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INTRODUCTION

The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam has so far submitted six Interim Reports covering its activities from August 11, 1954, to July 31, 1956.

2. This is the Seventh Interim Report of the Commission and contains a summary of its activities from August 1, 1956, to April 30, 1957, and a review of the progress made by the two parties in the implementation of the Agreement on the cessation of hostilities in Vietnam.(1) This Report should be read along with the relevant chapters of the six earlier Interim Reports.

(1) References to "Articles" in the Report are to the Articles of this Agreement. See "Miscellaneous No. 20 (1954)," Cmd. 9239, page 27, et seq.
CHAPTER I

Establishment and Machinery of the International Commission in Vietnam

During the period under review, the International Commission continued its efforts to carry out the tasks assigned to it under Articles 29, 34 and 36 of the Agreement, namely the supervision and control of the proper execution by the parties of the provisions of the Agreement. The Commission held 67 meetings for the transaction of its day-to-day business, bringing the total number of meetings from its inception to 385. Nine mobile teams were sent out for investigation, reconnaissance and control, making a total of 161 since the Commission started its activities. The fixed teams and the committees of the Commission, namely the Operations Committee, the Freedoms Committee and the Legal Committee, continued their activities.

2. The Commission continued to pay periodical visits to Saigon. The question of transfer of the Commission's Headquarters from Hanoi to Saigon has not yet been settled. Towards the end of November, 1956, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam informed the Commission that it could move its Headquarters to Saigon as soon as the necessary logistic arrangements were made. The Commission is pursuing this matter as well as the question of financial arrangements involved in the shift of its Headquarters to Saigon.


4. On the same date the Commission informed the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and the Commander-in-Chief of the Peoples Army of Vietnam that the Commission had reported to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference the new arrangements and had asked for the directions of the Co-Chairmen on the future working of the Commission and that, pending further instructions from the Co-Chairmen, the Commission would deal with the Liaison Mission of the P.A.V.N. High Command in the North, as hitherto, and with the Mission chargée des relations avec la C.I.C. established in Saigon by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam in the South, in the performance of the various tasks assigned to the Commission under the Geneva Agreements(1) and in accordance therewith.

5. The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Cambodia forwarded to this Commission copies of complaints which it had received from the Royal Cambodian Government alleging border incidents and threats of violation of Cambodian territory by the troops of the Republic of Vietnam. These communications were forwarded by this Commission on March 27, 1957, to the Government of the Republic of Vietnam for its information. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam was further informed that the Commission understood that the said Government and the Royal Government of Cambodia had had consultations on the subjects mentioned in the communications and the Commission hoped that these consultations would lead to an amicable settlement. After the issue of the letter and up to the end of the period under review, the Commission received

(1) "Miscellaneous No. 20 (1954)," Cmnd. 9239, pages 11-38.
from the International Commission in Cambodia copies of a few more complaints from the Royal Cambodian Government alleging acts of violation of Cambodian territory by the armed forces of the Republic of Vietnam, the latest incident being said to have taken place on March 25, 1957.

6. The Secretaries-General of the three Commissions in Vietnam, Laos and Cambodia held their fourth co-ordination conference at Saigon from March 29 to March 31, 1957, in accordance with the provisions of Article 45 of the Geneva Agreement. Administrative matters including the question of effecting economy and the rationalisation of various procedures and practices were discussed.

7. The Commission has discontinued its own coastal courier air service in South Vietnam from April 19, 1957, and is using the commercial air services available locally. It has also decided to effect an appreciable reduction in the strength of its Signal staff and to use the communication facilities available locally both in North and South Vietnam. The Commission realises that the substitute services will not be as efficient as its own special arrangements but is satisfied that the change-over will not be detrimental to the functioning of the Commission.

8. In paragraph 81 of the Sixth Interim Report reference was made to the question of the improvement of air services for the maintenance of teams in North Vietnam. The Commission has since been able, where necessary, to use alternative means which it considers satisfactory and has therefore decreased its air support requirements accordingly without affecting in any way its control duties. The Commission had requested the P.A.V.N. High Command to renovate the air strip at Tien Yen for use by light aircraft for evacuation purposes in case of emergency. A reply is awaited from the High Command.

9. During the period under review, four persons died while serving on the Commission in South Vietnam. Major A. N. Mural died of a heart attack. Signalman Venugopal died following a jeep accident. The Commission ordered a review of the regulations for driving its vehicles in both zones. Signalman Gurmit Singh was shot dead by a policeman in Saigon and the South Vietnamese authorities stated it was a regrettable accident and offered to pay a sum of money to his next of kin. Mr. A. E. L. Cannon was murdered in a Commission villa in Saigon. The Commission has extended its full co-operation to the Government of the Republic of Vietnam in the investigation into this murder and has reminded the Government of the Republic of Vietnam of the responsibilities which the latter has assumed for the safety and security of Commission personnel.

10. Ambassador G. Parthasarathi, representative of India, left in December, 1956, and Ambassador T. N. Knut took over as representative of India in February, 1957. Major-General D. S. Brar acted as the representative of India during the interval. The Canadian Commissioner, B. M. Williams, Esquire, left in February, 1957, and T. Le M. Carter, Esquire, took over as Canadian Commissioner in March, 1957. During the interval Brigadier R. W. Moncel acted as the representative of Canada. Ambassador J. Michalowski, representative of Poland, left in May, 1956, and Ambassador A. Szymonowski took over in September, 1956, as representative of Poland. During the interval Mr. J. Goldblatt acted as the representative of Poland.
CHAPTER II

Provisional Military Demarcation Line and Demilitarised Zone

11. In paragraphs 4, 5 and 8 of the Sixth Interim Report mention was made of the Commission’s recommendations and final suggestions of February, 1956, for the improvement of the administration of the Demilitarised Zones. The present position with regard to their implementation by the parties and the Commission’s remarks thereon are shown in Appendix B. The recommendations which were made by the Commission have been accepted by both parties. Recommendation No. 3 in Appendix B has, however, not been implemented owing to the non-functioning of the Joint Commission. It will be seen from this Appendix that the P.A.V.N. High Command has implemented these final suggestions. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam had accepted them previously but has not implemented them.

12. Reference was made in paragraphs 7 and 8 of the Sixth Interim Report to the restrictions imposed by the French High Command on the freedom of movement of permit-holders across the Demarcation Line and to the Commission’s suggestions to the French High Command in this regard. During the period under report the Commission received a few complaints from the P.A.V.N. High Command that a number of permits for crossing the Demarcation Line sent by them to the French Union Delegation and the Southern Administration for extension of their validity were not renewed. The Commission considered one of these complaints dated August 25, 1956, and expressed its concern that permits which were due for renewal on June 30, 1956, had not been renewed, and asked the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to clarify why action had not been taken in this regard and what steps were being taken to ensure freedom of movement to permit-holders in terms of the Geneva Agreement and Decisions 6 and 11 of the Joint Commission. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam replied that it did not see any objection to the renewal of the permits if certain stipulations were enforced. These stipulations and some other suggestions made by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, which are not provided for in the Statute of the Demilitarised Zone, and the Commission’s remarks on them are mentioned in Appendix B. The Commission informed the Government of the Republic of Vietnam that the latter might take up these suggestions in the Joint Commission, if it so wished, before taking any action on them and, in case of disagreement, refer the matter to the Commission. Both parties have agreed to discuss these suggestions in the Joint Commission; no discussion has taken place yet. As far as the Commission is aware, there has been no movement across the Demarcation Line of persons who would have been specifically authorised to cross the Demarcation Line under Article 9 of the Geneva Agreement and Decision No. 11 had the question of issue and extension of permits been resolved.

13. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam has replied to some of the complaints mentioned in paragraph 9 of the Sixth Interim Report, denying the allegations. During the period under review, the Commission received 43 complaints from the P.A.V.N. High Command alleging in a number of instances violation of the Demilitarised Zone by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and 16 complaints from the Government of the Republic of Vietnam alleging violation of the Demilitarised Zone by the P.A.V.N. High Command. These are under investigation.

The Commission’s Mobile Team in the Demilitarised Zones has reported to the Commission that on April 11, 1957, the Vice-President of the Republic of Vietnam visited the southern Demilitarised Zone and went up to the Hien Luong bridge on the Demarcation Line. About 200 civilians, including a
few Europeans/Americans went in the Demilitarised Zone area up to the Hien Luong bridge. It is reported that many photographs of the bridge and the northern Demilitarised Zone were taken. The matter is under consideration.

The Commission received a few complaints from the P.A.V.N. High Command alleging violation of its air space and territory by the planes of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam. The Commission noted the reply of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam admitting in one instance that due to a mistake in piloting a reconnaissance plane flew towards the Demilitarised Zone but did not cross the Ben Hai river; the other complaints were denied.

14. In paragraph 10 of the Sixth Interim Report the Commission had referred to the question of deployment of Mobile Team 87 and to the difficulties faced by the Commission. As no concurrence for the deployment of this team was received from the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, the Commission converted its request for concurrence into a recommendation in October, 1956, and requested its implementation. This recommendation has not so far been implemented by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam.

15. In paragraph 6 of the Commission’s message dated September 14, 1956, to the Co-Chairmen the Commission referred to the letter from the Commander-in-Chief of the P.A.V.N. High Command regarding the arrangements worked out by the Governments of France and of the Republic of Vietnam for the continuance of the work of the Joint Commission. During the period under review there has been a further exchange of communications between the French Embassy in Saigon and the P.A.V.N. High Command, through the Commission. This exchange of correspondence has not resulted in any change in the situation reported to the Co-Chairmen by the Commission on September 14, 1956. The Joint Commission, which is an important part of the machinery for the implementation of the Geneva Agreement, has not resumed its functions so far.

16. Thus the situation in the Demilitarised Zone has not shown any improvement since the Sixth Interim Report; if anything, certain difficulties further increased during the period under review. The Joint Commission did not resume its functions and the relevant provisions of the Agreement and the Protocols were not executed. The parties repeatedly approached the Commission with issues which should have been settled by the Joint Commission in discharge of its responsibilities of execution under the Agreement. The Commission is of the view that unless the Joint Commission and its agencies start functioning again, the execution of such provisions of the Agreement on the cessation of hostilities, and the Protocols as relate to the Joint Commission, in particular, those concerning the administration of the Demarcation Line and the Demilitarised Zone, will continue to be in jeopardy. The Commission does not feel justified in taking over the functions which are the exclusive responsibility of the Joint Commission. The Commission notes that there was no outbreak of hostilities from either side in the Demilitarised Zone during the period under review. The Commission is transmitting correspondence between the parties regarding the resumption of the activities of the Joint Commission which has an important task to perform, particularly in the Demilitarised Zone.

17. The Commission has, on receiving complaints from the P.A.V.N. High Command regarding Article 23 and Protocol 24, informed the High Command that the question of war graves in Vietnam should be taken up in the Joint Commission and, in view of the important humanitarian aspect of the question, expressed the desire that the parties should explore possibilities of an expeditious solution of the problem.
CHAPTER III

Democratic Freedoms under Article 14 (c) and 14 (d)

18. The Commission continued its efforts to supervise implementation by the parties of Article 14 (c) which has been one of the major problems confronting the Commission. Complaints from the parties and petitions from individuals alleging reprisals under Article 14 (c) received by the Commission were, as a rule, forwarded to the party concerned for comments and/or such action as was decided by the Commission.

19. The Commission is seized with 3 complaints from the Republic of Vietnam and 32 petitions, including the one mentioned in paragraph 30, from individuals involving 35 incidents alleging murder, arrest, and confiscation of property in violation of Article 14 (c) by the P.A.V.N. High Command.

The Commission is seized with 194 complaints from the P.A.V.N. High Command and 202 petitions from individuals involving 1,047 incidents alleging murder, detention, arrest, confiscation of property, etc., in violation of Article 14 (c) by the authorities of the Republic of Vietnam, involving a large number of persons. Included in the above complaints of the P.A.V.N. High Command are those mentioned in paragraphs 24, 25 and 26. The majority of these cases are pending for over a year and the Commission is not able to settle them and to determine whether the complaints are true or not. The difficulties with regard to supervision and control of the execution of Article 14 (c) in the Republic of Vietnam, mentioned in the Sixth Interim Report, have persisted and increased. The stand taken by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam on Article 14 (c), the Commission's unanimous decision not to accept the stand and views of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam have already been referred to the Co-Chairmen in the Commission's letter No. I.C./Adm/VI-D-I/57 dated April 11, 1957. (Appendix C.)

20. During the period under review the Commission decided to undertake four mobile team investigations into complaints of alleged violations of Article 14 (c) in South Vietnam and asked for concurrence of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam for deployment of three mobile teams. The present position with regard to these teams and the other mobile teams mentioned in paragraphs 17, 18 and 19 of the Sixth Interim Report is shown in Appendix D. These mobile teams could not be deployed because of the refusal of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to give their concurrence, as mentioned in the Commission's letter to the Co-Chairmen referred to in paragraph 19 above.

21. Paragraphs 17 and 18 of the Sixth Interim Report referred to Mobile Team 103. This was the only Mobile Team to conduct investigations under Article 14 (c) in South Vietnam in the period under review. This team started its investigation in South Vietnam in September, 1956. It encountered numerous difficulties. It returned to Hanoi in January, 1957, under the Commission's instructions, to prepare an interim report which has since been submitted to the Commission along with the team's other reports.

22. During the period under review the Commission decided that representatives of its three delegations will peruse and examine at Saigon dossiers and judgments of 147 persons detained in alleged contravention of Article 14 (c) in Chi-hoa prison in South Vietnam and report to the Commission whether the case of any of the detainees attracts Article 14 (c). The representatives have not yet started their work.
23. In paragraph 20 of the Sixth Interim Report reference was made to certain cases under Article 14 (c). In the case of Mr. Tran Chau, the Commission decided, Canadian Delegation dissenting, that his detention was in violation of Article 14 (c) and further decided to take action under Article 43 and inform the Members of the Geneva Conference of non-implementation of its recommendation by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam. The present position with regard to the remaining cases mentioned in paragraph 20 of the Sixth Interim Report is shown in Appendix E. During the period under review the Commission held that the detention of one person was in contravention of Article 14 (c) and the detention of two other persons, if continued, would be in violation of this Article. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam was asked to release them immediately. Compliance is awaited.

During the period under report the Commission asked the Government of the Republic of Vietnam for the results of the trials and other action taken by the said Government in implementation of the Commission's recommendations to the French High Command under Article 22 against local officials who had violated Article 14 (c). The reply is awaited.

24. In paragraph 21 of the Sixth Interim Report the Commission had referred to certain cases of alleged violation of Article 14 (c) involving Ordinance No. 6 issued by the President of the Republic of Vietnam. Sixty-seven cases under this category are pending with the Commission. Mobile Team 105 which was to investigate some such cases was not deployed for reasons mentioned in paragraph 20. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam has furnished some factual information about the application of the Ordinance but has given no clarification as to how retrospective effect was being given to this Ordinance.

25. During the period under review the Commission continued to receive a number of complaints from the P.A.V.N. High Command under Article 14 (c) containing allegations of reprisals against individuals and organisations under “the campaign of denunciation of Communists” in South Vietnam. The Commission has requested the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to state under what law action was being taken against the Communists, as alleged. The Commission instructed its Legal Committee in November, 1956, to examine the complaint and the reply of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, when received, and to report whether or not “the campaign” attracted the provisions of Article 14 (c). The reply of the said Government is awaited.

26. The Commission received a few complaints from the P.A.V.N. High Command alleging that persons asking for the Consultative Conference with a view to holding general elections were being arrested or detained by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam. The Commission forwarded these complaints to the said Government asking under what law, if the allegations were true, the persons concerned were being arrested, in order to determine if these cases attracted the provisions of Article 14 (c). A reply is awaited.

27. The question of settlement of residual cases under Article 14 (d), which was reported in paragraph 23 of the Sixth Interim Report, made little progress during the period under review. The Freedoms Committee met separately the representatives of the two parties who have submitted their proposals on the Commission's suggestions regarding residual categories. This question is still pending with the Freedoms Committee.

28. In the case of the seminarists of Xa Doai, referred to in paragraph 24 of the Sixth Interim Report, the P.A.V.N. High Command did not implement
the recommendations of the Commission to produce the seminarists before Fixed Team Vinh and the Commission decided, Polish Delegation dissenting, to take action under Article 43 to inform the Members of the Geneva Conference.

29. Concerning the deployment of Mobile Team 110 to investigate the alleged violation of Article 14 (d) in South Vietnam, mentioned in paragraph 25 of the Sixth Interim Report, has not been given by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam.

30. During the period under report, the Commission received an allegation from the Government of the Republic of Vietnam concerning an incident in November, 1956, in Quynh Luu district of Nghe An province in North Vietnam. The P.A.V.N. High Command was asked to comment with special reference to allegations that reprisals had been taken by soldiers against the inhabitants who submitted petitions to the Fixed Team at Vinh in Nghe An province and that the provisions of Article 14 (d) had not been brought to the knowledge of the inhabitants of village Quynh An, and that those who had made requests for departure to the South were arrested or otherwise punished. The P.A.V.N. High Command have denied the allegations of reprisals against petitioners who approached the Commission’s team and have stated that the provisions of Article 14 (d) were broadcast among the largest strata of the population of Quynh Luu district and that every facility was offered to persons who wanted to settle down in the South. When asked to clarify which Articles of the Agreement were attracted by its allegations, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam mentioned Articles 14 (d) and 15 (d). Out of the petitions received by Fixed Team Vinh since November, 1956, the Freedoms Committee, as directed by the Commission, examined 1,684 petitions during the period under report and found 203 containing allegations which attract residual categories under Article 14 (d) and 1 which attracts Article 14 (e). The Commission has found that Article 15 (d) is no longer operative and will consider the report of the Freedoms Committee when completed.

CHAPTER IV
Prisoners of War and Civilian Internees

31. The parties continued to exchange, through the Commission, fortnightly reports of progress made on search requests of prisoners-of-war received from the other side.

32. In paragraph 29 of the Sixth Interim Report mention was made of the Commission’s request to the P.A.V.N. High Command to adopt the procedure suggested by the Commission for giving the 89 persons, referred to in that paragraph, their right to choose their zone of residence, if they so desired. As the P.A.V.N. High Command in its reply did not accept the procedure, the Commission converted the suggestion into a recommendation and requested its implementation. The P.A.V.N. High Command did not implement the recommendation. While the Polish Delegation did not agree with the views of the other two delegations, the Commission informed the P.A.V.N. High Command that it would take action under Article 43 of the Agreement for non-implementation of its recommendation and inform the Members of the Geneva Conference.
33. Reference was made to the case of 57 German and Hungarian "rallies" in paragraph 30 of the Sixth Interim Report. The Commission has closed this case and has informed the Government of the Republic of Vietnam that since the procedure suggested by the Commission in July, 1955, for the settlement of the cases of deserters and "rallies" had not been accepted by the French Union Forces High Command, no further action could be taken by the Commission.

34. The question of settlement of cases relating to "rallies" or deserters was further examined by the Commission with reference to the 26 deserters mentioned in paragraph 31 of the Sixth Interim Report. The Commission closed the case of these deserters for the reasons stated in the preceding paragraph and informed the parties that in the matter of "rallies" or deserters the Commission would not take any action unless specific cases, where the persons concerned had been previously claimed as prisoners-of-war, were brought to its notice.

35. In paragraph 31 of the Sixth Interim Report the Commission had referred to the case of two "rallies" who were punished by the French High Command after they had been handed over by the P.A.V.N. High Command. The French High Command stated that the two persons were punished with imprisonment—one for eight and the other for four years—and explained that this was done according to military rules. It also stated that since the motives for desertion were not established to be political, Article 14 (c) was not applicable to these two cases. These replies have been communicated to the P.A.V.N. High Command for comments.

36. In paragraph 34 (3) of the Sixth Interim Report, the Commission had referred to two recommendations for the release of 19 persons under Article 21 which had not been implemented by the French High Command. In the case of 12 of these persons, as the recommendations were not implemented by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, the Commission held that their continued detention would be in violation of Article 21 and decided that it would take action under Article 43 for non-implementation of its recommendations and inform the Members of the Geneva Conference. In the case of the remaining 7 persons, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam released them in South Vietnam without handing them over to the P.A.V.N. High Command and the Commission held that such release was inconsistent with the procedure laid down in Article 21. In 19 other cases of civilian internees or prisoners-of-war, who were released in the South by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam without being handed over to the P.A.V.N. High Command, the Commission took exception to this procedure and held that their release was inconsistent with Article 21. With regard to the five cases mentioned at serial No. 1 of Appendix F the Commission has not been informed whether or not the Government of the Republic of Vietnam has implemented the recommendation for release. The present position with regard to civilian internees is shown in Appendix F.

The Commission has not been able to decide the majority of cases at serial No. 4 of Appendix F as the recommendations for furnishing copies of dossiers through Mobile Team 47, referred to in paragraph 70 of the Sixth Interim Report, have not so far been implemented by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam. The Commission is pursuing the matter.

37. In paragraph 40 of the Sixth Interim Report, a reference was made to the case of Father Nguyen Quang Vinh. The Commission decided, on the basis of a study made by its legal Committee, that his case was not covered by Article 21. The P.A.V.N. High Command was asked to request the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to remit the sentence of
Father Vinh and to declare him a free man and also, if he is traced, not to re-arrest him on account of the sentence passed against him in March, 1954. The Commission further decided that Father Vinh's case be treated as one in the residual categories under Article 14 (d).

CHAPTER V

Ban on the Introduction of Fresh Troops, Military Personnel, Arms and Munitions—Military Bases in Vietnam

38. Arrangements made for the supervision and control of the execution by the parties of the provisions of Articles 16 to 20 of the Agreement and the additional measures taken by the Commission to discharge its special responsibility under Article 36 (a) have been referred to in the previous Interim Reports.

39. The mobile team arrangement at Loc Ninh on the South Vietnam-Cambodian border continued throughout the period under report. The arrangements for accommodating the mobile element of the Fixed Team at Tan Chau on the South Vietnam-Cambodian border, referred to in paragraph 74 of the Sixth Interim Report, have not so far been made by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam. The recommendation of the Commission in this regard made in January, 1957, has not so far been implemented. The matter is being pursued with the party.

40. In paragraphs 42 and 43 of the Sixth Interim Report reference was made to the question of a mobile team at Phuc Hoa. During the period under report the P.A.V.N. High Command reiterated its view that the maintenance of a mobile team for an undetermined period changes its character to that of a fixed team and is contrary to the provisions of Article 35 of the Agreement. The Commission reaffirmed its view that continuous control by a mobile team at Phuc Hoa is essential and reaffirmed its interpretation of Article 35. The Commission made several attempts to keep a mobile team in continuous operation at Phuc Hoa. Mobile Team III which started functioning at Phuc Hoa on October 17, 1956, had to be withdrawn on December 28, 1956, after being in operation for two periods of a month each, as the P.A.V.N. High Command did not allow the functioning of the team up to the end of the initial period of three months as recommended by the Commission. The Commission, therefore, decided, Polish Delegation dissenting, to take action under Article 43 for non-implementation of its recommendation and to inform the Members of the Geneva Conference. At the same time, the Commission informed the P.A.V.N. High Command that the Commission is still of the view that there should be continuous control at Phuc Hoa by a mobile team and asked that logistic arrangements be made initially for a period of three months. A reply has been received from the P.A.V.N. High Command in the third week of April, 1957, reaffirming their previous views and reiterating their readiness to permit the deployment of a mobile team for a period of one month.

During the absence of Mobile Team III from Phuc Hoa, the mobile element of the Lang Son Team went to the Phuc Hoa area and visited it a number of times.

41. In paragraph 25 of the Fifth Interim Report the Commission reported that it had provisionally relocated 'Fixed Team Muong Sen at Con Cuong. During its location at Con Cuong the team met with certain difficulties beyond
the control of either the P.A.V.N. High Command or the Commission. The team was relocated at Muang-Sen in December, 1956.

42. In paragraph 44 of the Sixth Interim Report a reference was made to the question of the reconnaissance of some airfields in South Vietnam. In November, 1956 the Commission converted its request for reconnaissance of these airfields into a recommendation as the concurrence requested was not given. As the Government of the Republic of Vietnam did not implement these recommendations the Commission decided to take action under Article 43 for non-implementation of the recommendations and to inform the Members of the Geneva Conference. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam has, however, now given its concurrence for the reconnaissance of these airfields. The Commission's Team of Air Advisers has been despatched on April 13, 1957, to Saigon to carry out the reconnaissance.

43. Mention was also made in paragraph 44 of the Sixth Interim Report of the decision to control three airfields at Bien Hoa, Ban Me Thuot and Soc Trang in discharge of the Commission's mandatory task under Article 36 (d). The Commission converted its request for concurrence for control into a recommendation and asked the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to implement the recommendation. The said Government has agreed to the control of two of the airfields and, with regard to the third, namely Bien Hoa, it stated that this is a military airfield and cannot therefore be controlled. The Commission is pursuing the matter.

44. In paragraph 59 of the Sixth Interim Report a reference was made to certain allegations of the P.A.V.N. High Command regarding construction of new airfields in South Vietnam. In addition to the two airfields mentioned therein the P.A.V.N. High Command alleged in July and August, 1956, construction of seven others and also alleged all of them to be new military airfields. With regard to these nine airfields, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam has given concurrence for the reconnaissance of one only (Can Tho) and the Commission has asked it to give concurrence for the reconnaissance of the remaining eight. Its concurrence is awaited.

45. In North Vietnam the Commission completed the reconnaissance of two airfields and decided in February, 1957, to control one of these, namely Gia Lam (Hanoi), in discharge of its mandatory task under Article 36 (d). The P.A.V.N. High Command has agreed to its control and the Commission is pursuing the matter regarding necessary facilities to start the control.

46. Reference was made in paragraph 44 in the Sixth Interim Report to road reconnaissances. During the period under report the Commission undertook two road reconnaissances in North Vietnam with the concurrence of the P.A.V.N. High Command. The Bao Lac and Ha Giang reconnaissances were carried out as far as the roads permitted use of vehicular traffic. Another reconnaissance is to be made in Bao Lac after six months. With regard to Ha Giang, the Operations Committee decided that reconnaissance will be carried out twice a year. The Lai Chau reconnaissance could not be carried out as the P.A.V.N. High Command reported bad weather, poor road conditions and that the situation in the area had to be verified from the point of view of security.

47. In paragraph 48 of the Sixth Interim Report reference was made to the Commission's directions to its teams along the coast of Vietnam to carry out reconnaissance of the off-shore islands and to submit reports to the Commission. The teams in South Vietnam completed this task in early August, 1956, and their reports were approved by the Commission. As mentioned in paragraph 49 of the Sixth Interim Report, the teams in North
Vietnam were not able to carry out their reconnaissance and subsequently this task was made the responsibility of the Naval Advisers. Mention was also made in paragraph 48 of the Sixth Interim Report of the coastal reconnaissance tasks allotted to the Naval Advisers. In South Vietnam, the Advisers completed their reconnaissance of Cap St. Jacques area and submitted their recommendations in September, 1956. In the South the Naval Advisers were also given the task of reconnoitring the Saigon and Tan Chau team areas and this task will be taken up on completion of the reconnaissance in North Vietnam. In North Vietnam, the reconnaissance by the Naval Advisers of the coast and off-shore islands began only in January, 1957, as the P.A.V.N. High Command did not till then provide the necessary transport facilities and the reconnaissance has still not been completed.

48. With reference to paragraph 64 of the Sixth Interim Report, the P.A.V.N. High Command has not provided the required sea transport for Fixed Teams Tien Yen and Vinh. The Haiphong Fixed Team has been provided with a suitable motor launch and, when available, an ocean going tug to carry out its mandatory control tasks.

49. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam did not provide Fixed Team Nha Trang with the prescribed water transport during the period under report. Four other teams, namely, Cap St. Jacques, Saigon, Tourenne and Ban Goi were also without the prescribed water transport since November, 1956.

50. In paragraph 60 of the Sixth Interim Report reference was made to the recommendations of the Operations Committee to record the violations of Articles 16 and 17 in 1955, in South Vietnam. During the period under report, the Commission, after considering the reply of the French High Command in these cases, decided, Canadian Delegation dissociating itself, that there was violation of Article 16 in two cases and of Article 17 in one. The Commission further decided that there was violation of Article 16 in three cases and, Canadian Delegation dissociating itself, of Article 17 in two cases, of which three pertain to 1955 and two to July-August, 1956. Details of these decided cases are shown in Appendix G. In 18 cases the Government of the Republic of Vietnam was requested to explain why the procedure under Articles 16 and/or 17, as the case may be, and Protocol 23 was not followed. During the period under review the Commission, after examining team reports, notifications from the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, where received, and complaints from the P.A.V.N. High Command, concerning Articles 16 and 17, was seized with 96 cases which may violate Article 16 and 114 cases which may violate Article 17 in South Vietnam. The reply of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam denying many allegations of the P.A.V.N. High Command is under consideration. In four cases, the Commission, after considering the reply given by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, asked it to show cause why a finding of violation of Article 17 should not be recorded.

During the period under review, the Commission did not consider any violation of Articles 16 or 17 by the P.A.V.N. High Command as there was no team report, notification or complaint, warranting such consideration.

51. Many instances of arrival of military personnel and war materials in South Vietnam were reported by the Commission's teams and were stated by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to be in transit. Some of the arrivals took place without advance notification. In some instances, during the period under report, the Commission was not notified about the exit, if any, of these war materials and military personnel and it was not in a position to say whether or not they left the country. The matter is being pursued.
52. During the period under report the Commission’s fixed teams at Nha Trang and Tourane in South Vietnam reported that they were not allowed to control American military and other planes stated by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to be United States Embassy planes. As directed by the Commission, its Legal Committee is examining whether, in exercise of immunities and privileges, diplomatic missions can introduce into Vietnam war material without repugnance to Article 17 of the Agreement.

53. In paragraphs 51 and 52 of the Sixth Interim Report a reference was made to the question of time notice restrictions on team movements to certain areas in South Vietnam. Despite the request of the Commission the situation showed no improvement during the period under review; it deteriorated in the case of Cap St. Jacques. Some fresh restrictions in certain cases were imposed by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and the mobile elements of most of the Commission’s fixed teams in South Vietnam were, as a rule, not able to go out on control duties.

54. The situation with respect to control of foreign incoming aircraft at Saigon airport under Articles 16 and 17 of the Agreement was mentioned in paragraphs 54, 55 and 57 of the Sixth Interim Report. The improvement in the production of manifests referred to in paragraph 57 of the Sixth Interim Report continued though there were a certain number of cases where manifests were still not produced. There has been no improvement with regard to the physical control of the cargo of the incoming aircraft as the aircraft are not being brought to the parking area for the purpose of spot checking of their cargo. Neither is the Commission’s Team permitted to enter the military area of the airport where these aircraft are parked after landing. The Commission is still not in a position, as mentioned in paragraph 53 of the Sixth Interim Report, to state whether or not every incoming aircraft, in so far as Article 17 is applicable to it, has left South Vietnam.

55. In paragraph 63 of the Sixth Interim Report reference was made to the entry of an American Military Mission, called “TERM” (Temporary Equipment Recovery Mission), into South Vietnam in May, 1956. The Commission could not review the question after a lapse of three months, as originally decided, or carry out spot checks as no reply was received from the Government of the Republic of Vietnam until December, 1956. In this reply it was stated that TERM was expected to complete its task of cataloguing United States war material for eventual re-export from South Vietnam in a limited time and that before its withdrawal due intimation would be given, so that the Commission might exercise appropriate control. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam also agreed that the Commission might visit the installations where TERM personnel were carrying on their activities. The strength of the Mission was stated not to exceed 350. The said Government did not comply with the Commission’s request to furnish fortnightly reports regarding the activities of the Mission. The Commission informed the Government of the Republic of Vietnam in February, 1957, that it regarded this lapse with concern and asked for a report concerning the activities of TERM up to the end of January, 1957, and thereafter fortnightly reports to be sent expeditiously and without fail. It further asked to be informed when TERM would be completing its task and where TERM’s activities were going on so that the Commission may decide where to send a mobile team for the purpose of ascertaining the activities of TERM. No reply has been received so far.

56. In paragraph 63 of the Sixth Interim Report a reference was made to the complaints of the P.A.V.N. High Command with regard to certain United States Military Missions in South Vietnam. During the period under
review the Commission received a few more complaints and considered some of these. In one of these it was alleged that the existence of "MAAG" (Military Aid Advisory Group) and the introduction of United States military personnel were in effect a factual realisation of a military alliance between the Governments of the Republic of Vietnam and of the United States of America in contravention of Articles 16 and 19 and paragraphs 4 and 5 of the Final Declaration. In November, 1956, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam was asked to offer its specific comments on the allegations and also on certain enclosures to the letter of the P.A.V.N. High Command, in which it was stated that a military agreement had been concluded between the above two countries in February, 1955, and to furnish certain information regarding the status, purpose, original and present strength and the present activities of "MAAG." In February, 1957, the Commission received a letter from the Government of the Republic of Vietnam denying that the presence of "MAAG" constituted a violation of Articles 16 and 19 and stating that "MAAG" had started its activities in 1950 and that there had been no change in its activities, statute or structure and it had never exceeded its original strength and that there did not exist a formal or factual military alliance between the Governments of the Republic of Vietnam and of the United States of America. The matter is under consideration.

The P.A.V.N. High Command also alleged that two United States Military Missions—"TRIM" (Training Reorganisation Inspection Mission) and "CATO" (Combat Arms Training Organisation) founded in March, 1955, and in May, 1956, respectively, had come into existence in South Vietnam. The Commission asked in January, 1957, for the comments of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam. The reply is awaited.

In one of its complaints the P.A.V.N. High Command alleged a factual materialisation of a military alliance between the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and the member countries of "SEATO" (South-East Asia Treaty Organisation) as military personnel, warships and jet planes of the said member countries participated in the National Day celebrations of South Vietnam on October 26, 1956. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam denied the factual materialisation of a military alliance with the "SEATO" Powers. The Commission viewed with concern the omission of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to follow the procedures laid down by the Commission for the introduction of military missions and consequently concluded that it was not in a position to state whether and, if so, how far the provisions of Article 16 had been observed by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and, whether or not, all or any of the war material in question had left South Vietnam. The Commission also concluded that the participation of foreign military personnel and war material in public celebrations of a ceremonial character did not necessarily prove the existence of a military alliance. The Commission has closed the case.

57. The Commission has not been able to exercise the prescribed control of Nha Be harbour, near Saigon, since the end of August, 1956. The Commission did not accept the contention of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam that this harbour was not in the zone of action of Saigon Fixed Team and reaffirmed that it should be controlled. As no reply was received, the Commission converted its request into a recommendation on December 28, 1956. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam did not implement the recommendation and the Commission decided that it would take action under Article 43 to inform the Members of the Geneva Conference if its recommendation was not implemented immediately. The Commission was informed on February 20, 1957, that Nha Be was a military base and could
CHAPTER VI

Co-operation of the Parties to the Agreement

58. In preceding chapters the Commission has given an account of activities and difficulties during the period under report regarding the supervision of the proper execution by the parties of the provisions of the Agreement.

59. As mentioned in paragraphs 23 and 50 and Appendix E, the Commission recorded a violation under Article 14 (c) (which is also reported under Article 43) and a few violations under Articles 16 and 17 of the Agreement by the French High Command and the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, and none by the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The violations of Articles 16 and 17 mentioned above concern introduction to South Vietnam of United States military personnel in five United States military aircraft, a few aircraft wheel tyres, 1,000 revolvers and 610 cases of revolver ammunition.

60. As the Government of the Republic of Vietnam did not afford the necessary assistance and co-operation to the Commission in cases under Article 14 (c) and, in particular, decided not to send any more replies to the Commission's communications and not to permit the deployment of the mobile teams for investigation of complaints under this Article in South Vietnam, the Commission addressed a special letter to the Co-Chairmen on April 11, 1957, (vide Appendix C) and expressed its grave concern to the Government of the Republic of Vietnam.

61. As mentioned in paragraph 36, the Commission has not been able to decide the cases of 122 alleged civilian internees/prisoners-of-war under Article 21 in South Vietnam, as the Government of the Republic of Vietnam failed to produce the relevant documents and dossiers in the manner required by the Commission.

62. In North Vietnam, the Commission has not been able to supervise continuously, under Article 36 (d) of the Agreement, the Phuc Hoa sector of the land frontier through its Mobile Team set up under Article 35 (vide paragraph 40), as the P.A.V.N. High Command did not co-operate with the Commission in this matter.

The mobile elements of most of the Commission's fixed teams in South Vietnam were, as a rule, not able to go out on control duties (vide paragraph 53), as the Government of the Republic of Vietnam did not co-operate with the Commission in this matter, and the Commission was thus not able to supervise, under Article 36 (d), the execution of Articles 16 and 17 of the Agreement along the rest of the frontier of South Vietnam. The Commission was also not able to exercise physical control of foreign incoming military aircraft which went direct to the military section of Saigon airport, and of their cargo, as the Government of the Republic of Vietnam did not afford the necessary assistance in this regard.

63. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam did not, in all cases, give the Commission advance notification under Articles 16 (f) and 17 (e) of
the arrival of military personnel and war materials respectively. The said Government did not ask for the Commission's approval, as required by Protocol 23, in any case concerning war material.

64. The Co-Chairmen in their message dated May 8, 1956, to the Democratic Republic of Vietnam and the Republic of Vietnam strongly urged the authorities in both parts of Vietnam to give the Commission all possible assistance in future in the exercise of its functions as defined by the Geneva Agreements on Vietnam. In their message to the Commission, the Co-Chairmen had expressed their confidence that the parties in both parts of Vietnam would show effective co-operation and that the difficulties encountered by the Commission would in practice be removed. The situation described in paragraph 84 of the Sixth Interim Report showed no improvement during the period under review. As will be seen from previous paragraphs, the Commission encountered further difficulties in the exercise of its functions, in particular, a major difficulty with respect to the implementation of Article 14 (c) of the Agreement by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam (vide paragraph 19).

CHAPTER VII

Conclusions

65. In paragraph 86 of the Sixth Interim Report and in its message, dated September 14, 1956, to the Co-Chairmen (Appendix A), the Commission had referred to the situation which arose as a consequence of the withdrawal of the French High Command from Vietnam. As was mentioned in the Commission's message, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam had stated that it was prepared to offer effective co-operation to the Commission but that it was not prepared to assume responsibility for the implementation of the Geneva Agreements in Vietnam. While this major development had its origin during the period of the Sixth Interim Report, it was during the period under review that its effects on the work of the Commission were felt fully.

The Joint Commission, which is an important part of the machinery for the implementation of the Geneva Agreements, has not resumed its activities since May, 1956.

The Commission had requested the Co-Chairmen to give urgent consideration to the situation mentioned in its letter of September 14, 1956. There has been no progress towards a solution of those difficulties. In fact they have further increased.

66. A major difficulty facing the Commission arises from the failure to hold consultations between the two parties and free nation-wide elections with a view to reunification of Vietnam. The Co-Chairmen in their message of May 8, 1956, to the parties had asked them to indicate the time required for the opening of these consultations and, in their message of the same date to the Commission, had informed it that they attached great importance to the maintenance of the cease-fire under the continued supervision of the International Commission for Vietnam. There has been no progress in the matter of the consultations and the elections to the knowledge of the Commission. The Commission is naturally anxious about the duration of its stay in Vietnam which is conditioned by the political settlement in this country, as envisaged in the Final Declaration of the Geneva Conference.
67. In the Sixth Interim Report the Commission expressed great concern over cases where the parties gave their own interpretations, which differed from those of the Commission, on the provisions of the Agreement. The Commission notes with regret that this tendency continued during the period under report. The Commission must point out that for its effective functioning, it is essential that all the provisions of the Agreement should be strictly applied by the parties.

68. In spite of the difficulties described in previous Chapters, the Commission, as directed by the Co-Chairmen, has persevered and will continue to persevere in its efforts to maintain and strengthen peace in Vietnam on the basis of the fulfilment of the Geneva Agreements with a view to reunification of the country through the holding of free nationwide elections in Vietnam. The Commission is glad to report that there has been no resumption of hostilities in Vietnam. The Commission would, however, request the Co-Chairmen, and through them the Members of the Geneva Conference, to give their early consideration to the difficulties mentioned in this Report and take such measures as they may consider appropriate in order to facilitate the effective fulfilment of the Geneva Agreements.

T. N. KAUL,
India.

T. LE M. CARTER,
Canada.

J. GOLDBLAT,
Poland.

Saigon, July 12, 1957.
APPENDIX A
(Reference: Chapter I, Paragraph 3)

MESSAGE DATED SEPTEMBER 14, 1956, FROM THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION TO THE CO-CHAIRMEN

The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam has the honour to refer to its message dated May 27, 1956, addressed to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference, in reply to the messages issued by the Co-Chairmen on May 8, 1956, to the International Commission, the Government of the Republic of France and to the Governments of the Republic of Vietnam and the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

2. In accordance with paragraph 10 of its message of May 27, 1956, the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam has persevered in its efforts to maintain and strengthen peace in Vietnam on the basis of the fulfilment of the Geneva Agreements and on the basis of the continuance of the status quo, requested by the Co-Chairmen. The representatives of the Government of the Republic of France have held discussions in Saigon with the representatives of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam "with a view to reaching an arrangement that will facilitate the work of the International Commission and of the Joint Commission in Vietnam." On July 31, 1956, the Commission received a note No. 3456/DAF from the Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, which stated that "the Government of the Republic of Vietnam intends to accredit to the International Commission an organisation called 'Mission Vietnamienne chargee des relations avec la CIC'" and that "this organisation will be confided with the mission of ensuring the liaison between the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and the International Commission after the suppression by the French Government of the French Liaison Mission, which will cease to exist from August 15, 1956." Certain other matters of logistic and financial nature were also mentioned in this note but no mention was made about the assumption of responsibility under the Geneva Agreements by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam. A copy of this note is attached to this message. (Appendix A.)

3. On August 2, 1956, the Commission received a note verbale No. 00769/SAG from the High Commissioner for the Republic of France in Vietnam. In this note the High Commissioner for France informed the Commission that the French Liaison Mission would be dissolved on August 15, 1956. No mention was made in this note of the question of continued responsibility for the execution of the Geneva Agreements.

4. In reply to the High Commissioner's note verbale, the Commission on August 8, 1956, requested the High Commissioner to forward to it a copy of the letter which had been addressed by the Government of the Republic of France to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference and further requested the High Commissioner to give the Commission detailed information regarding the arrangements which would come into force after August 15, 1956, which would facilitate the work of the International Commission and the Joint Commission in Vietnam.

5. On August 11, 1956, the Commission received from the High Commissioner for the Republic of France a copy of a message dated July 25, 1956, addressed by the Government of the Republic of France to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference. The Commission also received on the same date a letter No. 007152/SAG from the High Commissioner for the
Republic of France in Vietnam in which was set out the proposed new arrangements for the continuance of the work of the Joint Commission. In this letter the High Commissioner stated that "the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference had requested the French Government to offer their good offices with a view to continuing the labours of the Central Joint Commission. This position implies the recognition by the Co-Chairmen of the fact that our country does not assume any more responsibilities whether direct or special for the implementation of the Agreement on the Cessation of Hostilities and that henceforth the role it is requested to play is only that of a mission of goodwill." The arrangements proposed were: "the French Union Delegation to the Central Joint Commission which has been suppressed as a consequence of the dissolution of the High Command of the French Union on April 28, 1956, has been replaced by a 'French Mission to the Central Joint Commission.'" The High Commissioner requested the Commission to bring the above to the knowledge of the High Command of the People's Army of Vietnam and to inform the latter that the French Mission to the Central Joint Commission is ready to get into touch with the P.A.V.N. Delegation in order to resume the labours of this organ at the date most suited to the said High Command of the P.A.V.N." A copy of this letter is attached to this message. (Appendix B.)

6. On August 14, 1956, the Commission forwarded to the Commander-in-Chief of the People's Army in Vietnam a copy of the letter No. 007152/SAG of August 11, 1956, from the High Commissioner for the Republic of France. The Commission has received in reply a letter No. 032/TTL dated August 21, 1956, from the Commander-in-Chief of the People's Army in Vietnam. In this letter the Commander-in-Chief has stated that "the standpoint of the Government of the Republic of France and the Southern Administration as well as the arrangements entered into between them are not compatible with the Geneva Agreements and with the recommendations of May 8, 1956, made by the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference." He further stated that "the French Government is a signatory party of the Geneva Agreements. So long as the responsibility for the implementation of the Agreements is not yet transferred to the Southern Administration in accordance with Article 27 of the Cease-fire Agreement and in accordance with the recommendations of May 8, 1956, from the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference, the French Government must continue to assume its obligations under these Agreements 'to maintain the status quo' in order to guarantee the normal activities of the International Commission and their joint organs." With regard to the functioning of the Joint Commission the High Command of the P.A.V.N. considers it necessary "that the joint organs should resume their work within the framework defined by the provisions of the Geneva Agreements in order to assure the continued implementation of these Agreements." The Commander-in-Chief has requested the Commission to communicate the point of view of the Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam to the Chairman of the Geneva Conference and to the Government of the Republic of France. A copy of this letter is attached to this message. (Appendix C.)

7. The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam wishes to bring the following points to the urgent notice of the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference:

(i) The Government of the Republic of France is not prepared to continue to assume any further direct or special responsibility for the implementation of the Geneva Agreements in Vietnam and has terminated on August 15, 1956, the status quo requested by the Co-Chairmen.
(ii) The Government of the Republic of Vietnam basing itself on the declaration made by President Diem on April 6, 1956, is prepared to offer effective co-operation to the Commission but is not prepared to assume responsibility for the implementation of the Geneva Agreements in Vietnam.

(iii) The Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam reiterates its position that all the provisions of the Geneva Agreements in Vietnam must be fully implemented by the parties and that until the Government of the Republic of France makes arrangements for handing over responsibilities under the Agreements to the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, it continues to be responsible for the execution of the Agreements as a signatory party. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam considers that the proposed new arrangements are incompatible with the Geneva Agreements.

8. In view of the situation revealed in the foregoing paragraphs the Commission is placed in a difficult position. The Commission requests the Co-Chairmen to give urgent consideration to the situation which has arisen in Vietnam and which has been set out in this message.
APPENDIX B, PART I

(Reference: Chapter II, paragraph 11)


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Permits should preferably bear the photographs of the persons in whose favour they are issued.</td>
<td>P.A.V.N. High Command advised the population to affix photographs on permits for crossing the Demarcation Line and a number of permits have been provided with photographs.</td>
<td>The Government of the Republic of Vietnam has agreed to make arrangements for supply of photographs to those who apply for permits.</td>
<td>The Commission, realising the practical difficulties involved, called upon the parties to consider ways and means of providing photographs on permits. The Commission requested that the permit-holders be not prevented from crossing or in any way obstructed or hindered on the ground that permits do not have photographs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>The parties may increase by 50 per cent. the police strength in the zones under their control for the proper maintenance of law and order.</td>
<td>P.A.V.N. High Command accepted and stated that as the increase in the police strength would constitute an amendment of the Statute of the Demilitarised Zone, the two parties to the Joint Commission should start discussions on this matter.</td>
<td>The Government of the Republic of Vietnam maintained that 100 per cent. increase is necessary, but in accordance with the permission given by the Commission has increased its police strength by 50 per cent.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>In the event of the Joint Commission considering any serious incident, or threat of incident, Mobile Team 76 be advised with a view to observe and, if the Joint Commission machinery fails to take action, the Mobile Team to report to the Commission immediately and take preliminary action to prevent or limit the incident under Article 36 (b) of the Agreement.</strong></td>
<td>Accepted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Political meetings in the Demilitarised Zone should be regulated at fixed hours and places, security authorities informed to take adequate measures to maintain order and also intimate the time and place of such meetings to Mobile Team 76.</strong></td>
<td>Accepted.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Government of the Republic of Vietnam stated that the Team will be permitted to attend as observers at the meetings of the Joint Sub-Commission when considering serious incidents or threats of incidents.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>The Commission has not been informed by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam whether the members of the Team will be permitted to attend as observers at the meetings of the Joint Commission when considering serious incidents or threats of incidents.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Implementation by both parties is contingent upon such meetings being held.</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## APPENDIX B, PART I—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B.—Final suggestions of the Commission</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position regarding implementation by the P.A.V.N. High Command</strong></td>
<td><strong>Position regarding implementation by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam</strong></td>
<td><strong>Commission's remarks</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Check posts on the Demarcation Line to check all movements of personnel, both in and out, and both sides to maintain registers indicating name, time of entry and exit and the purpose of the visit.</td>
<td>The Commission has been informed that it is being implemented.</td>
<td>The Government of the Republic of Vietnam stated that implementation could only be considered usefully after the rearrangement of the Statute of the Demilitarised Zone.</td>
<td>According to the existing Protocol any revision of the Statute must be approved by the Joint Commission which has not been functioning during the period under review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Both sides should have mobile patrols to stop people crossing at places in between the check posts and breaches to be brought to the attention of Mobile Team 76 at Gio Linh periodically, say once a week.</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Telephone communication be provided to Mobile Team 76 from the P.A.V.N. Delegation Headquarters at Ho Xa.</td>
<td>Necessary telephone equipment, implements and personnel are kept ready. Telephone cable laid up to the Demarcation Line from the P.A.V.N. Delegation Headquarters.</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
<td>The Commission requested the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to permit the P.A.V.N. to lay the telephone cable from the Demarcation Line to the Team Headquarters at Gio Linh in the southern zone. However, permission has not been given so far.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX B, PART II

(Reference: Chapter II, paragraph 12)

**STIPULATIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM FOR RENEWAL OF SPECIAL PERMITS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Stipulations</th>
<th>P.A.V.N. position</th>
<th>Commission's remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All special permits to bear the photograph of the holder.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Mission feels that these suggestions of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam would modify the Statute of the Demilitarized Zone and are against the spirit of the Agreement, but may be discussed in the Joint Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(a)</td>
<td>Controlling posts to be limited from nine to three and every crossing to be effected through these posts.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Commission informed the Government of the Republic of Vietnam that it may take up these suggestions in the Joint Commission, if it so desires, before taking any action. In case of disagreement in the Joint Commission the matter may be referred to the Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2(b)</td>
<td>The holder of a special permit who crosses from one zone to the other must pass through the same post on exit and entry to facilitate the checking of his movements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Government of the Republic of Vietnam deems it necessary that the Commission consider the above suggestions urgently as the Statute of the Zone should be established on a new basis before improvement measures and other detailed questions are taken into consideration.

See page 24, Serial No. 1.
## APPENDIX B, PART III

(Reference: Chapter II, paragraph 12)

### OTHER SUGGESTIONS OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF VIETNAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>1 Suggestions</th>
<th>2 P.A.V.N. position</th>
<th>3 Commission's remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Suspension of permanent permits and their replacement in the southern Demilitarised Zone by census cards with a special mention in red ink: &quot;inhabitant of the Demilitarised Zone&quot;.</td>
<td>The Government of the Republic of Vietnam deems it necessary that the Commission consider these suggestions urgently as the Statute of the Zone should be established on a new basis before improvement measures and other detailed questions are taken into consideration.</td>
<td>The Mission feels that these suggestions of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam would modify the Statute of the Demilitarised Zone and are against the spirit of the Agreement, but may be discussed in the Joint Commission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Special permits to be issued by the Joint Sub-Commission of the Demilitarised Zone with previous agreement of the administrative authorities of both zones. However, temporary permits for entering the Demilitarised Zone to be issued by the administrative authorities of the zone concerned without intervention from the Joint Sub-Commission.</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Commission informed the Government of the Republic of Vietnam that it may take up these suggestions in the Joint Commission, if it so desires, before taking any action. In case of disagreement in the Joint Commission the matter may be referred to the Commission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX C

(Reference: Chapter III, Paragraph 19)

LETTER DATED APRIL 11, 1957, FROM THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION TO THE CO-CHAIRMEN

No. IC/ADM/VI-D-I/57

Hanoi.
April 11, 1957.

The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam presents its compliments to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China and has the honour to refer to their message dated May 8, 1956, to the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam, and in particular to paragraph 2 of that message in which the Commission was asked by the Co-Chairmen to inform them in case the Commission encountered any difficulties in their activities which could not be resolved on the spot.

2. In the Sixth Interim Report, the Commission had informed the Co-Chairmen of its difficulties in the supervision of the implementation by the parties of the provisions of Article 14 (c). Those difficulties have persisted and increased as the Commission has not received the necessary assistance and cooperation from the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and has, therefore, not been able to supervise the implementation of Article 14 (c) in accordance with the Geneva Agreement. In spite of the efforts of the Commission, replies were not received from the Government of the Republic of Vietnam in the majority of pending cases referred to it alleging reprisal or discrimination under Article 14 (c) and involving a large number of persons. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam not only declined to give concurrence to the deployment of eight Mobile Teams decided upon by the Commission but also refused to permit the deployment of two Mobile Teams for which concurrence had already been given by them.

3. On November 17, 1956, the Commission received a communication from the Government of the Republic of Vietnam stating their views regarding the applicability of Article 14 (c). The attached correspondence mentioned in the Appendices below describes the stand taken by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and the views of the Commission on this question.

APPENDICES

Group A

7. South Vietnamese Mission letter No. 1446/PDVN/CT/TD/1, dated March 6, 1957.
Group B

9. OPS/V(98)/4349, dated October 12, 1956.
11. OPS/V(98)/4607, dated October 31, 1956.

4. It will be seen from the correspondence mentioned above that the Commission has unanimously decided not to accept the views of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam on the applicability of Article 14 (e). The Government of the Republic of Vietnam, however, have not accepted the unanimous views of the Commission as expressed in the Commission's letters of December 3, 1956, and January 17, 1957, and have decided not to give any more replies to the complaints under the Article and not to permit investigations of such complaints through the machinery of Mobile Teams as laid down in the Agreement. The Commission is, therefore, no longer able to supervise the implementation of this Article by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and settle the large number of complaints pending before the Commission under this Article.

5. As desired by the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference in their message dated May 8, 1956, to the International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam, the Commission wishes to bring to the notice of the Co-Chairmen this serious difficulty in the Commission's activities regarding Article 14 (e) which it is not able to resolve on the spot.

6. The Commission would, therefore, be grateful if the Co-Chairmen could kindly give their early consideration to this matter and advise the Commission regarding its future course of action. The Commission is determined to perform its duties with respect to Article 14 (e), as indeed with respect to all other Articles of the Cease-Fire Agreement, but in view of the difficulties mentioned above, the Commission is not able to take any effective action in cases under this Article unless these difficulties are resolved.

7. The International Commission for Supervision and Control in Vietnam takes this opportunity to renew the assurances of its highest esteem to the Co-Chairmen of the Geneva Conference on Indo-China.

T. N. KAUL,
India.

T. LE M. CARTER,
Canada.

A. SZYMANOWSKI,
Poland.
### APPENDIX D

(Reference: Chapter III, paragraph 20)

**MOBILE TEAM INVESTIGATION UNDER ARTICLE 14 (c) IN SOUTH VIETNAM**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Number of the Team</th>
<th>Task of the Team</th>
<th>Date of the Commission's decision to carry out investigation</th>
<th>Date when concurrence requested</th>
<th>Present position</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>To investigate the alleged violation of Article 14 (c) in the province of Chau Doc, South Vietnam</td>
<td>August 25, 1955</td>
<td>August 27, 1955</td>
<td>The Team could not be deployed because of the refusal of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to give concurrence in March 1957, as mentioned in the Commission's letter dated April 11, 1957, to the Co-Chairmen (vide Appendix C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>To investigate the alleged violation of Article 14 (c) in the Demilitarised Zones (north and south)</td>
<td>September 7, 1955</td>
<td>September 8, 1955</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>To investigate the alleged massacre of 3 families at Gia Rai (Bac Lieu Province)</td>
<td>March 13, 1956</td>
<td>March 15, 1956</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>To investigate the alleged detention of 14 persons in violation of Article 14(c) in Huong Tra district, Thua Thien Province</td>
<td>November 8, 1956</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>To investigate the alleged detention of 8 persons in Binh Province in violation of Article 14 (c)</td>
<td>January 8, 1957</td>
<td>January 14, 1957</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serial No.</td>
<td>Number of the Team</td>
<td>Task of the Team</td>
<td>Date of the Commission's decision to carry out investigation</td>
<td>Date when concurrence requested</td>
<td>Present position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>To investigate the alleged detention of 3 persons in violation of Article 14(e) in Saigon</td>
<td>January 8, 1957</td>
<td>January 14, 1957</td>
<td>The Team could not be deployed because of the refusal of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to give concurrence in March, 1957, as mentioned in the Commission's letter dated April 11, 1957, to the Co-Chairmen (vide Appendix C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>To investigate into the allegation that the murder of Mrs. Nguyen Thi Dieu was in violation of Article 14(e)</td>
<td>January 8, 1957</td>
<td>January 14, 1957</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>To investigate the alleged violation of Article 14(e) in Huong Hoa and an alleged incident in Aluoi village, South Vietnam</td>
<td>October 1, 1955</td>
<td>October 4, 1955</td>
<td>Concurrence was given on July 28, 1956. The Team could not be deployed because the Government of the Republic of Vietnam withdrew its concurrence in March 1957, as mentioned in the Commission's letter dated April 11, 1957, to the Co-Chairmen (vide Appendix C).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>To investigate the alleged concentration of former resistance workers and their 44 families in Thua Thien Province</td>
<td>March 13, 1956</td>
<td>March 15, 1956</td>
<td>Concurrence was not requested during the period under review.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>To investigate into the complaint of reprisals alleging detention of 62 persons and 27 murders in Thanh Binh district, Quang Nam Province, in violation of Article 14(e)</td>
<td>January 21, 1957</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>Present position has been indicated in paragraph 21 of this Report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>To investigate the alleged violation of Article 14(e) in the province of Quang Nam (Duy Xuyen)</td>
<td>March 9, 1956</td>
<td>March 15, 1956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: The Team could not be deployed because the Government of the Republic of Vietnam was not forthcoming in granting concurrence.
### APPENDIX E

*(Reference: Chapter III, paragraph 23)*

**PRESENT POSITION WITH REGARD TO CASES UNDER ARTICLE 14(c) (EXCLUDING TRAN CHAU'S CASE) MENTIONED IN PARAGRAPH 20 OF THE SIXTH INTERIM REPORT**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A. Number of cases in which the Commission held that there was a violation of Article 14(c) and recommended release</th>
<th>B. Number of persons released as stated by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam</th>
<th>C. Number of persons still under detention as stated by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>15 persons in detention</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>In January, 1957, the Commission informed the Government of the Republic of Vietnam that if their detention was continued the Commission would consider taking action under Article 43 of the Agreement. In March, 1957, the Commission considered the reply of the Government of the Republic of Vietnam and asked if these 4 persons had been released, if not, that they be released.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7 persons in detention</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The dossiers were not submitted. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam has been informed that it has not afforded all possible assistance and cooperation to the Commission to enable it to finally settle these pending cases.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

(Reference: Chapter IV, paragraph 36)

PRESENT POSITION WITH REGARD TO CIVILIAN INTERNESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>By the Government of the Republic of Vietnam</td>
<td>By the P.A.V.N. High Command</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Number of persons recommended during the period under report for release under Article 21 (c)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>17 persons were released by the French Union Forces in South Vietnam in 1954 after the cease-fire on grounds that they were common law prisoners although included in the prisoners-of-war lists. In July, 1956, the Commission asked the French Union Forces to produce dossiers or other documentary evidence proving that they were common law prisoners, so enable the Commission to determine their status. The Commission informed the French Liaison Mission that if no dossiers were made available within three weeks, the Commission would hold that they were prisoners-of-war/civilian internees and that their release after the cease-fire was inconsistent with Article 21. As no dossiers were supplied, the Commission in January, 1957, held that these persons were prisoners-of-war/civilian internees and that their release was inconsistent with Article 21. The Commission took exception to the procedure adopted by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam in not releasing these persons in accordance with the provisions of Article 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Number of persons in whose cases the releases were held to be effected inconsistently with Article 21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>9 persons were released in South Vietnam by the Government of the Republic of Vietnam without handing them over to the P.A.V.N. High Command. The Commission held that the release was inconsistent with Article 21 and took exception to the procedure adopted in releasing these 9 persons without following the procedure laid down in Article 21 (c).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX F—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>In South Vietnam</td>
<td>In North Vietnam</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 3          | Number of persons in whose case the Commission held that their continued detention would be in violation of Article 21 and decided that it would take action under Article 43 for non-implementation of its recommendations | 12 | Nil | Details of cases of 120+2 persons pending against the Government of the Republic of Vietnam:—

   Regarding the case of 89 persons (out of which 35 have been released in the South by the French Union Forces), in March 1956 the Commission recommended supply of dossiers within 15 days to determine whether their cases fall under Article 21 or not. The Commission has not received the dossiers.

   The case of 16 alleged prisoners-of-war/civilian internees detained in Poulo Condore prison, referred to in paragraph 70 of the Sixth Interim Report, is pending since October 1955. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam stated for the first time in October 1956 that these 16 persons were convicted for common law offences. The Commission requested the supply of the dossiers of 14 persons within a period of three weeks. The Commission has not received the dossiers.

   The cases of the remaining 2 persons are not being pursued by the Commission.

   The case of Huyen Van Da was referred to the Legal Committee. As the documents required were not supplied, the Legal Committee has reported that it cannot give any opinion. The matter is pending before the Commission.

   In July 1956 the Commission asked the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to produce dossiers of Tran Vu Ma within 3 weeks. The dossiers have not been supplied.

   The case of Nguyen Hoang Xuyen was referred to the Legal Committee. As the documents required were not supplied, the Legal Committee has reported that it cannot give any opinion. The matter is pending before the Commission. | |
| 4          | Number of persons whose cases are pending with the Commission for determination of their status | 120+2 | 5 | |
|            | Details of cases of 120+2 persons pending against the Government of the Republic of Vietnam:—

   Regarding the case of 89 persons (out of which 35 have been released in the South by the French Union Forces), in March 1956 the Commission recommended supply of dossiers within 15 days to determine whether their cases fall under Article 21 or not. The Commission has not received the dossiers.

   The case of 16 alleged prisoners-of-war/civilian internees detained in Poulo Condore prison, referred to in paragraph 70 of the Sixth Interim Report, is pending since October 1955. The Government of the Republic of Vietnam stated for the first time in October 1956 that these 16 persons were convicted for common law offences. The Commission requested the supply of the dossiers of 14 persons within a period of three weeks. The Commission has not received the dossiers.

   The cases of the remaining 2 persons are not being pursued by the Commission.

   The case of Huyen Van Da was referred to the Legal Committee. As the documents required were not supplied, the Legal Committee has reported that it cannot give any opinion. The matter is pending before the Commission.

   In July 1956 the Commission asked the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to produce dossiers of Tran Vu Ma within 3 weeks. The dossiers have not been supplied.

   The case of Nguyen Hoang Xuyen was referred to the Legal Committee. As the documents required were not supplied, the Legal Committee has reported that it cannot give any opinion. The matter is pending before the Commission. | |
APPENDIX F—continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subject</td>
<td>In South Vietnam</td>
<td>In North Vietnam</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the case of 4 alleged civilian internees detained in Po Co Condore prison, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam, in November 1956 stated that they are common law prisoners. The Commission in January 1957 asked the Government of the Republic of Vietnam to give details about the nature of the offence and charges under which they were tried and convicted. These have been furnished. The matter is under consideration.

In the case of 2 persons who were released in South Vietnam, the Commission asked the Government of the Republic of Vietnam in July 1956 to produce their dossiers within 3 weeks to determine their status. The dossiers have not been supplied.

In the case of 4 alleged civilian internees detained at Phu Quoc, the Government of the Republic of Vietnam stated that their names are not mentioned in the list of prisoners detained at Phu Quoc.

In the case of 4 alleged civilian internees detained in Po Co Condore prison, the Commission recommended the supply of dossiers in March 1956. The Commission has not received the dossiers.

Details of the cases of 5 persons pending against the P.A.V.N. High Command—
Out of the 6 persons mentioned in paragraph 34 (4) of the Sixth Interim Report, the P.A.V.N. High Command has stated that 5 persons were never arrested. The case of the remaining person, namely Father Vinh, is not covered by Article 21 as mentioned in paragraph 37 of this Report.
APPENDIX G, PART I

(Reference: Chapter V, paragraph 50)

PARTICULARS OF CASES OF VIOLATIONS OF ARTICLES 16 AND 17 IN SOUTH VIETNAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A.—Cases referred to in paragraph 60 of the Sixth Interim Report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>On November 24, 1955, a plane of the United States Navy landed</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at Tan Son Nhut airfield with some Vietnamese and American</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>military personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On November 27, 1955, a plane of the United States Navy landed</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at Tan Son Nhut with 10 American military personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>On November 8, 1955, a plane of the United States Navy brought</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>into South Vietnam aircraft wheel tyres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>On November 10, 1955, a United States Navy plane brought into</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Vietnam, one American Major-General and some other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>military personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>On November 12, 1955, a United States Navy plane brought into</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Vietnam several military personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>On December 2, 1955, a United States Air Force plane brought</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>into South Vietnam several military personnel</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B.—Cases during the period under report</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>On July 20, 1956, S.S. Merit Maersk brought to Saigon 21 cases</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>containing 1,000 revolvers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>On August 15, 1956, S.S. Alice Brown brought to Saigon 610 cases</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of munitions for revolvers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G, PART II

(Reference: Chapter V, paragraph 50)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial No.</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Article involved</th>
<th>Date of incident</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td>Instances in which the Government of the Republic of Vietnam was asked by the Commission to show cause why a violation of Article 17 should not be recorded—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction of aircraft parts</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>January, 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Introduction of war material on S.S. Steel Seafarer</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>August, 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B.</td>
<td>Instances in which the Government of the Republic of Vietnam was asked by the Commission to take up the matter with the French authorities to explain why war materials were imported without following the prescribed procedure and to show cause why a violation of Article 17 should not be recorded (as the Government of the Republic of Vietnam had explained that the responsible services were at this time under the control of the French High Command)—</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Introduction of aircraft parts</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>January, 1956</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Introduction of 14 armoured boats</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>April, 1956</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>