

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE A14

NEW YORK TIMES  
4 March 1987

# Long Feud Nears End

## Webster Likely to Unify Intelligence

By **FOX BUTTERFIELD**

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, March 3 — The appointment of William H. Webster to be Director of Central Intelligence could bring a definitive end to a long period of feuding between the Federal Bureau of Investigation and the Central Intelligence Agency and improve the Government's effort to curb foreign spying, experts in the field said tonight.

"Our most profound intelligence problem in this decade has been in counterintelligence," said Senator Daniel Patrick Moynihan, a New York Democrat of New York who is a former member of the Senate Intelligence Committee. "It is the function of the F.B.I., but with Judge Webster moving over to the C.I.A. he may be able to make people more aware of counterintelligence and create a better sense of common purpose."

By law, Senator Moynihan noted, the C.I.A. has no authority for spying inside the United States.

"But it has great internal interests and it has had to depend on the F.B.I. to protect these interests," the Senator said, adding, "In the past decade the F.B.I. has failed ominously in counterintelligence."

### A Split in Responsibility

A former C.I.A. official said the two agencies' rivalry in counterintelligence work had left a split in responsibility with loopholes for foreign agents. Although the two agencies often cooperated, he said the bureau's work in counterintelligence was "what you think of when you think of tracking down a spy in the New York subway."

"The C.I.A. is more like a classic spy novel," the official said. "It's sort of the cops versus the intellectuals."

G. Robert Blakey, a professor of law at the University of Notre Dame, said the F.B.I. and the C.I.A. had "an arm's-length relationship" when J. Edgar Hoover was Director of the bureau.

At that time, he said, the two agencies "didn't trust each other and sometimes didn't talk to each other."

In mid-1946 the F.B.I. was compelled

to give up its role as the nation's lead intelligence agency in Latin America to the Central Intelligence Group, the immediate predecessor of the C.I.A. But the intelligence agency did not assert full authority in Latin America until some years later.

### 1976 Senate Report Cited

As stated in a 1976 Senate report on United States intelligence activities, "F.B.I. Director Hoover had conceded his authority grudgingly. A formal agreement between the two agencies (presumably initiated by Hoover) stipulated that no F.B.I. Latin America files were to be turned over" to the C.I.A. authorities.

Under the law, Professor Blakey said, the bureau is supposed to concentrate on law enforcement in the United States while the agency works overseas. But he noted that investigations led by Senator Frank Church of Idaho, who was chairman of the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence in the 1970's, showed that the C.I.A. had engaged in operations in this country, in-

cluding investigations of the antiwar movement.

Professor Blakey said that since 1978, when Mr. Webster became Director of the F.B.I., the bureau and the agency "have cooperated more than they ever did before" on such subjects as foreign counterintelligence, terrorism and narcotics trafficking.

Jerry J. Berman, chief legislative counsel of the American Civil Liberties Union, said the selection of Mr. Webster to head the C.I.A. was "a logical choice for an Administration that is trying to dig itself out of a well-founded perception that it has broken the law in carrying out foreign policy."

"The F.B.I. and the C.I.A. have a similar mission, namely, to collect intelligence, the F.B.I. in the United States and the C.I.A. abroad," Mr. Berman said, adding, "The difference is that the C.I.A. engages in covert operations to influence events overseas. The F.B.I. has conducted investigations but has not engaged in covert activities to undermine dissent in this country since Webster became Director."