

For the Record *Post 8/14/76*  
**Kelley: 'I Have Control of the FBI'**

The following is excerpted from the appearance of Clarence M. Kelley, director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, on CBS's "Face the Nation" Aug. 8.

Q: Mr. Kelley, three months ago in a speech, you apologized for a number of FBI activities, saying some of them were clearly wrong and quite indefensible, and giving us, perhaps unconsciously, an impression that they were all behind us. And in the three months that followed, a number of new investigations have opened up, a number of new things have come to light, including one burglary just a month ago, which fed new documents, new information, into FBI files. Do you have real control of the FBI, or is it still sort of a runaway agency?

A: I feel that I have control of the FBI. I think this because the great majority of the organization are loyalists to the FBI, and I represent the FBI. They're not going to be wandering around without leadership, and I'm trying to afford it to them. And I'm going to do everything I can to maintain that control.

Q: . . . that—although it sounds healthy—leaves the implication that outside of the great majority there is a lesser minority which is not loyal or under control. Could you explain a little bit what you meant by that?

A: In the first place, I can't identify anyone who is not actually loyal to the FBI. I think that they all are really loyal to the FBI; not all, however, are confident that the administration which I am now bringing into effect is the proper way to lead the organization. Some cling to traditions. Some cling to the idea that you can

do anything you want so long as you follow certain ideas that were embedded in them throughout the many years of the leadership of Mr. Hoover. Now I'm not critical of Mr. Hoover; I'm merely saying that it was an authoritarian type of administration. Mine is not that. And I might say that I'm confident some feel more comfortable where they have the fatherly type of control, where they have that—again—very authoritarian type of control. And until this is banished from their minds, until they accept that we're in a different era, we're in a different control situation, we're besieged by the aftermath of Watergate—until that is well recognized by them, I may not get 100 per cent support. Insofar as support to the bureau—yes, I think that's there.

Q: Isn't one of the problems that many of those people who resist your leadership have been in the upper ranks of the bureau, people you named from the old Hoover guard to top positions in the FBI? You fired your first associate director, Nicholas Callahan, and I think many people wonder whether there aren't perhaps another half dozen or more members of the old guard who are either part of these old activities or helped cover them up, who've got to go before you can have control over the FBI.

A: Of course, you must recognize that all those within the top echelon—and as a matter of fact, the majority of the people in the bureau today—were in the bureau at the time Mr. Hoover was the director. And all of them had—during that period—had experiences with the great leadership of Mr. Hoover, and as we look at the top echelon, we have some who were in leader-

ship capacities. None now, however, was an assistant director or above at the time Mr. Hoover was there. All of them have been appointed to their present posts by me. The field has one assistant director, Bob Gebhardt, who was an assistant director at the time, but he's in the field. Now those men, I feel, have, in my estimation, become very well adapted to the new type of control, the new type of administration. I have no reason to believe that necessarily they're bucking me. I think that some of it, perhaps, has been a little slow in coming, but I think they have the idea and have the feeling that this is the proper way to do things.

Q: Sir, may I ask you, specifically, you made—gave testimony, and you made in statements the remarks some months back that all of the burglaries had ceased, essentially, in 1968. Now since then, it was disclosed that scores, maybe more burglaries, in fact, had taken place, some of them in 1972 and 1973. Now I gather that you were deceived by someone in the FBI, and my question is, have you found out who?

A: In the first place, I have not found out who had deceived me. I am confident—I know that I was deceived. I do know that. However, you must understand that most people are reluctant to confess to something which they think may be the subject of even prosecution. So I can understand their reluctance. But I cannot thereby condone it. I think they should have told me—at least not make me stand out on a limb with this knowledge which they had, which they should have imparted to me.

Q: But sir, you're the director of the FBI. If you can't find out who deceived you within the

FBI, don't you think that's cause for concern among the public?

A: That is cause for concern; it is concern to me. And it is now being investigated, and the results will thereby dictate to me what action I take. And if I find those who have knowledgeable, knowingly, intentionally deceived me, I will take some action.

Q: Mr. Kelley, why did you fire Mr. Callahan?

A: This, of course, is a matter which is under investigation. I had facts presented to me which, at that point, indicated that action was warranted in asking for his resignation. Beyond that, I can only say that other matters are still being investigated and I cannot elaborate beyond just that particular point.

Q: Well, Mr. Kelley, there's another man in the top ranks of the FBI right now, I believe in the No. 3 position, who, according to a sworn testimony from an FBI secretary, was the witness to a forged signature on a document which was essential in the disposing of Mr. Hoover's fortune of about half a million dollars or so. I wonder whether you have asked this gentleman, James Adams, to explain to you why he signed the document, when Mr. Tolson had not signed it but his secretary had.

A: I have talked with Mr. Adams about that particular thing. He has told me what happened. Insofar as a revelation of that disclosure, that, of course, cannot be made inasmuch as this too is a matter under litigation. I, possibly, during the course of this session, will mention (that) I cannot say something because of the fact that these matters are under investigation or

are under litigation. I'm not trying to seek sanctuary. I'm merely explaining what is the fact. I have had this presented to me. I do not think that it impairs his present capacity to do his job.

Q: But doesn't it impair his credibility and that of the FBI when it has been stated under oath, by an FBI secretary, that he was witness to a forged signature and he is expected to be upholding the law?

A: I don't think that necessarily—that you can assume from the statement I made that he made a disclosure which would place him in the position where he could be prosecuted or should be dismissed. I think that the basic facts as presented to me are subject to interpretation which would—I feel I safely made, that this would not impair his capabilities within the FBI...

Q: Well, can you tell us now how many agents may be—or officials—may be disciplined, based on what you now know?

A: I cannot say just how many will be involved in this thing. I—

Q: Ball park figure?

A: Well, the ball park figure possibly could be that—from three or four on up. I don't know how many, but I think that possibly there would be that many.

Q: As high as 30?

A: When you go to the figure of 30, you possibly are encompassing the situation involving surreptitious entries. Those might well be not construed as doing anything other than following the authority that they think stems from those higher up.