilateral decision on single, integrated communication system. Durbrow advises GVN.
9. Mar. 4, 1960 Walton suspects that Hemmye has information on Surete manpower distribution and refuses to give it to him. Hemmye tells me he does not have the information. Walton threatens to cut off MSU financial support for communications program for Surete. Vernon and Walton both accuse Hemmye of disloyalty. Turner calms everybody down and gets information from Gen. La. What a day this was.

10. March. 4, 1960 Walton, with Vernon present, agrees that MSU should recruit a replacement for Hemmye. (This decision changed by Walton June 7 without consultation with MSU.)
11. Mar. 7, 1960. Walton hears rumor that Hemmye is using project car for personal driving. Investigated and found completely inaccurate and without basis. No apology .
12. Mar. 24, 1960 VBI Command Officers School graduation. Walton and Vernon not invited by VBI. Vernon complains.
13. Apr. 28, 1960. Meeting with Gardiner. Walton complaining about lack of MSU cooperation. Criticizing forthcoming tours of Brandstatter and Nicol.
14. May 19, 1960. Brandstatter, Walton, Turner meet with Coster.
15. May 25, 1960. Turner takes vacation.
16. June 13, 1960. New crises develop.

## RESUME OF MSU-USOM RELATIONSHIPS

The following resume of observations and opinions relative to current MSU-USOM relationships is brief and only deals with events from July 1959 to the present, with a few references to prior events which are either a matter of record or have been related by MSU staff members who were present in Saigon prior to mid-1959. It is suggested that the Viet Nam Coordinator's office consult with all returned staff members who are on campus for verification of certain portions of this report and for additional briefing information. In an effort to highlight, what in our opinion constitute the areas of conflict, the report has been subdivided into sections dealing with specific problems.

### I. General Philosophy of MSU Program.

As a result of recent discussions with USOM officials, and more specifically, the completion of the USOM Auditor's report (a copy of which has been sent to Mr. Brandstatter), there is gradually emerging the idea that one of the basic difficulties lies within the MSU-ICA contract. Review of previous contracts and Project Agreements indicates that responsibilities, goals, elements of supervision, etc., both on the part of MSU and USOM, have not been spelled out in a careful and precise manner. This shortcoming has been brought to the forefront since the creation of the USOM Public Safety Division. Prior to the establishment of USOM/PSD, MSU was given, or assumed, rather generous portions of responsibility and authority. We are now being held accountable for these past actions. Unfortunately, we have very few friends in court at this moment, for nearly all of the USOM and Embassy people who were on the scene during the period 1955-1959 have been replaced. Many of the newcomers have had no foreign service experience, have no knowledge whatsoever of what conditions were like in the early days of the program, and have no valid experience to evaluate the accomplishments to date. This is further complicated by the fact that some individuals appear to have a hostile attitude toward the MSU program and came equipped with many preconceived opinions as to how the program should be conducted. Naturally, this could be the result of orientation by ICA/W, or it could be legitimate criticism of past MSU errors. If the latter be the case, MSU has never been so advised in an honest and objective evaluation of MSU's accomplishments and mistakes. Thus, East Lansing should avail itself of the knowledge of Weidner, Fishel, Smuckler, Hoyt, Ryan, etc., for a summary of the facts which would present the philosophy and goals of the MSU program as it was conceived and implemented in 1955. Recent reports from Musolf, supplemented by the observations of Austin and Brandstatter, should serve to present the current picture with regard to changes in interpretation by USOM of MSU's role in Viet Nam.

## II. The Security Problem.

Unquestionably, the current deterioration of the internal security within Viet Nam, particularly in the south, has contributed to the air of tension which has developed. A review of the security situation was forwarded to East Lansing a short time ago. Since that report situations have not changed materially. Brandstatter can supply the most recent "on the spot" opinion. As of this writing there appears to be a slight sense of optimism on the part of GVN that they are getting things under control. Naturally, we all hope that matters will continue to progress favorably; however, everyone is still prepared for new and increased offensives on the part of the Viet Cong.

With the present concern over the security condition, many people are, understandably, looking about for the reasons...and also looking about for the scapegoats. Because of MSU's participation in the police program, we, naturally, are one of the targets. Any discussion of this problem would be too long and complex for this report. I refer you to Hoyt, Ryan and Brandstatter for further information. The present staff in Saigon is currently on the receiving end of something which has been building up for several years. We are doing all that we can to handle the current situation. Thus, in any discussions with Mr. Gardiner, there should be a realistic appraisal of the impact of the present situation on the conduct of the program. This applies to both USOM and MSU, for we have observed a certain number of "panic" reactions coupled with some examples of sober judgment.

## III. Civil Guard

The Civil Guard problem has been discussed ad infinitum, and is still a prime topic of conversation. MSU's role is well known to Hoyt and Ryan. In brief retrospect and review, the following can be said. MSU, in 1955, presented GVN with a concept of the organization, responsibilities, and goals of the Civil Guard. Essentially, the suggestions envisioned a rural, civil police force which would not be unlike state police organizations in the United States. This concept never was, and is not now, acceptable to GVN. As a result a stalemate was reached in 1957, with a Country Team decision resulting in the virtual suspension of support for the Civil Guard. In spite of these difficulties, certain progress was made with the Civil Guard; however, a decision was made to transfer support for the Civil Guard from MSU to the newly created USOM/PSD, effective July 1959. As mentioned earlier, internal security conditions in Viet Nam began to deteriorate in late 1959. For many reasons, unknown to MSU, the Viet Nam Army, until recently, has not played a major role in combatting the subversive elements. A poorly equipped and trained Civil Guard, with support from the Surete, has been thrown into the breach.

In simple terms, the following can be stated: MSU envisaged the Civil Guard as a civil police force, operating in peace time conditions, following stateside patterns of law enforcement and administration of justice. USOM/PSD, judging by its present staffing pattern and procurement, has changed this philosophy. The Civil Guard is become para-military in the real sense of the word and is being geared to cope with the present emergency situation. Only time will reveal the merits and wisdom of the two courses of action. Again, one has to compare the conditions as they existed in 1955-57 with the current situation before making any fair appraisals.

#### IV. Communications.

The communications program has probably been the thorniest and most controversial issue, and one in which MSU is open to some deserved criticism. Progress in this field has been marked by a series of unfortunate incidents. The original plan submitted by Williams (deceased) has generally been labelled by all subsequent advisors as too elaborate and complex. The Rundlett plan, while less elaborate, has also been criticized as being too generous, and as a result of subsequent investigation was found to be incomplete and in error in some respects. Hemmye has put together a plan, which aside from certain violent technical disagreements, is generally acceptable.

Criticism of the communications plan can be divided into two parts. One centers about the Rundlett affair, misconduct, allegations of questionable dealings, etc. This is now a thing of the past; however, MSU has never been able to shed the stigma of suspicion as a result of this incident. The other point of contention is the debate about the so-called "separate systems" versus an "integrated system". MSU has been saddled with being proponents of a costly separate system for the Surete and a separate system for the Civil Guard. One of the first acts of USOM/PSD, without the benefit of field trips, consultation with informed parties, and a thorough study of the problem, was to announce that an integrated system to serve both the Civil Guard and Surete would be installed. MSU objected, debated, presented its case...all to no avail. A unilateral decision was made in favor of the integrated system, after which MSU has continually provided its technical resources and support. The initial objections on the part of MSU, based on its years of observation and experience, are continually cited as examples of non-cooperation. It should be stated for the record that even though MSU is participating in the establishment of the integrated system, MSU has serious reservations about the wisdom and ultimate success of the system. This has been reported to USOM and is also used as an example of non-cooperation. The reason for MSU's suggestion of two slightly different technical systems is that given the nature of the role of the Civil Guard vs the Surete, and having a fairly good understanding of the problems within the Vietnamese hierarchy, MSU feels that in the long run, its (MSU) original plan will be of greater benefit to Viet Nam, both in peace time and during an emergency.

#### V. Interpretation of Contract.

As mentioned in earlier paragraphs, interpretation of the MSU contract by both USOM and MSU has been a source of friction. With the creation of the USOM/PSD, there now exists two police advisory groups. Ostensibly, USOM/PSD is to concern itself with the Civil Guard, while MSU is to work with the Surete and Municipal Police. Obviously, with USOM being responsible for the cost of the program, it feels, and justifiably so, that it must exert supervision and control over MSU's activities. The difficulty is in describing and defining this supervision. I refer you to my letter to Brandstatter of May 24, 1960, wherein I enclosed a memo which outlines USOM/PSD version of supervision and cooperation. This, coupled with an aggressive and difficult personality, creates a most discouraging working atmosphere. I have no objections whatsoever to offering complete cooperation with USOM/PSD, but I would prefer to do it in an atmosphere of mutual trust and professional confidence.

#### VI. Congressional Investigations.

Against the backdrop of conditions in Viet Nam, one must also consider the impact of the 1959 congressional investigation of the aid program. While much of the criticism was leveled at USOM programs, MSU was indirectly involved, and achieved some publicity via the Colegrove and Lucas articles, some of which referred to the Rundlett affair. There is also the feeling on the part of Mr. Gardiner that Ryan was responsible for contributing some information to reporters and investigators.

#### VII. Lack of Cooperation with USOM.

MSU has continually been criticized for not cooperating with USOM/PSD. We all have our own opinions as to what constitutes cooperation. Assuming that the MSU staff is competent enough to make routine decisions about the administration of its program within the general framework of the USOM policy, I feel that we should be permitted to conduct our program in the best interests of GVN and and USOM. On important issues I feel that decisions should be made jointly by USOM/PSD and MSU. The following incidents reflect my version of how I attempted to cooperate with USOM/PSD on what I thought were important matters:

1. As soon as I took over, I extended an invitation to Walton to attend a series of briefings by experienced MSU staff members wherein they reviewed the entire MSU program. Walton did not attend a single meeting. Some of his associates did.
2. I offered him the services of experienced staff members to sit in on Country Team meetings when matters concerning the police program were being discussed in an effort to provide background information. This offer was never accepted.



3. I have held several meetings with USOM/PSD wherein all matters of MSU plans for future programs and personnel were discussed.
4. In view of the anticipated problems with the integrated communications system, MSU proposed an experimental set-up before launching a full scale program. This proposal was rejected.
5. The services of Hemmye have been made available to USOM/PSD at all times.
6. With the exception of technical meetings concerning the communications program, there has not been a single time when MSU has been invited to attend meetings for discussion about the total police program.
7. Mr. Gardiner has not consulted with the MSU police advisor about the progress of the police program. One meeting was held at MSU request.
8. MSU takes USOM/PSD personnel on its field trips. However, there have been instances when these personnel, due to their unfamiliarity with the situation, have embarrassed MSU by the nature of their inquiries.

#### VIII. Plans and Goals of MSU.

As a concluding statement, I would like to express my thoughts concerning MSU's role during the remaining years. It has always been, and still is, my desire to

1. Complete the remaining portions of the MSU program in as competent a manner as possible. The attached resume prepared for the Embassy illustrates these plans.
2. In late 1961 provide for an orderly transfer of the program to USOM/PSD which is to be effective July 1962.

Report on Current Situation re: Hemmye Replacement.

1. On Jan. 28, 1960 Saigon prepared a memo re: recruitment of a communications replacement for Hemmye. It was suggested by MSU/Saigon that in view of anticipated developments within the communications field, MSU withdraw and turn the entire project over to USOM.
2. The above suggestion was vetoed in the Feb. 9 memo of Hoyt and Ryan to Brandstatter and supported by Brandstatter in his letter of Feb. 17, 1960
3. March ~~2, 1960~~<sup>4, 1960</sup>. Turner has meeting with Walton. See attached thermofax record of meeting.
4. MSU/EL proceeds with recruiting.
5. May 25, 1960 Turner leaves on vacation; returns to office June 13, 1960. On going through accumulated mail he finds a revised E-1 form, dated June 7, 1960. The significant portion reads: "1 Police Advisor (Communications) responsible for coordinating the activity of the single security network established for the joint use of Civil Guard and Surete. Overall supervision of entire Communications Project. Action deletes similar position MSUG Contract Staff"

At no time was there any discussion between USOM/PSD and MSU (Turner or Musolf) regarding this proposed change.

Upon This matter was immediately taken up with Walton on June 16, 1960. He indicated that he had made this decision in view of the administrative difficulties of working with a contract technician housed in different quarters and had so notified ICA/W. ICA/W replied that it concurred in idea but would take the matter up with MSU/EL. When Walton was shown the memo for the record of March 7, 1960 he no particular comment. When asked why MSU had not been consulted he stated he assumed that ICA/W had contacted MSU/EL and MSU/EL had notified MSU Saigon. He stated further that to his knowledge the matter had not been resolved as yet by ICA/W and he was awaiting further information. On the basis of these developments the cable to stop recruitment on Newmarch was sent immediately.

June 22, 1960

Mr. A. F. Brandstatter, Director  
School of Police Administration  
Michigan State University  
East Lansing, Michigan

Dear Art:

Under separate cover we are sending you three copies of the report on the police participant program. As you will note, there is a blank in the Foreward. Will you please fill this in with regard to the number of participants who have come to the campus. The report is in draft form and you should feel free to change it in any way you see fit. We have presented a rough idea of our recommendations for a Foreign Police Training Institute. Undoubtedly you will want to elaborate on this section.

I hope this reaches you in time for Gardiner's visit to the campus, in the event this topic comes up for discussion. I trust you will take this report with you when you visit ICA/W and IACP in Washington.

I suggest that you send a copy directly to Walton (if you want to), or let me know how you want to handle this.

As you can see, it is a rather extensive report and we will have to have some correspondence with regard to the possible publication of it. I haven't talked with Lloyd Musolf about it; however, will let you know as soon as possible what his reaction is. I don't know if our budget out here will support a publication of the entire document.

I am getting this letter off in a hurry and will write more news as soon as I have time.

Sincerely,

RALPH F. TURNER, Chief  
Police Administration Division

cc: Musolf  
~~Justice~~ no copy to Justice