

Mr. SPEISER. I even believe there is good and bad on the House Un-American Activities Committee.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Well——

The CHAIRMAN. What is that?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Good and bad on the committee.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Go ahead.

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speiser, do you think the further inquiry that would be necessary to establish the security-risk situation that would properly bar employment in a sensitive situation would be received by the criteria enunciated by the Chief Justice in the *Robel* case, or at least alluded to, when he specifically said the status makes it irrelevant that an individual may be a passive or an active member of a designated organization, that he may be unaware of the organization's unlawful aims, or that an individual—or that he may disagree with those unlawful aims. It is also irrelevant that an individual who is subject to the penalties of the statute may occupy a nonsensitive position in the defense facility.

Now in response to Mr. Ashbrook's question, assuming that you can satisfy those criteria, which can be relatively objectively ascertained, do you think that that would present a situation where properly and constitutionally, under this statute, you could bar employment?

Mr. SPEISER. I think so. Only if you have all of the factors that you mentioned, that the Chief Justice enunciated. You are asking what would be permissible, and I think as Mr. Culver has pointed out, there are some criteria set out by the Supreme Court; but it is apparent, as I read the bills, that this is not what is desired by the proponents of this legislation. Because I assume, Mr. Ashbrook, you feel that those criteria would be just too difficult to fulfill.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Well, I guess we would disagree. I think it is fair to say that a person should have a right to associate with any groups he wants, but I just fail to understand how a person can call himself a Nazi, for example, and not make himself subject to the argument that either knowingly or for one reason or another, accepting the connotation of what nazism has been in history, and its——

The CHAIRMAN. And the same would be true of the Ku Klux Klan.

Mr. ASHBROOK. The Ku Klux Klan. I don't doubt a bit but what you have warmhearted, honest, Christian Ku Klux Klanners, but it just seems to leave me cold to think that in taking up that mantle he isn't in a way accepting what the Ku Klux Klan means, exactly the same as communism. Their worldwide purpose of domination, subversion, and so on. I don't know how you can be a Communist and not accept what the thrust of the world communism has been for the last 50 years, and I guess that's where you and I could never agree.

Mr. SPEISER. Well, I think most of what you have just said, Mr. Ashbrook, seems to be that this person has become part of a group that has offensive ideas, repugnant ideas, and you are leaving out, in my view, the critical factor, whether you are talking about the denial of a security clearance, Government job, or a wide range of privileges, of what is he going to do, in that specific kind of situation.

You have to go beyond that factor, and this is where I think that our basic——

Mr. ASHBROOK. But who have been the people that have leaked the defense secrets in the last 20 years? Who are the Judith Coplons and