

Date: NOV 15 1955

Middle-East Tension Seen Very Dangerous

Herewith is presented the text of an interview with Allen W. Dulles, director of Central Intelligence Agency, by Richard Rendell.

Washington, Nov. 15. (NANA)

Rendell—Mr. Dulles, on the basis of your present information, what do you think are the prospects for the immediate future in the Middle East, as

you know, the situation has been very much confused by this recent delivery of Communist arms—supposedly coming from Czechoslovakia, but the hand which sent them there is the hand of Moscow. Unfortunately, this large shipment of arms in a very tense

situation that exists in that area is calculated to cause trouble to increase the threat of war, and consequently, play into the hands of the Soviets—quite a grave danger for us all.

Q. Do you think that danger is truly a serious one?

A. Whenever you have as explosive a situation as that in the Middle East, it doesn't take very many matches to light a fire.

Q. Mr. Dulles, now that the conference of foreign ministers at Geneva has run into great difficulty, what information do you

have—what do you think—will be Russia's next move?

A. I think Russia will continue along, particularly in the field in which I am acquainted—namely in the subversive field to American policy they have been following. As I've said several times in the last few weeks, we see no evidence here in the C. I. A. that the Soviet Union has renounced any of its subversive tactics or changed its policy. And what I just said about the Middle East a few minutes ago is pretty good evidence of that.

Q. There haven't been any ex-

plussions in the news of the Far East lately; what is the meaning of that?

A. Well, Mr. Rendell, as you know, there have been so many explosions in other parts of the world that probably our attention has been directed—temporarily, at least—a little bit away from the Far East to other problems. I can't see any evidence of any substantial change of policy on the part of the Chinese Communists. They have not given up any of their subversive objectives. They have not yet freed a great many of the persons they are illegally holding

I don't think we can forget the Far East a minute.

Q. Now, I would like to bring the questioning to a point closer to home. In a speech in Philadelphia recently, you said that you would not be surprised if we heard that countries in this hemisphere, the western hemisphere, were being approached to accept obsolete but surplus Communist countries' munitions. Is there anything further that you can tell us regarding what has occurred since your speech in Philadelphia—

believe it was on the third of October?

A. I think I can say this: We have evidence, increasing evidence, that there are offers being made even to countries in this hemisphere. You may remember that less than two years ago it was a shipment of Czech arms to Guatemala which alerted the free world to the danger that that country was facing a Communist takeover.

The Soviets are not likely to forget how nearly they succeeded in that, and they may try the

same thing over again in other parts, even of this continent.

Q. Mr. Dulles, here is something more personal. Your organization is a substantial one. There are some people—American citizens—who would like to know more about it. Perhaps they are fearful or apprehensive that the C. I. A. could become a threat to the constitutional guarantees of individual liberty for American citizens. I'd be very grateful if you would talk about that, sir.

A. Let me take up the last part of your question, Mr. Rendell, right at the beginning, this question of threat. You probably know, but maybe the American people at large don't fully know, that I have no police powers. I have no investigative powers in the United States at all.

My job is to deal with intelligence, collected and coming from various foreign countries, and try to put that intelligence together, working with other intelligence agencies of government, so as to help protect the national security. There are many other collectors.

We're not the only collectors, you know, the state department collects intelligence, and the services—the military and naval air attaches collect intelligence. And it comes in many, many ways.

Q. Is it all followed or channeled through the Central Intelligence agency?

A. Yes, it is, and we try to coordinate that intelligence, but in doing that work of coordination we, too, don't do it alone. We have a meeting here every week with the head of the other intelligence services, so as to try to give the policy makers not only our ideas, but the ideas of the intelligence community here in Washington as a whole.

Q. You are sort of a harmonizer, would that be the way to put it?

A. Well, Mr. Rendell, I wouldn't quite put it as a harmonizer because there are clear differences of opinion. I prefer that the policy makers should know these differences of opinion, because it is rare that our intelligence all points in one direction. But we try to see that the vital elements of that intelligence get to the policy makers at the very top level, and get there quickly. Really, I think our main job here is to prevent another Pearl Harbor

Vertical handwritten note on the right margin, partially obscured by a large black redaction mark.

(OVER)

Q. Well, now then, there is consideration now for a new location for the headquarters building of your organization, the Central Intelligence agency. What is your thinking about that matter?

A. First of all, I know we need it badly. We're scattered around in temporary buildings that were built for the purposes of World War II. We had a great overflow of government workers. The buildings were supposed to fall down, I understand, in about five years, but here they are—and we're still working in them, or trying to work in them.

The congress has recognized that I need a new building and has authorized its construction and has appropriated the money to start it. And as you know, Mr. Rendell, I have an idea that I can create a building that will be a kind of model office building.

Q. What do you mean by that, Mr. Dulles?

A. Well, I'm going to put the building a little outside of Washington. I'm going to put it, if I can, in a park area where there can be plenty of space for cars, so that those who come to work in their own cars will have a place to park right near where they work.

G. Do you have any particular area in mind?

A. Well, as you probably know, I appeared before the national capital planning commission and other commissions here in Washington a few days ago and explained my preference for the Langley site, which is on the Potomac—high above the Potomac.

The government owns the land now, so I won't have to displace anybody or put up any money for my land, and there I have plenty of space to build this kind of a building or series of buildings.

Under the conditions here, I think my employes would be able to work better. They'll be able to go out there for their lunches out in the woods if they want at lunch time. They will have new facilities that I don't believe—that I know—our government workers do not now have, and they ought to have a break. And that would apply from the youngest stenographer to the oldest employes.