

## CIA-Ambassadors Clash Over Who's Boss

By The Associated Press

Traditionally, the U.S. ambassador has been in charge of American operations in his particular country. Ambassadorial protests that this is not always so concerning the CIA was given some credence in 1961 when President Kennedy issued a memo reasserting the ambassadors' primacy.

An ex-CIA official said if an ambassador objects to a CIA operation "the chances are 99 to 1 it won't happen." But two years ago a congressional committee reported "to a degree the primacy of the ambassador is a polite fiction."

There have been reports of some polite friction between the State Department and the CIA, partially because their reporting duties sometimes overlap and because the agents can use dollars instead of just diplomacy in their pursuits. But there appears to be general agreement the diplomats should stick to diplomacy and the CIA to finding out, as one congressman put it, "who is sleeping with whom."

Yet the very existence of the Defense Intelligence Agency causes some concern in the CIA. The DIA was created in 1961 to coordinate the reports of the Army, Navy and Air Force intelligence branches, including the work of the military's Samos spy satellites.

Whether the DIA, with its 5,751 employees — unlike the CIA it reports that figure but buries its budget, which may be bigger than the CIA's — will come to have more in common with CIA than its initials remains to be seen.

Some CIA voices would answer the only way to have a fine intelligence agency is to shut up about it. They have said the CIA is not secret enough, is too closely identified with the government overseas, should be more like the Secret Service in Britain where its head is

not publicly known and where Daniel DeFoe, author of "Robinson Crusoe," had been dead 50 years before any one knew he was chief of English intelligence.

In judging the CIA the public should consider the difficulty of the task undertaken, the agency has said in its defense, and not write off misfires automatically to incompetence. Its very secrecy makes it a handy scapegoat for other agency's mistakes. It has conceded two blunders and attributed them to amateurism, but says neither has been made public.

Some of its brighter moments have. In 1948 the CIA correctly predicted the Russians would not fight over the Berlin airlift. It knew in advance of the British-French intervention in the

Suez, of the overthrow of Premier Kassem in Iraq, of a recent coup in a friendly Middle East country although the U.S. ambassador insisted it could not happen. A year before Sputnik I the CIA reported the Russians had the ability to launch a satellite.

About a year ago the agency asked in some newsmen — a CIA first — and briefed them to the effect that the Soviet economy was in trouble. "We have as many Ph.Ds studying the Soviet economy as any one in the world, maybe Russia itself," said a former intelligence person. "I sometimes wonder what effect our report had on Khrushchev's departure." In any event, recent upheavals in the Soviet way of doing business would seem to give the Ph.Ds good marks.

"The CIA is not as good as it should be," one who should know said recently. "But it is constantly improving. I don't think, any responsible intelligence officer is going to say it is as good as it should be until we know what our adversaries are going to do and the likelihood of any confrontation anywhere in the world. Russia may get more intelligence with the help of its Communist parties around the world, but I submit they have more trouble analyzing it. I think we are the best in the world in proving intelligence to our policy makers."

But perhaps the final judgment of the CIA does not lie in adding up the black eyes and balancing them against the merit badges. Consider, rather, this: If lack of intelligence is a road to war has the United States' intensified use of it led away from war?

"I shudder to think what sort of nuclear blackmail we would have been subjected to if we didn't have the U2s over Russia and Cuba," said the knowledgeable informant. "If we hadn't had the CIA, I wonder if we would have even survived. And if we maintain our intelligence, it is just possible we can get through the rest of the century with just small wars."