

Mr. SPEISER. No, I have no problem with that, Mr. Ashbrook. Yes, if he has access to information, secret classified or any classified information, and there is knowledge that he would pass it on to a foreign government, you are right, the Government has a right to bar him from that kind of position, and whether he is a Communist or not is almost irrelevant. It is the question of his intention to pass it on.

Mr. ASHBROOK. It is a question of prejudging.

Mr. SPEISER. Very much so.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Your organization would take the position in favor of passing a bill that prejudged that every American might discriminate in housing, on one hand, it might be all right, and on the other hand, it might be wrong?

Mr. SPEISER. I am sorry, I don't hear you.

Mr. ASHBROOK. I say, you would certainly support a bill, the thrust of which would prejudice every American in wanting to discriminate in housing, but yet you won't prejudice when it comes to secret documents.

Mr. SPEISER. I am not aware of the fact that our support for the open housing provisions of the Civil Rights Act of 1968 involved a position of prejudging Americans. It would seem to me that that is not involved in that kind of situation. It set up standards in a law to accomplish the desired social end.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Which is what we are trying to do, here. These standards. If I can read you directly, the situation you agreed to is one that can never ever be accomplished. I mean, how many Communists are going to, or how many times are you going to come across a contract, or a known agreement, that a Communist is going to turn something over? You isolate the factual situation so narrowly, in my opinion, you never ever could make the law applicable in any relevant situation, because the thing you people seem to fail to understand is the whole thrust of the Communist organization is to conceal, is to engage in duplicity, to deceive.

Now how you can use these criteria for an organization like this is beyond me. I don't think you could ever make it applicable, the way you have drawn this.

Mr. SPEISER. Well, we do have a security program, under which consideration is given to whether classified information will be compromised. I think it has often been suggested that the effective spies, in our society, are ones who wouldn't have any connection with Communist or leftwing or radical organizations, simply because that kind of information is too easily picked up by security officers and agencies, and I think that this has been, to a great extent, true, as far as our problems with spying. So it isn't a question of leaving our information freely available, and having no security program. It is a question of judgment, I grant you that. But the difficulty, and the reason, I suppose, for our going off in diverse directions is the feeling that you can make a judgment as to whether individuals would turn over classified information, based on their political points of view. Now—

Mr. ASHBROOK. All right, to reiterate—

Mr. SPEISER. I raise a red flag, I realize, when I use that term before the committee, in talking about people who may or have been members of the Communist Party, or Communist organizations. But what the Supreme Court has puzzled about in this area—and I don't think they