BY MR. MASTRO:

Q. WHAT WAS YOUR RANK IN THE ARMY RESERVES WHEN YOU LEFT THE ARMY RESERVES IN 1970?
A. SECOND LIEUTENANT.

Q. WHEN YOU TESTIFIED DURING MR. MURRY'S EXAMINATION THAT THE ONE TO ONE RATIO WHICH YOU DEVELOPED OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE TROOPS TO MANEUVER TROOPS WAS A "BEST GUESS," DID YOU MEAN TO IMPLY THAT THAT ESTIMATE WAS A GUESS?

MR. MURRY: OBJECT TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION.

A. I DIDN'T INTENTIONALLY TESTIFY THAT THE ONE TO ONE RATIO WAS A GUESS OR A BEST GUESS.

I ONLY MEANT TO SAY THAT SOMETIMES ANALYSTS WHEN TALKING ABOUT ESTIMATES REFERRED TO ESTIMATES AS BEST GUESSES WHEN THEY MEANT THAT THAT WAS THEIR BEST ANALYTICAL JUDGMENT ABOUT WHAT THE RESULTS SHOULD BE.

I HOPE I'VE MADE CLEAR IN NUMEROUS ANSWERS HERE THAT I FELT THAT THE ONE TO ONE RATIO WAS A WELL-SUPPORTED PIECE OF ANALYSIS.

BY MR. MASTRO:

Q. WHEN YOU TESTIFIED EARLIER TODAY THAT A GREAT NUMBER OF NVA UNITS MOVED INTO SOUTH VIETNAM JUST BEFORE THE TET OFFENSIVE, YOU SAID THAT THIS MOVEMENT OF NVA UNITS INTO SOUTH VIETNAM BEFORE TET WAS "APPELLANTLY UNKNOWN TO MACV."
WHAT DID YOU MEAN BY "APPARENTLY UNBEKNOWNST TO MACV"?
MR. MURRY: OBJECTION.
A. WHAT I MEANT WAS THAT THE MACV INFILTRATION NUMBERS IN THE MONTHS LEADING UP TO TET DID NOT SHOW THE MOVEMENT OF THESE UNITS FROM THE AREA NORTH OF THE DMZ DOWN INTO THE DMZ, INTO THE BORDER AREA AND INTO SOUTH VIETNAM.
BY MR. MASTRO:
Q. YOU BECAME AWARE OF THIS GREAT NUMBER OF UNITS MOVING INTO SOUTH VIETNAM BEFORE THE TET OFFENSIVE AFTER THE TET OFFENSIVE; IS THAT CORRECT.
MR. MURRY: OBJECTION.
A. I'M NOT SURE IF I FIRST BECAME AWARE OF THE MOVEMENT OF THESE UNITS BEFORE THE TET OFFENSIVE OR AFTER. I RECALL FROM SPECIAL INTELLIGENCE SOURCES THAT THESE UNITS BEFORE THE OFFENSIVE WERE IN THE NORTH OF THE BORDER AREA.
I DON'T KNOW AT WHAT POINT I ACTUALLY LEARNED THAT THEY CAME DOWN INTO THE BORDER AREA AND ACROSS THE BORDER.
BY MR. MASTRO:
Q. AT THE APRIL 1968 ORDER OF BATTLE CONFERENCE DID COLONEL GRAHAM OFFER ANY DOCUMENTARY EVIDENCE TO SUPPORT THE MACV POSITION ON TOTAL STRENGTH FOR THE ENEMY'S ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES?
MR. MURRY: OBJECT TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION.
BY MR. MASTRO:

Q. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION?
A. YES.

NO, HE OFFERED NOTHING. HE SIMPLY STATED THAT THAT WAS MACV'S ESTIMATE. HE DIDN'T WANT TO BECOME ENGAGED IN ANY SORT OF EXCHANGE OF INFORMATION.

HE MADE A FEW REMARKS CRITICAL OF OUR ESTIMATE; I THINK I RECALLED ONE ABOUT THE NUMBER OF DOCUMENTS BEING INSUFFICIENT. AND HE WOULDN'T OTHERWISE ENGAGE US IN A DISCUSSION OF WHAT THE NUMBERS OUGHT TO BE.

Q. AT THE APRIL, 1968 ORDER OF BATTLE CONFERENCE DID COLONEL GRAHAM EXPLAIN THE METHODOLOGY USED BY MACV TO FORMULATE ITS ESTIMATE OF TOTAL STRENGTH FOR THE ENEMY'S ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES?

MR. MURRY: OBJECTION.

BY MR. MASTRO:

Q. DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE QUESTION?
A. I DO.

Q. PLEASE PROCEED.
A. I RECALL HIM SAYING SOMETHING ABOUT THE METHODOLOGY USED FOR THE ADMIN. SERVICES OB WAS SIMILAR TO THAT USED FOR THE MAIN FORCE OB BASED ON UNITS ACTUALLY CONTACTED.

Q. WHAT WAS YOUR REACTION TO COLONEL GRAHAM'S STATEMENTS AT THE APRIL, 1968 ORDER OF BATTLE CONFERENCE ABOUT STRENGTH ESTIMATES FOR THE ENEMY'S ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES?
A. I was very surprised that a senior intelligence official for MACV would not engage us in a meaningful discussion of the strength of the administrative services groups. I felt that he was a man who had his orders to stay with the number which they already had and he was not going to budge or discuss the matter with us in any way.

Q. In the draft working paper which you prepared on administrative services which you attached to your affidavit as Exhibit A and which has been marked as joint exhibit 472, there is a discussion in paragraph 8 about the personnel included in the enemy's administrative services. I believe that Mr. Murry asked you a series of questions about the reference in this paragraph to cooks and washerwomen. Do you recall those questions?

A. Yes.

Q. Could you please read that full paragraph into the record.

A. Yes. "The quality of administrative service personnel varies considerably within given units, and some personnel occasionally listed in documents—cooks and washerwomen, for example—may be unworthy of being carried in the military ob. The number of such persons listed in the documents is small, however, and it is therefore reasonable that almost all personnel belonging to what are defined as administrative service units should be recognized as part of the
COMMUNISTS' MILITARY ESTABLISHMENT. IN THE PAST, HOWEVER, MACV HAS SCALED DOWN THE NUMBERS OF SERVICE AND SUPPORT TROOPS REPORTED IN THE DOCUMENTS."

THAT'S THE END OF THE QUOTATION OF THE PARAGRAPH.

WHAT I MEANT HERE IS SIMPLY THAT THERE MAY BE VERY SMALL OR VERY FEW NUMBERS OF COOKS OR WASHERWOMEN INCLUDED IN SOME OF THESE NUMBERS, BUT IF THEY ARE, IT'S A VERY SMALL NUMBER; THAT BASICALLY THESE UNITS ARE FULL-TIME PROFESSIONAL SOLDIERS, AND THERE IS NO RATIONAL BASIS FOR SCALING DOWN THE NUMBERS THAT THE ENEMY REPORTS AS BEING IN THESE UNITS BECAUSE OF THE SUPPOSED PRESENCE OF COOKS OR WASHERWOMEN.

MR. MURRY: MOVE TO STRIKE THE ANSWER AS NONRESPONSIVE AFTER HE FINISHED READING THE PARAGRAPH.

BY MR. MASTRO:

Q. IN THIS PARAGRAPH YOU MAKE REFERENCE TO MACV "SCALING DOWN" THE NUMBERS OF SERVICE AND SUPPORT TROOPS REPORTED IN DOCUMENTS.

WHAT DID YOU MEAN BY MACV "SCALING DOWN" THE NUMBERS?

MR. MURRY: OBJECTION.

A. I WAS REFERRING TO THE PROCESS WHEREBY MACV ARBITRARILY REDUCED THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE REPORTED IN A CAPTURED DOCUMENT AS BEING PART OF A UNIT BECAUSE MACV BELIEVED, APPARENTLY, THAT THESE PEOPLE WERE NOT WORTHY OF BEING INCLUDED IN AN OB.
I think I mentioned earlier a document that I recalled that had some notations indicating the extent of scaling down that had taken place.

By Mr. Mastro:

Q. Mr. Stumpf, I'd like to show you a document dated April 2, 1968.

Mr. Murry: Do you have a copy of that, counsel?

Mr. Mastro: I do not, but I will of course show it to you, Mr. Murry, when I've finished explaining what it is.

This is a document dated April 2, 1968. It is a "Memorandum for the Record: Subject: History of Strength Estimates of the Communist Administrative Services."

The document is five pages in length with two appendices.

I'd like this to be marked as Defendants' Exhibit No. 1 at the Stumpf deposition.

(Copy of five-page "Memorandum for the Record" with two appendices marked Defendants' Exhibit 1 for identification)

By Mr. Mastro:

Q. Mr. Stumpf, in particular, I would like you to look at paragraph 15 of this document and Appendix B of the document. Please read the introductory paragraph of Appendix B into the record, entitled "The Scaling Down of Administrative Services in Long Dat District."

A. "At the Saigon conference, a CIA representative
ASKED MACV TO DEMONSTRATE HOW IT HAD "SCALED DOWN" THE
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES BY ELIMINATING WHAT IT DESCRIBED AS
"PART-TIMERS" AND "HANGERS-ON." MACV WAS PRESENTED WITH A
CAPTURED DOCUMENT, (MACV DEC LOG 06-1409-67) LISTING THE
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE TROOPS (AMONG OTHERS) IN LONG DAT
DISTRICT, VC BA BIEN PROVINCE, AND WAS ASKED TO ELIMINATE THOSE
IT SAW FIT. COMPARED BELOW ARE THE NUMBERS AS INDICATED IN THE
DOCUMENT AND THE NUMBERS "SCALED DOWN" BY MACV:

WHAT follows is a list of perhaps 10 or 12 sections
OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE UNITS AND THE ORIGINAL NUMBER ON THE
DOCUMENT AND THE SCALED DOWN NUMBERS.

Q. WHEN YOU WERE TESTIFYING EARLIER TODAY ABOUT THE
"SCALING DOWN" OF STRENGTH ESTIMATES FROM THE CAPTURED ENEMY
DOCUMENT, IS THIS THE DOCUMENT TO WHICH YOU WERE REFERRING?

A. YES, IT IS. IT'S -- I THINK I MENTIONED IN MY
TESTIMONY THAT I THOUGHT IT WAS LONG DAT DISTRICT, AND THAT WAS
RIGHT. THIS DOCUMENT SHOWS THAT THE NUMBERS REPORTED WERE 103
AND IT WAS SCALED DOWN BY MACV TO 42.

Q. WAS SPECIAL INTELLIGENCE USED TO FORMULATE YOUR
ENEMY RECRUITMENT ESTIMATES?

A. NO.

Q. MR. MURRY SHOWED YOU EARLIER TODAY THE AFFIDAVIT OF
MICHAEL FRABONI WHO WAS A MACV RECRUITMENT ANALYST. WOULD YOU
PLEASE READ PARAGRAPH 9 OF HIS AFFIDAVIT INTO THE RECORD.

MR. MURRY: OBJECTION.
"By the time I left Saigon in August, 1968, I had become disenchanted with my work. Just before leaving Vietnam, I told my commanding officer that I felt our efforts in OB studies were basically a waste of time. We were doing our best to produce estimates of some value, but it was apparent to me that the MACV command had their own numbers and they were not willing to accept estimates from the analysts in OB studies that conflicted with these numbers. Therefore, I felt the whole exercise was ridiculous. Our work had become meaningless."

And the document is executed by Michael Fraboni.

BY MR. MASTRO:

Q. Did Michael Fraboni express similar sentiments to you when you met with him in Saigon in late 1967 and early 1968?

A. Yes. He and other analysts in CICV expressed these sentiments of disgust.

BY MR. MASTRO:

Q. What did Michael Fraboni tell you during your visit to Saigon in late 1967 and early 1968 about his work on enemy recruitment estimates for MACV?

A. I'm sorry I can't be very helpful to you there, sir, because it's impossible for me to remember exactly what Michael Fraboni told me vis-a-vis what some of the other analysts told me.
BY MR. MASTRO:

Q. CAN YOU GIVE ME A GENERAL SENSE OF WHAT MICHAEL FRABONI TOLD YOU WHEN YOU MET WITH HIM IN LATE 1967 OR EARLY 1968?

MR. MURRY: OBJECTION.

MR. MASTRO: I'LL WITHDRAW THE QUESTION.

Q. YOU TESTIFIED EARLIER TODAY THAT YOUR ESTIMATES FOR TOTAL ENEMY STRENGTH FOR THE ENEMY'S ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES WAS 75,000 TO 100,000 IN THE SPRING OF 1968; IS THAT CORRECT?

A. YES, AT THE OB CONFERENCE IN WASHINGTON.

Q. DID THAT ESTIMATE OF TOTAL ENEMY STRENGTH FOR THE ENEMY'S ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES INCLUDE ENEMY ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE TROOPS WHO WERE OUTSIDE OF SOUTH VIETNAM?

A. NO, GENERALLY NOT. IT MAY HAVE INCLUDED A FEW THAT WERE RIGHT ON THE BORDER, BUT FOR ALL INTENTS AND PURPOSES, THEY WOULD BE IN SOUTH VIETNAM AND SUBORDINATE COMMAND STRUCTURES IN SOUTH VIETNAM.

Q. MR. MURRY ASKED YOU WHETHER OR NOT YOU HAD ATTENDED THE NIE CONFERENCES IN AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER OF 1967. WERE YOU AWARE OF WHAT TRANSPRIRED AT THOSE CONFERENCES?

A. I WAS GENERALLY AWARE, YES.

Q. WHAT WERE YOU AWARE OF?

A. I WAS AWARE OF OUR CIA VIEW THAT THE ORDER OF BATTLE WAS CONSIDERABLY LARGER THAN MACV WAS WILLING TO ACCEPT, THAT THERE WAS A PROTRACTED CONTROVERSY WITH MACV ON THIS
MATTER, THAT WE FELT THAT MACV WAS STONEWALLING AND ATTEMPTING TO KEEP ITS ORDER OF BATTLE TO A NUMBER LESS THAN 300,000, WHEREAS WE WERE PRESENTING EVIDENCE THAT INDICATED THAT THERE WERE CONSIDERABLY MORE, MORE PEOPLE THERE.

Q. DO YOU KNOW WHOSE POSITION PREVAILED AT THOSE NIE CONFERENCES?

MR. MURRY: YOU'RE TALKING ABOUT THE 1968 ORDER OF BATTLE CONFERENCE?


Q. DO YOU KNOW WHOSE POSITION PREVAILED AT THE NIE CONFERENCES IN AUGUST AND SEPTEMBER?

A. I RECALL --

MR. MURRY: OBJECT TO THE FORM OF THE QUESTION.

A. I RECALL AT THE SAIGON OB CONFERENCE THAT CIA ENDED UP GIVING IN TO MACV'S POINT OF VIEW. MANY OF US BACK IN WASHINGTON FELT THAT WE SHOULD NOT HAVE DONE THIS, THAT OUR VIEW WAS RIGHT. AND I BELIEVE THAT THE TET OFFENSIVE AND THE AFTERMATH VINDICATED US IN THIS VIEW.

MR. MASTRO: I HAVE NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.

MR. MURRY: I'VE JUST GOT A COUPLE.

EXAMINATION

BY MR. MURRY:

Q. DO YOU KNOW WHAT THE TERM "COLLATERAL ORDER OF
"BATTLE" MEANS?

A. YES.

Q. YOU KNEW, DID YOU NOT, IN 1967 AND 1968 THAT THE MACV ORDER OF BATTLE SUMMARY WAS A COLLATERAL ORDER OF BATTLE, DID YOU NOT?

MR. MASTRO: OBJECTION. OBJECTION TO FORM.

A. YES.

BY MR. MURRY:

Q. COULD YOU LOOK AGAIN AT THE DOCUMENT THAT'S BEEN MARKED AS DEFENDANTS' EXHIBIT NO. 1 AT THE STUMPF DEPOSITION WHICH IS A 2 APRIL 1968 MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD, SUBJECT: HISTORY OF STRENGTH ESTIMATES OF THE COMMUNIST "ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES."

I'D LIKE TO DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO APPENDIX B WHICH YOU READ FROM EARLIER. AND YOU SAID EARLIER THAT IN ADDITION TO AN OPENING PARAGRAPH WHICH MR. MASTRO HAD YOU READ INTO THE RECORD, WHAT FOLLOWED WAS A LISTING OF NUMBERS IN A DOCUMENT, A CAPTURED ENEMY DOCUMENT, AND "SCALED DOWN" NUMBERS.

LET ME ASK YOU: DO YOU KNOW WHO AUTHORED THIS DOCUMENT THAT'S BEEN MARKED AS DEFENDANTS' EXHIBIT 1 AT THE STUMPF DEPOSITION?

MR. MASTRO: ARE YOU ASKING HIM WHO AUTHORED THE DOCUMENT OR WHO AUTHORED THE APPENDIX B?

MR. MURRY: I'M CONSIDERING THE DOCUMENT AS A WHOLE.
MR. MASTRO: I THINK THE DOCUMENT SPEAKS FOR
ITSELF. I'LL OBJECT TO THE QUESTION.

BY MR. MURRY:
Q. DO YOU KNOW WHO AUTHORED THIS DOCUMENT, SIR?
A. THE BODY OF THE DOCUMENT WITHOUT THE APPENDICES
BEARS THE NAME SAMUEL A. ADAMS. PRESUMABLY THE INFORMATION IN
APPENDIX B IS TAKEN FROM A CAPTURED ENEMY DOCUMENT SUPPLEMENTED
BY INFORMATION FROM MACV.
Q. DO YOU KNOW WHO COMPILED THIS INFORMATION IN THE
FORM IN WHICH IT IS PRESENTED IN APPENDIX B?
A. I BELIEVE SAM ADAMS DID.
Q. WOULD YOU READ INTO THE RECORD THE BODY OF THE
DOCUMENT THAT COMES AFTER THE PARAGRAPH WHICH MR. MASTRO HAD YOU
READ INTO THE RECORD.
A. YES, I WILL. FOR THE BENEFIT OF THE COURT
REPORTER, I WILL BE READING THE INDIVIDUAL ELEMENTS OF THE
ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE GROUP, AND THEN I WILL GIVE TWO NUMBERS.
THE FIRST NUMBER WILL BE THE NUMBER OF PEOPLE REPORTED IN THE
DOCUMENT AS BEING MEMBERS OF THAT ELEMENT, AND THEN THE SECOND
NUMBER WILL BE THE SCALED DOWN NUMBER.
I'LL BEGIN: "COMMAND COMMITTEE, FIVE AND FIVE;
TRAINING AND OPERATIONS, FOUR AND FOUR."
Q. AND THE FIRST NUMBER YOU'RE READING IS THE NUMBER
IN THE DOCUMENT, AND THE SECOND NUMBER IS THE "SCALED DOWN" NUMBER?
A. YES, SIR.

"MILITARY INTELLIGENCE, FIVE AND TWO; POLITICAL STAFF, FOUR AND FOUR; REAR SERVICES, 14 AND 4; RECON AND LIAISON, FOUR AND ONE; PRODUCTION, THREE AND ZERO; SAPPER/RECON, NINE AND SIX; ENGINEER, SIX AND SIX; MEDICAL, 15 AND 3; ORDINANCE, 15 AND 3; MILITARY POSTAL, 19 AND 4."


Q. MR. STUMPF, YOU DON'T KNOW WHY SOME OF THOSE NUMBERS GO DOWN AND SOME OF THOSE NUMBERS STAY THE SAME, DO YOU, SIR?

A. MR. MASTRO: OBJECTION. OBJECTION TO FORM.

MR. MASTRO: OBJECTION. OBJECTION TO FORM.

A. THE TEXT THAT I READ EARLIER INDICATES THAT MACV HAD ELIMINATED PEOPLE THAT IT DESCRIBED AS "PART-TIMERS" AND "HANGERS-ON."

I DON'T KNOW WHY IT WOULD OR WHAT EVIDENCE MACV HAD TO BELIEVE THAT THE MEDICAL PERSONNEL, FOR EXAMPLE, IN LONG DAT PROVINCE WERE PART-TIMERS OR HANGERS-ON.

BY MR. MURRY:

Q. I WANT TO SHOW YOU AGAIN A DOCUMENT DATED 2 MAY 1968, SUBJECT: RESULTS OF COMMUNITY NEGOTIATIONS ON ENEMY STRENGTHS IN SOUTH VIETNAM.

LET ME DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION IN PARTICULAR TO ANNEX A OF THAT DOCUMENT WHICH IS ENTITLED "REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE ON DCI ASSESSMENT OF ENEMY STRENGTHS, 10-16, APRIL, 1968."
WHAT DO THE LETTERS DCI STAND FOR?

A. NORMALLY, THEY STOOD FOR DIRECTOR OF CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE.

Q. LET ME DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION, AND OF COURSE TAKE YOUR TIME AND LOOK THROUGH THE DOCUMENT AT WHATEVER LENGTH YOU'D LIKE, BUT I WANT TO DIRECT YOUR ATTENTION TO PAGE 11 OF THE DOCUMENT.

DO YOU SEE THERE THERE'S A DISCUSSION AT PARAGRAPH C OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES?

A. YES.

Q. AND THIS DOCUMENT SAYS THAT, "THE CIA ESTIMATE ALSO INCLUDES A NUMBER OF TROOPS SERVING OUT OF COUNTRY BUT SUBORDINATE TO HEADQUARTERS ELEMENTS OPERATING IN THE SOUTH," DOES IT NOT, SIR?

A. THAT'S WHAT THE SENTENCE SAYS HERE.

Q. IS THAT STATEMENT ACCURATE TO THE BEST OF YOUR KNOWLEDGE AND BELIEF?

MR. MASTRO: OBJECTION. OBJECTION TO FORM.

A. I HAVE TESTIFIED BEFORE THAT THE CIA ESTIMATE COVERED ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE TROOPS THAT WERE IN SOUTH VIETNAM AND IN THE IMMEDIATE BORDER AREA, OPERATING VERY CLOSE TO THE BORDER, AND SUBORDINATE TO HEADQUARTERS IN SOUTH VIETNAM. THESE UNITS MOVED AROUND. AT SOME TIME THEY MIGHT HAVE BEEN ON ONE SIDE OF THE BORDER, AND OTHER TIMES THE OTHER SIDE OF THE BORDER.
ON A GIVEN DAY NO ONE COULD KNOW WHERE THEY WERE.

IT WOULD BE MISLEADING NOT TO INCLUDE THEM IN THE OB IN THAT
THEY WERE SO CLOSE TO VIETNAM THAT IF THEY WEREN'T ACTUALLY IN
IT, THEY MIGHT AS WELL HAVE BEEN IN IT. I'M SURE THERE WERE
TIMES WHEN THESE UNITS WOULD ACTUALLY HAVE BEEN IN SOUTH
VIETNAM.

BY MR. MURRY:

Q. DID YOU HAVE DISCUSSIONS WITH ANY MEMBERS OF THE
MACV DELEGATION TO THE 1968 ORDER OF BATTLE CONFERENCE IN
WASHINGTON?

MR. MASTRO: READ BACK THE QUESTION.

(LAST QUESTION READ)

MR. MASTRO: EXCEPT AS HE'S ALREADY TESTIFIED?

MR. MURRY: YES.

A. I'VE TESTIFIED ABOUT THE DISCUSSION I HAD WITH
COLONEL GRAHAM IN WHICH I FELT THAT HE DIDN'T NEGOTIATE OR
EXCHANGE WITH US IN GOOD FAITH ON THE MATTER.

BY MR. MURRY:

Q. DID YOU HAVE ANY DISCUSSIONS WITH ANY OTHER MEMBERS
OF THE MACV DELEGATION, IF YOU CAN RECALL?

A. I MAY POSSIBLY HAVE HAD, BUT THOSE WOULD HAVE BEEN
BRIEF AND I CANNOT RECALL THEM.

Q. DO YOU SEE IN THE DOCUMENT I PUT IN FRONT OF YOU,
THE REPORT OF THE CONFERENCE ON DCI ASSESSMENT OF ENEMY
STRENGTHS 10-16 APRIL, 1968, SUBPARAGRAPH C, THE STATEMENT, "IN
THE DISCUSSION OF THE ESTIMATE, A CASE WAS MADE THAT CIA MIGHT
WELL HAVE USED TOO HIGH A RATIO OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE FORCES
TO COMBAT FORCES."

DO YOU SEE THAT, SIR?

A. YES.

Q. YOU TESTIFIED A MOMENT AGO, I BELIEVE, THAT TO YOUR
RECOLLECTION COLONEL GRAHAM DID NOT PRESENT ARGUMENTS IN
OPPOSITION TO YOUR ESTIMATE OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES. DO YOU
RECALL THAT?

A. I SAID HE DID NOT PRESENT SUBSTANTIVE ARGUMENTS OR
ENTER INTO DISCUSSIONS WITH US CONCERNING THE BASIS OF OUR
ESTIMATE AND HIS ESTIMATE. I DO NOT RECALL COLONEL GRAHAM
SAYING AT ANY POINT THAT OUR RATIO WAS TOO HIGH.

Q. YOU DON'T RECALL COLONEL GRAHAM CRITICIZING YOUR
RATIO OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES TO COMBAT TROOPS?

A. NO. I RECALL HIM CRITICIZING THE NUMBER OF
DOCUMENTS IN OUR SAMPLE.

Q. DO YOU KNOW WHAT PERSON OR PERSONS MADE THE CASE
THAT'S REFERRED TO IN PARAGRAPH C THAT THE CIA MIGHT HAVE USED
TOO HIGH A RATIO OF ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICE TROOPS TO COMBAT
PERSONNEL?

A. NO.

MR. MURRY: NO FURTHER QUESTIONS AT THIS TIME.

MR. MASTRO: NO FURTHER QUESTIONS.
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