

David Greenglass and the people like that. They were members of the Communist Party, and how you can say that "Oh, well, all these people in the past, they have been the ones that spied, they are the ones that turned our defense secrets over," and yet now you come along, and their successors as Communists will not do the same thing. I think exactly the opposite. The Government has the right, and we make judgments in many areas, to logically conclude that members of the Communist Party will do what Communists normally have done, over the last 30 years, and that is betray this country, turn its secrets over to a foreign power. I don't think it is illogical at all for the Government to make that conclusion. The findings of fact in the last 30 years are fantastic in favor of the argument that Communists act like Communists, and basically are going to work as a part of a foreign power.

Now you can disagree on that, but I think the facts are patently clear.

Mr. SPEISER. I haven't made a tote score on this, but my recollection is that while certainly you can point to Sobell and Greenglass, who did have membership or contact with the Communist Party, the vast majority of espionage cases that we have had, certainly in the past 15 years, have not involved members of the Communist Party. Many of them have involved members of the military, and it has been a straight, money transaction kind of situation in which there was no ideological factor present at all.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Who paid Jack Dunlap, for example, one of the people you are talking about? Who was he turning his secrets over to?

The CHAIRMAN. Exactly. You say, you overweighed the word "military" over "Communist," but at the same time there was a dual capacity there.

Mr. SPEISER. I have no doubt that there are representatives of foreign governments, Communist and non-Communist, who are in the business of buying information from anybody they can get the information from, on a wide range of subjects. There is no doubt in my mind that that is true. All I am saying is that because, for example, in some of the cases, in which military personnel have sold information, the accused have been Negro, is no reason to assume that Negro soldiers as a class—

Mr. ASHBROOK. Jack Dunlap wasn't a Negro.

Mr. SPEISER. The same may be said of the fact that some of the accused are white. You have to get beyond that.

Now the difference, I suppose, between us, is the fact that because you can point, as you can, to Communists who have engaged in espionage who were American citizens, that you assume that all Communists are going to engage in that, and this is something that the Supreme Court says you can't assume, because you have to go beyond that first factor to determine whether or not they are a threat to national security.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Well, the Supreme Court didn't exactly say this. It tied it also into the sensitive nature of the position, and had the same decision been on the CIA files, and so forth, I don't think they could have arrived at quite the same conclusion. The area of sensitivity of the defense work concerned or the Government work concerned would obviously make a difference.