

# ARMY IS DEFENDED ON ITS TROOP DATA

MAR 8 1973

C.I.A. Analyst Is Questioned

by Ellsberg Prosecutor

NYTimes

By MARTIN ARNOLD

Special to The New York Times

LOS ANGELES, March 7—

The Government attempted today at the Pentagon papers trial to shore up the accuracy of the Army's estimates of enemy troop strength in Vietnam and at the same time to discredit a Central Intelligence Agency analyst who challenged those estimates.

Thus the Government found itself fighting in court to give credence to statistics that the Government itself stopped using after the Tet offensive in 1968.

The issue was the Order of Battle, the estimates that an army gives of the number of troops opposing it in combat.

Yesterday, Samuel A. Adams, the analyst, who was the third defense witness, testified that there were "political pressures in the military to display the enemy as weaker than he actually was." The defense contends that this was an effort to make it appear as if the Army was winning the war.

## Two Were Prepared

Mr. Adams said that after the Tet offensive in 1968, two Orders of Battle were prepared each month, one by the Army and one by the Central Intelligence Agency. The latter was used by the Government because it was more accurate, he said.

Today, on cross-examination, David R. Nissen, the chief prosecutor, asked Mr. Adams whether it was not true that he objected to the Army's Order of Battle in 1967 and that the national intelligence estimates of that year still supported the Army.

Yes, the analyst agreed, that was true.

Mr. Nissen asked if Mr. Adams's complaints about the Order of Battle had been in "your organization" heard by "very competent and senior people" who were apparently willing to go along with the Army's figures.

Again, Mr. Adams agreed that this was true, but he reiterated that the national intelligence estimates changed "after the Tet offensive" to use the C.I.A. figures, not the Army's.

Mr. Adams was asked what he meant by "political pressure" and whether "the President" or other high-ranking officials were forcing the use of lower Order of Battle estimates, and he answered that he had "heard discussions of that."

He said that on "two occasions I was told in private by [Military] officers that what I was espousing was true" but that in public the officers kept repeating the lower Order of Battle estimates.

Mr. Adams said that he knew not only from his own C.I.A. studies, but also from the Army's use of figures that the Army was fabricating the Order of Battle figures. This was done, he said, by not putting into them all the components that the agency used.

He gave this example. The Army's criteria for adding enemy troops to the Order of Battle were information contained either in captured enemy documents or in prisoner of war interviews.

But, he said, "pilots flying over an area would report anti-aircraft flak, but the military wouldn't put it [the anti-aircraft troops below] in their Order of Battle because there was no captured document or prisoner of war report."

## Order of Battle

"It was my feeling that if you see someone shooting at you, you put it in the Order of Battle," he added.

To show the various enemy forces that the agency considered part of the proper Order of Battle, Mr. Adams wrote them out yesterday on a large piece of paper on an easel, and this led to the judge's admonishing one of the defendants, Anthony J. Russo Jr.

Mr. Adams had written on the paper, for the jury to see, the following components: main/local forces, combat support, irregulars and political cadre.

During a court recess, Mr. Russo added a fifth item, "the people." Mr. Nissen complained, and Federal District Court Judge William Matthew Byrne Jr. asked who had added an item.

"I wanted to flesh it out," Mr. Russo said.

"This case is not being tried in a humorous vein," Judge Byrne replied.

"I apologize to the court," said Mr. Russo.

The judge then told him that if he did such a thing again he would not get off with a simple "warning."

Judge Byrne said that Mr. Russo was also being unfair to his co-defendant, Daniel Ellsberg, who was being "put in jeopardy." All this occurred before the jury returned from the recess.

The cross-examination of Mr. Adams will continue tomorrow morning.

The next defense witness is scheduled to be McGeorge Bundy, special assistant to Presidents Kennedy and Johnson for national security affairs, who is now president of the Ford Foundation.

Dr. Ellsberg and Mr. Russo are standing trial on six counts of espionage, six counts of theft and one count of conspiracy.