Grow Stolen Diary Incident Gives Support To Advocates of Separate G-2 Career Service

By John G. Norris

The Grow stolen diary incident has focused attention on Army intelligence—its virtues and failings—and lent support to advocates of a G-2 career service.

In other words, how good is our military intelligence today? Is Maj. Gen. Robert W. Grow—whose compromised diary has given Communist propagandists a powerful weapon in the Cold War—a good example of our intelligence personnel? Or should we build a corps of specialists in this vital field?

These questions are being discussed at the Pentagon as an aftermath of the disclosure that America's military attaché to Moscow kept a diary in which he told of his information-seeking activities in Russia and expressed his personal conviction we should attack the U.S.S.R. This diary was surreptitiously photographed by Communist agents and widely used as anti-American propaganda in Europe.

Those familiar with what has happened in military intelligence since the end of World War II agree that the changes have been all for the better.

Washington correspondents recall that just after Gen. Dwight W. Eisenhower returned to America after VE-day, he held a rather low opinion of our intelligence. Ike rated British as tops and listed the United States and Russia far down. The North Korean surprise attack and China's subsequent entry into the fight did not cause newsmen here to revise Eisenhower's summation.

Under its present chief, Maj. Gen. Alexander R. Bolling, however, G-2 has made a number of far-reaching reforms. But it takes time to build. British intelligence, for example, is hundreds of years old. Britain has a hard corps of specialists in its G-2 service—something we never have had. One of the improve-