

More CIA trouble may follow deputy director's resignation

CPYRIGHT

CPYRIGHT

CPYRIGHT

WASHINGTON

INSIDE REPORT

... by Rowland Evans and Robert Novak

CERTAIN to impair declining morale in the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) is the unannounced, unprecedented decision of a topflight professional intelligence man to resign as Deputy Director for Intelligence for a lesser job.

Ray Cline has privately informed CIA chief William F. (Red) Raborn that he wants to relinquish the agency's fourth-highest post and take a field job in Europe. His decision comes as Raborn is under increasing internal CIA criticism for letting CIA morale slip.

Although Cline disclaims unhappiness with Raborn as a factor in his unusual departure, colleagues think otherwise.

More important, the departure of the crack intelligence professional will leave a gaping hole in the agency at the very time that internal dissatisfaction with Raborn is highest.


The question asked in Washington is this: If Raborn (justly famed as the father of the Polaris missile) can't prevent the flight of a crack professional like Cline, how can he restore his agency to the high morale it enjoyed under former Directors Allen Dulles and John McCone?

Another factor lies behind Cline's decision: His intimacies to McGeorge Bundy, who is quitting as President Johnson's top national security aide effective Feb. 28.

With Bundy as the chief White House link to CIA, he and Cline were in the thick of super-secret operations during the Cuban missile crisis. It was Cline who rushed the first



Gerald Ford



Everett Dirksen

U-2 pictures of Soviet missiles in Cuba to Bundy at the White House in October, 1962. Bundy ran them upstairs to President Kennedy.

Soft on LBJ

PRELIMINARY drafts for the Republican "State of the Union" speech to be delivered Jan. 19 by House Leader Gerald Ford and Senate Leader Everett M. Dirksen have been discarded as being much too critical of President Johnson.

Because of LBJ's peace offensive, Republican strategists won't risk the label of "war party" belittling peace overtures. Consequently, Republican members of Congress will be softer on Mr. Johnson.

Furthermore, Rep. Melvin Laird of Wisconsin, a leading Republican spokesman on

military affairs, is cautioning Republican congressmen not to criticize the President's bombing pause as an aid to Communist military operations. Though a hard-liner himself, Laird would leave war hawk talk to right wing Democrats like Mendel Rivers of South Carolina.

Yarmolinsky to go

ADAM Yarmolinsky, an imaginative, dedicated public servant immobilized by neo-McCarthyism, has decided to call it quits in Washington after 16 months in limbo. He intends to join Harvard's new Kennedy Institute.

Yarmolinsky's troubles began early in 1964 when he left the Pentagon (where he was Secretary of Defense Robert McNamara's top assistant) to Sargent Shriver in the new

poverty program.

To appease Southern conservatives (who made absurd charges of Communist sympathies), Yarmolinsky was bounced out of the poverty program in August, 1964. Since then, President Johnson has declined to give Yarmolinsky any job requiring Senate confirmation.

Although friends urged Yarmolinsky to quit with a blast at the White House, he declined — telling them he needed to rehabilitate his unjustly shattered reputation. Consequently, he wandered inside the Great Society without a permanent job until named Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for International Affairs in October — a junior position not requiring Senate confirmation.

A footnote: Other New Frontiersmen set to turn up at the Kennedy Institute are Daniel P. Moynihan, former Assistant Secretary of Labor and author of the famed report on the Negro family, and Carl Kaysen, former White House aide for international affairs.

Interest from Salty

IN ONE of his last acts as a politician, Sen. Leverett Saltonstall of Massachusetts displayed the thrift and honesty of a New England Yankee.

The Senate Republican Campaign Committee had given Saltonstall \$5,000 as a preliminary contribution to his 1966 re-election campaign. When Saltonstall announced his retirement, he promptly returned the \$5,000 — plus another \$500.

Why the extra \$500? Rather than let the \$5,000 lie idle until campaign time, Saltonstall had put the money to work. The \$500 represented the return on his investment, and he felt that too should be returned to the Campaign Committee.