# SOUTH VIETNAM

## Chams

Activity: 1954-1975

**General notes**

NA

**Movement start and end dates**

* The earliest Cham nationalist organization we found was the one led by Les Kosem, a Cham Muslim, founded in 1944. Based on this we code 1944 as the start date. However, since South Vietnam became independent only in 1954 we code the movement only from 1954, the earliest possible start date, indicating that the Cham movement was active and nonviolent prior to 1954. Kosem’s movement aimed for the “restoration of the former kingdom of Champa” and was distinctly anti-French colonialist.
* Around the same time, the Minorities of the Western Highlands (of which the Chams were a large part) were fighting for recognition as an ethno-nationalist movement (Noseworthy 2013: 11). In 1954, the United Liberation Front of Highland Champa (FLC) was founded. Soon after, the FLC merged with with other liberation movements - the Front pour la Liberation des Montagnards and the Front pour la Liberation des Khmer Krom - to form the Front Unifie de Lutte es Races Opprimees (FULRO) (Keesing’s; Minahan 1996: 115ff, 2002: 424ff; Noseworthy 2013; Tucker 2011).
* The Cham movement remained active in the unified Vietnam (see Chams under Vietnam). [start date: 1944; end date: host change (1975)]

**Dominant claim**

* The Chams in South Vietnam aimed at greater self-determination for the Cham people in resistance against assimilation into South Vietnam. Numerous sources (Hickey 2002; West 2009) name the Front for the Liberation of Champa (Front de Libération du Champa FLC) and the United Liberation Front of Highland Champa (FLC) as the dominant organizations representing Cham nationalist interests. Minahan, in contrast, reports an organization called the Champa Highland Liberation Front (FLHPC). The goals of these organizations are similar, that is an “independent Cham state” (Minahan 2002: 427) or the “restoration of the former kingdom of Champa”. This is also in line with Cham missions to the United Nations asking for a reestablishment of an independent Cham state. We therefore code a claim for independence in this period. [1954-1964: independence claim]
* As of 1964, the Cham are represented by the Front Unifie de Lutte des Races Opprimees (FULRO), the product of a merger between the FLC and the Front de Liberation des Hauts Plateaux (FLHP) and the Front de Liberation du Kampuchea Krom (FLKK). Noseworthy (2013) describes FULRO as an irredentist movement that wants to join Cambodia, which is why we code an irredentist claim as of 1965 (following first of January rule). [1965-1975: irredentist claim]

**Independence claims**

* The movement originated with an independence claim (see above). The two organizations referred to by Hickey (2002) and West (2009) - the Front for the Liberation of Champa (Front de Libération du Champa FLC) and the United Liberation Front of Highland Champa (FLC) – appear to be the same organization, which appears to have become inactive in 1964. We could not find further information on the organization mentioned by Minahan (2002) - Champa Highland Liberation Front (FLHPC) – though it seems likely that this is also the same organization. According to Minahan (2002: 428), the independence movement was suppressed in 1965. [start date: 1944; end date: 1965]

**Irredentist claims**

* See above. [start date: 1964; end date: host change (1975)]

**Claimed territory**

* The territory claimed by Cham nationalists consists of the highland districts of Dak Lak, Lam Dong, and Phu Khanh, including the coastal Mui Dinh (Ninh Thuan) district south of Camranh (Minahan 1996: 115). In 1990, Phu Khanh province split into Khanh Hoa and Phu Yen (Law 2012). We code this claim relying on the Global Administrative Areas database.

**Sovereignty declarations**

* On February 19, 1964, the Cham leaders declared Champa independent of Vietnam (Minahan 2002). On October 17, the same year, the Provisional Government of Champa was established. Y Bham Enuol was appointed prime minister, Khua Y Ruah Anha minister of foreign affairs, Khua Ip’ha L’and minister of war while FULRO remained the military wing of the provisional government (Noseworthy 2013). [1964: independence declaration]

**Separatist armed conflict**

* We found no reports of separatist violence from 1954-63, hence a NVIOLSD classification.
* FULRO revolted against the South Vietnam government twice over self-determination claims, in 1964 and again in 1965 (Hickey 2002: 152, 180-181). The 25 deaths threshold was met for the Montagnards in 1964 and 1965 (Magnusson 2014: 3, 74). While the Chams and Khmer Krom also participated in FULRO (Magnusson 2014: 6), we found no evidence to suggest that the 25-deaths threshold was met. [NVIOLSD]

**Historical context**

* When the Chinese Han dynasty broke up, the Cham kingdom (Champa) emerged as a separate kingdom in what is today central and southern Vietnam. Almost permanently at war, the kingdom had to fight off the Chinese, Javanese kingdoms, the Khmer, Mongols as well as the newly independent Vietnamese in the north. After a decisive defeat in 1471 by the Vietnamese, the Cham territory was further diminished in the mid-sixteenth century when the Viet army conquered all but the highland region and the Champa empire was reduced to its southern kingdom of Panduranga. The Cham territory was completely annexed by Vietnam in 1832 when Emperor Minh Mang crushed the last bits of Cham autonomy, burned down Cham villages and destroyed farmlands and religious symbols (Islam had replaced Hinduism as the dominant Cham religion between the fifteenth and seventeenth century). The Chams were recruited by the French colonial army and administration that colonized southern Vietnam in the 1860s. Amidst rising Cham nationalism, the French administration created an autonomous Cham region in the highlands in 1946 (Minahan 2002: 427). [1946: autonomy concession]
* When the French were defeated by Vietnamese nationalists, the Chams mobilized as they saw their autonomy threatened by Vietnamese efforts to unify historical Vietnamese lands. At the 1954 Geneva Conference the fate of the Cham territory was sealed as it was – against their will - incorporated into the newly established Republic of Vietnam, implying the loss of their autonomy (Minahan 2002). [1954: autonomy restriction]

**Concessions and restrictions**

* During the 1950s and 1960s, the government of the Republic of Vietnam initiated several assimilation campaigns against the country’s minorities. The study of the Cham language was banned, language books were burned, Viet-Kinh Catholic migration into the Cham lands was encouraged, the official position of the mufti was eliminated and the Muslim pilgrimage to Mekka was prohibited (Noseworty 2013; Minahan 2002). Since we lack a clear indication when the respective policies were initiated, we code a single cultural rights restriction in 1956 since this is the year when the “nationalization” decree was adopted, which was at the root of these assimilation campaigns (Adams et al. 2009). [1956: cultural rights restriction]
* The 1957 Land Development Program first stated the principle that land of highlander minorities belongs to the Vietnamese state and not the indigenous peoples. The 1958 Highlander Resettlement Program provided for the resettlement of highlander minorities from land they were occupying into reservations where they would be “civilized”. Corresponding legal decrees were passed in Dember 1958 and May 1959 and led to large-scale land theft (Hickey 1967: 81ff). [1957: autonomy restriction]
* As a result of pressure by the US, the South Vietnamese government began in 1965 to replace discrimination and repression with programs to protect culture and identity. The most significant acts in this direction were the establishment of a Directorate-General for Development of Ethnic Minorities and the passing of legislation according to which highlanders were entitled to own land (Minahan 2002; Human Rights Watch 2002: 24). Land rights are considered a concession on autonomy in line with the codebook. [1965: autonomy concession]

**Regional autonomy**

* We do not code regional autonomy because the colonial autonomy arrangement had been abrogated upon South Vietnam’s independence.

**De facto independence**

NA

**Major territorial changes**

* [1954: host change (new); end of regional autonomy]
* Became part of Vietnam in 1975. [1975: host change (old)]

**EPR2SDM**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Movement* | Chams |
| *Scenario* | No match |
| *EPR group(s)* | - |
| *Gwgroupid(s)* | - |

**Power access**

* EPR does not include the Cham. Being the most loyal allies to the French administration, they were left without protection once the French withdrew. As other highland peoples, the Chams were often targeted by Vietnamese nationalist as they were seen as opposing Vietnamese unification. According to Minahan (2002: 995), the southern government “prohibited minority rights and pressed assimilation.” Based on the linguistic, religious and cultural discrimination described above, we thus code the Chams as discriminated from 1954 onwards.
* Discrimination “eased” (Minahan 2002: 995) when the US Army was seeking allies among the non-Vietnamese groups such as the Chams, Montagnards and the Khmer Krom during the Vietnam War. Members of these ethnic minorities were trained by Special Forces and engaged in guerilla warfare. Despite these close ties between Americans and the Montagnards, the latter’s relationship with the South Vietnamese government did not improve significantly (Minahan 2002). [1954-1965: discrimination]
* Beginning in 1965 – and only as a result of pressure by the US –South Vietnam replaced discrimination and repression with programs to promote culture and identity. The relation between FULRO and Saigon also appeared to improve as the government established a Directorate-General for Development of Ethnic Minorities. Several highlanders, including a FULRO member, were elected to the National Assembly and legislation according to which highlanders were entitled to own land was also passed. In light of these developments, we change the power access variable to powerless. [1966-1975: powerless]

**Group size**

* We were unable to get by ethno-demographic data for South Vietnam. Instead, we draw on the estimate provided in Minahan (2002: 424): 240,000. Note: the Chams are concentrated in the southern part of Vietnam (see Minahan (2002: 424). In combination with the 2002 World Bank estimate of Vietnam’s population of 79.54 million, we get a 2002 group size estimate of 0.003017. Since South Vietnam made up about 45% of unified Vietnam, this yields a group size of .006705. [0.0067]

**Regional concentration**

* In the assimilation campaigns of the 1950s and 1960s Viet-Kinh Catholic migration into the Cham lands was encouraged (Noseworty 2013; Minahan 2002: 428). Taylor (2007: 2) states that the Cham “settlements are small and scattered within a dense circuitry of Vietnamese settlements”. [not concentrated]

**Kin**

* According to Minahan (2002: 424) there are 250,000 Chams in Cambodia. Smaller communities live in Laos, Malaysia and Thailand but they are too insignificant to be considered here. EPR codes close ethnic bonds also with Malays in Malaysia, Cambodia, and Indonesia. [kin in neighboring country]
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## Khmer Krom

Activity: 1955-1975

**General notes**

NA

**Movement start and end dates**

* The Khmer Krom have been active in seeking more autonomy over the Mekong Delta region both as a distinct group as well as under an umbrella group with the Chams and Montagnards.
* The Khmer Krom are ethnic Cambodians who were annexed into Vietnam in 1949. They have since mounted protests over issues including land, linguistic, and religious rights.
* The onset of the Khmer Krom movement is pegged at 1955, when the Front de Liberation du people Khmer (Khmer Liberation Front, FLK) was founded, the first self-determination organization we found. The group aimed for greater self-determination for the Khmer people in resistance against assimilation into South Vietnam. The group subsequently became a part of the Front Unifie de Lutte es Races Opprimees (FULRO) alongside the Chams and the Montagnards (Dharma n.d.; Human Rights Watch 2006; Khmers Kampuchea-Krom Federation; Minahan 2002: 990ff; Thul 20005; Tyner 2008; UNPO 2008).
* The Khmer Krom movement remained active in the unified Vietnam (see Khmer Krom under Vietnam). [start date: 1955; end date: host change (1975)]

**Dominant claim**

* The Khmer Krom in South Vietnam aimed at greater self-determination for the Khmer people in resistance against assimilation into South Vietnam. Upon inclusion into Vietnam in 1949, they favored reunification with the historical territory of Cambodia to achieve this goal (Minahan 2002). The movement allied with the Front for the Struggle of the Oppressed Races (Front Unifie de Lutte des Races Opprimees FULRO) in 1964 alongside the Chams and the Montagnards. Noseworthy (2013) describes FULRO as an irredentist movement that wants to join Cambodia, which is why we code an irredentist claim throughout. [1955-1975: irredentist claim]

**Independence claims**

NA

**Irredentist claims**

* See above. [start date: 1955; end date: host change (1975)]

**Claimed territory**

* The territory claimed by the Khmer refers to the historical territory of Cochinchina, today known as Kampuchea Krom, in southern Vietnam (Minahan 2002: 990). We code this claim using geographic data on admin units from the Global Administrative Areas database.

**Sovereignty declarations**

NA

**Separatist armed conflict**

* FULRO revolted against the South Vietnam government twice over self-determination claims, in 1964 and again in 1965 (Hickey 2002: 152, 180-181). The 25 deaths threshold was met for the Montagnards in 1964 and 1965 (Magnusson 2014: 3, 74). While the Chams and Khmer Krom also participated in FULRO (Magnusson 2014: 6), we found no evidence to suggest that the 25-deaths threshold was met. [NVIOLSD]

**Historical context**

* The Khmer Krom’s history of independence reaches back to the ninth century, when the Khmer empire reunited and initiated the golden age of Khmer culture and power around the capital of Angkor. Under constant pressure from east and north, the Khmer power declined and came to an end in the 15th century. The neighbouring Vietnamese infiltrated the region, setting off a long history of antagonism between the Vietnamese and the Khmer that continued under French colonial rule. French colonial rule favoured the Vietnamese and relegated the Khmer. Vietnamese efforts to unify historical Vietnamese lands caused fierce resistance by the Khmer Krom also during the Japanese occupation. In 1949, their territory (as part of Cochinchina) was placed under Vietnamese control in exchange for specific rights for the Khmer Krom. These rights were ignored and the four Khmer Krom provinces were abolished and replaced by 21 Vietnamese provinces in 1949 (Minahan 2002). [1949: autonomy restriction]

**Concessions and restrictions**

* During the 1950s and 1960s, the government of the Republic of Vietnam initiated several assimilation campaigns. The use of the Khmer Krom language was discouraged, Khmer pagoda schools were closed, anti-Buddhist laws adopted and the Khmer identity was targeted by the obligation to take on Vietnamese surnames. Since we lack a clear indication when the respective policies were initiated, we code a single cultural rights restriction in 1956 since this is the year when the “nationalization” decree was adopted, which was at the root of these assimilation campaigns (Adams et al. 2009). [1956: cultural rights restriction]
* The 1957 Land Development Program first stated the principle that land of highlander minorities was belongs to the Vietnamese state and not the indigenous peoples. The 1958 Highlander Resettlement Program provided for the resettlement of highlander minorities from land they were occupying into reservations where they would be “civilized”. Corresponding legal decrees were passed in Dember 1958 and May 1959 and led to large-scale land theft (Hickey 1967: 81ff). [1957: autonomy restriction]
* As a result of pressure by the US, the South Vietnamese government began in 1965 to replace discrimination and repression with programs to protect culture and identity. The most significant acts in this direction were the establishment of a Directorate-General for Development of Ethnic Minorities and the passing of legislation according to which highlanders were entitled to own land (Minahan 2002; Human Rights Watch 2002: 24). Land rights are considered a concession on autonomy in line with the codebook. [1965: autonomy concession]

**Regional autonomy**

* The land rights that were granted in 1965 were insufficient to warrant an autonomy code.

**De facto independence**

NA

**Major territorial changes**

* Became part of Vietnam in 1975. [1975: host change (old)]

**EPR2SDM**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Movement* | Khmer Krom |
| *Scenario* | No match |
| *EPR group(s)* | - |
| *Gwgroupid(s)* | - |

**Power access**

* EPR does not code the Khmer Krom. The Khmer Krom were often targeted by Vietnamese nationalist as they were seen as opposing Vietnamese unification. Upon their inclusion in Vietnam in 1949, they were promised specific rights as part of an agreement between the French and Vietnamese nationalists. However, as stated above, these rights were not maintained. According to Minahan (2002: 995), the southern government “prohibited minority rights and pressed assimilation”. Based on the linguistic, religious and cultural discrimination described above, we code the Khmer Krom as discriminated. Discrimination “eased” (Minahan 2002: 995) when the US Army was seeking allies among the non-Vietnamese groups such as the Montagnards, the Chams and the Khmer Krom during the Vietnam War. Members of these ethnic minorities were trained by Special Forces and engaged in guerilla warfare. Despite these close ties between Americans and the Khmer Krom, the latter’s relationship with the South Vietnamese government did not improve significantly (Minahan 2002). [1955-1965: discriminated]
* Beginning in 1965 – and only as a result of pressure by the US – the South Vietnamese replaced discrimination and repression with programs to prevent culture and identity. The relation between FULRO and Saigon also appeared to improve as the government established a Directorate-General for Development of Ethnic Minorities. Several highlanders, including a FULRO member, were elected to the National Assembly and legislation according to which highlanders were entitled to own land was also passed. In light of these developments, we change the power access variable to powerless. [1966-1975: powerless]

**Group size**

* Note: the Khmer Krom predominantly resided in South Vietnam. Since we were unable to get by ethno-demographic data for South Vietnam, we take the EPR group size estimate after the unification in 1975 (.013) and multiply this with 1/.45 (population-wise South Vietnam made up about 45% of the unified Vietnam) and get a group size estimate of .0289. [0.0289]

**Regional concentration**

* The Khmer Krom are concentrated in Kampuchea Krom, where they make up 28% of the population (Minahan 2002: 990). Since they do not constitute a majority in their territory, we do not code them as regionally concentrated. We did not find evidence of an alternative territory where the Khmer Krom would form a majority. [not concentrated]

**Kin**

* According to Minahan (2002: 990) there are approximately 1.2 million Khmer Krom in Cambodia. [kin in neighboring country]
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## Montagnards

Activity: 1956-1975

**General notes**

NA

**Movement start and end dates**

* The Montagnards are a diverse collection of ethnolinguistic groups including the Jarai, Rhad, Bahnar, Ede, and Stieng. Their resistance to rule by outsiders predates South Vietnam’s independence in 1954, but it is not clear that this resistance was organized in the form of a self-determination movement until 1956 when the Bajaraka organization was founded (Magnusson 2014: 7). Thus, we peg the start date to 1956.
* In 1964 another self-determination organization was founded, the rebel United Front for the Struggle of the Oppressed Races (FULRO), which sought widespread autonomy in the Montagnards’ regions of residence to help ensure the survival of their culture and lifeways. In the early 1960s Montagnards violently opposed the South Vietnamese government’s efforts to control their regions of residence and assimilate the population.
* From 1965, FULRO was fighting primarily against North Vietnam, but there was still ethnonationalist contention against South Vietnam (Hickey 2002: 202).
* According to Salemink (2003: 204), “[a]fter 1965, FULRO continued to be active both within and outside of the ranks of the [South Vietnamese] Special Forces, and for some time there was a tacit agreement that FULRO forces could control portions of Darlac province if they would fight the NLF…From 1964 onward the GVN started to give in to some of the demands of FULRO during a series of negotiations and following massive American pressure.”
* FULRO formally surrendered in 1969 when the South Vietnam government promised to recognize land titles. However the South Vietnam government did not really make good of their promises so “In 1972 FULRO was in fact re-established outside of the CIDG forces, and eventually took sides against the Saigon government. In March 1975 it was the non-cooperation of the Montagnards with the Vietnamese authorities that would make the Communist surprise attack…possible” (Salemink 2003: 204).
* The movement remained active after the fall of South Vietnam and subsequent unification with Vietnam (see Montagnards under Vietnam; Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 194; Hickey 2002; Keesing’s; Marshall & Gurr 2003; Minahan 2002: 1288ff; MAR; Radio Free Asia 2013; Salemink 2003). [start date: 1956; end date: host change (1975)]

**Dominant claim**

* Bajaraka, an acronym for the four main Montagnard groups Bahnar, Jarai, Rhade (or Ede) and Koho, was founded in 1956 (Magnusson 2014: 7). The sources agree on the claim in the early years being “the return of autonomy granted by the French” (Minahan 2002: 1291; also see Hewitt & Cheetham 2000: 194). This claim is substantiated by a letter of the Bajaraka leader to some of the diplomatic missions in Saigon demanding Montagnard autonomy (Human Rights Watch 2002). [1956-1963: autonomy claim]
* In 1964, the Montagnards movement allied with the Front for the Struggle of the Oppressed Races (Front Unifie de Lutte des Races Opprimees FULRO). In other cases, alliance with or membership in FULRO results in the coding of an irredentist claim (see e.g. Noseworthy 2013), but not in this case. According to Minahan (2002), the Montagnard movement turned to one for independence in 1964. This seems to be the claim that gets most support in the relevant sources, e.g. Walker (2009) and Adams (1998). We reflect this claim already in 1964 because the group was involved in an insurgency from that year on. [1964-1975: independence claim]

**Independence claims**

* See above. [start date: 1964; end date: host change (1975)]

**Irredentist claims**

NA

**Claimed territory**

* The territory claimed by the Montagnards consists of the provinces Gia Lai, Dak Lak, Kon Tum, and Lam Dong (Minahan (2002: 1288). Up until 2003, Dak Lak included Dak Nong, which only became a separate province after (Law 2012). We code this claim based on the Global Administrative Areas database.

**Sovereignty declarations**

NA

**Separatist armed conflict**

* The Montagnards’ MAR rebellion score is 6 in 1955-1959 (“large-scale guerilla activity”). The qualitative sources we consulted suggest that there was a major protest in 1958, which was however quelled without a single shot being fired (Magnusson 2014: 7, 50). We found no other indications which would justify a LVIOLSD code in qualitative sources and, therefore, do not code LVIOLSD.
* FULRO revolted against the South Vietnam government twice over self-determination claims, in 1964 and again in 1965 (Hickey 2002: 152, 180-181). The 25 deaths threshold was met for the Montagnards in 1964 and 1965 (Magnusson 2014: 3, 74). While the Chams and Khmer Krom also participated in FULRO (Magnusson 2014: 6), we found no evidence to suggest that the 25-deaths threshold was met.
* During the Vietnam War, the Montagnards fought with the United States against the communist north. We do not code this as violence over self-determination because the Montagnards were fighting on behalf of South Vietnan.
* Based on this, we code LVIOLSD from 1964-1965 and NVIOLSD from 1966-1975. [1958-1963: NVIOLSD; 1964-1965: LVIOLSD; 1966-1975: NVIOLSD]

**Historical context**

* The ethnic minorities of the highland areas were to a large extent autonomous from the Vietnamese state in the pre-colonial period but nonetheless experienced economic exploitation by the ethnic Kinh (Minority Rights Group International 1997).
* The French established colonial authority over what is today Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam (French Indochina) in the nineteenth century. Increased penetration of the territory and French missionary activities in the highland areas resulted in increased contacts of the Montagnards with the outside world in the mid-nineteenth century, when the French began to settle in the central highlands (Minahan 2002; Minorities at Risk Project).
* In 1899, the French divided the administration of the Central Highlands into Motagnard provinces (Minahan 2002) and utilized direct rule through traditional chiefs to collect taxes and oversee development (Minorities at Risk Project). Although the population of the Central Highlands was divided into over forty groups, French policies gradually produced a common sense of identity among them (Hewitt and Cheetham 2000).
* Upon their return after the Second World War (Indochina was under Japanese influence between 1941-1945), the French attempted to reassert control over Vietnam against the Communist Viet-Minh forces, who also tried to recruit the Montagnards in their anticolonial struggle. To accommodate the Montagnards, the French colonial authorities in 1947 created the Commiserate of the Federal Government for the Montagnard Populations of South Indochina (*Commissariat du Gouvernement Federal pour les Populations Montagnardes du Sud Indochinois*) and in 1950 established the Country of the Montagnards of Southern Indochina (*Pays Montagnard du Sud Indochinois*), five separate provinces with far-reaching autonomy rights placed under the authority of the Vietnamese Emperor Bao Dai. The latter was installed by the French as an alternative to Ho Chi Minh’s Democratic Republic of Vietnam. The statute that established the Country of the Montagnards also guaranteed protection of the Montagnard’s languages, traditions, and customary laws (Hewitt and Cheetham 2000; Human Rights Watch 2002; Minahan 2002; Minority Rights Group International 1997). [1950: autonomy concession]
* At the 1954 Geneva Conference the Montagnard homeland was incorporated into the newly established Republic of Vietnam/South Vietnam. As the French withdrew, the South Vietnamese regime under Ngo Dinh Diem annexed the Central Highlands and abolished the autonomous Montagnard Region in 1955 (Minahan 2002). [1955: autonomy restriction]
  + According to Magnusson (2014: 42): “After the October 1955 South Vietnamese Presidential elections, Ngo Dinh Diem acted quickly to begin eliminating Montagnard primordial ties. He replaced French-supported Montagnard administrators in the Central Highlands with Vietnamese bureaucrats, who governed the indigenous populations with an iron fist. Vietnamese administrators eliminated the tribal legal system, requiring that all Montagnard legal issues be handled according to Vietnamese jurisprudence. Indigenous languages were removed from the education system in an attempt to eradicate tribal languages, forcing students to study in Vietnamese. Educational materials written in the traditional tribal dialects were destroyed and replaced with Vietnamese language textbooks. Members of the thirteen Montagnard military battalions, who served during the French Indochina war, were disbanded and their members transferred to different Vietnamese military units to weaken Montagnard military capabilities.
* Starting 1955, South Vietnamese President Ngô Dinh Diêm launched various programs to resettle members of the dominant ethnic Kinh in the central highlands in order to promote development in this area. The traditional lands of the highland groups were handed to the settlers. Relocation policies of this type, however, wherein the center motivates members of an ethnic group to settle in the homeland of a self-determination group, are not coded.

**Concessions and restrictions**

* Vietnamese settlements in Montagnard areas were encouraged through the establishment of “land development centers” (Human Rights Watch 2002). Montagnards were classified as ethnic minorities and assimilation policies were launched with the goal to eradicate their local cultures, traditional lifestyles and religious beliefs (Hewitt and Cheetham 2000). We lack a clear indication when the respective policies were initiated, but 1956 seems to be a good marker since this is the year when the “nationalization” decree was adopted, which was at the root of these assimilation campaigns (Adams et al. 2009). [1956: cultural rights restriction]
* The 1957 Land Development Program first stated the principle that land of highlander minorities was belongs to the Vietnamese state and not the indigenous peoples. The 1958 Highlander Resettlement Program provided for the resettlement of highlander minorities from land they were occupying into reservations where they would be “civilized”. Corresponding legal decrees were passed in Dember 1958 and May 1959 and led to large-scale land theft (Hickey 1967: 81ff). [1957: autonomy restriction]
* As a result of pressure by the US, the South Vietnamese government began in 1965 to replace discrimination and repression with programs to protect culture and identity. The most significant acts in this direction were the establishment of a Directorate-General for Development of Ethnic Minorities and the passing of legislation according to which highlanders were entitled to own land (Minahan 2002; Human Rights Watch 2002: 24). Land rights are considered a concession on autonomy in line with the codebook. [1965: autonomy concession]
  + It is not entirely clear, based on our sources, whether this concession was made before or after the end of the 1964-1965 period of violent conflict. However, the Montagnards were involved in an armed revolt in December 1965 (Magnusson 2014: 73), suggesting the concession was likely made before the end of the conflict.

**Regional autonomy**

NA

**De facto independence**

NA

**Major territorial changes**

* Became part of Vietnam in 1975. [1975: host change (old)]

**EPR2SDM**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| *Movement* | Montagnards |
| *Scenario* | No match |
| *EPR group(s)* | - |
| *Gwgroupid(s)* | - |

**Power access**

* There are two categories of ethnic groups that are referred to as highlanders in Vietnam. First, there are the minorities and indigenous peoples in the central highlands. On the other hand, there are the minorities in the country's north highlands located beyond the Red River (Minority Rights Group International 1997). Only the former are, however, referred to as Montagnards. They are a diverse collection of ethnolinguistic groups such as the Jarai (320,000), Ede (or Rhade, 258,000), Bahnar (181,000), Stieng (66,000), Koho (122,000), and Mnong (Bnong, or Pnong, 89,000) (Human Rights Watch 2011). Docking to an EPR group is not possible since EPR does not code ethnic power relations in South Vietnam (only Northern Vietnam and the unified country).
* The Montagnards resisted the influx of Vietnamese that followed the government’s campaign to resettle members of the dominant ethnic Kinh in the central highlands. Their resistance was met with repression and the cracking down of all political activity in the region (Minahan 2002). Montagnards were classified as ethnic minorities and assimilation policies were launched with the goal to eradicate their local cultures, traditional lifestyles and religious beliefs (Hewitt and Cheetham 2000).
* Discrimination “eased” (Minahan 2002: 995) when the US Army was seeking allies among the non-Vietnamese groups such as the Montagnards, Chams and the Khmer Krom during the Vietnam War. Members of these ethnic minorities were trained by Special Forces and engaged in guerilla warfare. Despite these close ties between Americans and the Montagnards, the latter’s relationship with the South Vietnamese government did not improve significantly (Minahan 2002). [1958-1965: discrimination]
* Beginning in 1965 – and only as a result of pressure by the US – South Vietnam replaced discrimination and repression with programs to promote culture and identity. The relation between FULRO and Saigon also appeared to improve as the government established a Directorate-General for Development of Ethnic Minorities and appointed an ethnic Bahnar (Paul Nur) as a cabinet member. Several highlanders, including a FULRO member, were elected to the National Assembly and legislation according to which highlanders were entitled to own land was also passed. In 1968, an agreement allowed the highlanders to form their own political party. In light of these developments, we change the power access variable to powerless. In 1971 Nay Luett, an ethnic Jarai, was appointed as minister for ethnic minority development (Human Rights Watch 2002). But this representation, induced by pressure from the US with the aim of gaining allies in the war against the communist north, remained token. [1966-1975: powerless]

**Group size**

* We were unable to get by ethno-demographic data for South Vietnam. Instead, we draw on the estimate provided in Minahan (2002: 1288): 1.31 million. Note: the Montagnards are concentrated in the southern part of Vietnam (see Minahan (2002: 1288). In combination with the 2002 World Bank estimate of Vietnam’s population of 79.54 million, we get a 2002 group size estimate of 0.0165. Since South Vietnam made up about 45% of unified Vietnam, this yields a group size of .0366. [0.0366]
  + Note: group size estimates tend not to be very exact but usually coincide across sources. According to a Human Rights Watch (2011) report, the Montagnards number between 1 and 2 million. The same indication is also provided by UNPO (2008). Similar data can also be found in a Human Rights Watch (2002: 13) report of 2002, according to which “the population of the Central Highlands provinces […] is approximately four million, of whom approximately one-quarter are indigenous highlanders.”

**Regional concentration**

* The Montagnards are concentrated in their homelandin the sense that almost all Montagnards live in their regional base. This is confirmed by Minahan (2002: 1288) and MAR. However, we also require the group to make up a majority in their respective territory. This requirement is not fulfilled: According to Minahan (2002: 1288), the Montagnards only make up only 32% of the population of the Dega Republic. We found no evidence suggesting an alternatively defined territory that would fulfil the threshold for spatial concentration. [not concentrated]

**Kin**

* EPR does not code the Montagnards but only the Gia Rai as the largest of the upland ethnic groups of the Central Highlands. The Gia Rai are not coded as having any kin group. Minorities at Risk data, however, which code the Montagnards as a group of its own, codes “close kindred in one country“, referring to the Khmer Leou in Cambodia (over 140,000 in 1996). This is confirmed by Minahan (2002: 424) who mentions kin communities in adjacent areas of Cambodia and Laos as well as a small number (3,000) in the United States. [kin in neighboring country]
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