

Mr. CULVER. What about the disclosure of security information? I recall in the President's veto message this was one of the concerns that intelligence organizations charged with security responsibilities within our Government gave grave concern to, that this legislation within the Department of Defense with regard to designation of defense facilities would force, in order to comply with the legislation, the disclosure and divulgence of sources of intelligence-gathering information which were extremely valuable in order for you to perform properly your responsibilities.

Has that proven to be the case? Has it resulted in a compromise of your security files which we all wish to preserve and maintain?

Mr. YEAGLEY. This is an important problem and it is a practical and realistic problem that we live with in all of our cases, whether it is before the Board or whether they are espionage cases or other cases in the courts.

I am sure it is one the Attorney General is going to have to keep in mind in deciding about these petitions that may be coming up in the future.

If in a given case the FBI or the Government feels that certain informants cannot be disclosed for the purpose of testifying in a given case, in other words, that their continued service as informants is more valuable than bringing up a certain case, this is a difficult decision to be made, but very likely it will be that that particular case will not be filed.

Mr. CULVER. Then in your judgment, the activities and services of the Subversive Activities Control Board in the past 18 years has served to strengthen the national security interests of the United States consistent with the first amendment values?

Mr. YEAGLEY. That is my opinion, and I think beyond that it has been very detrimental to the operations of the Communist Party.

I think it may have been more detrimental to the party than it was helpful to the Government because they were really bothered by the provisions of the act.

They spent a great deal of time and money, not just in court but politically, resisting the provisions of the act and propagandizing against it.

I think they diverted an undue amount of time, attention, and money to fighting this law and conceivably might have been much more effective had they continued on their own road paying little attention to the act.

But this is not what they did. I think it was very detrimental to the operation of the party.

I think I should also observe, although there are many reasons involved as you know, the party membership has fallen drastically all through this period.

Mr. WATSON. Purposefully so. Now their modus operandi is not to enlist members in the party per se, but to have front organizations. Isn't that a basic principle under which they are operating now?

Mr. YEAGLEY. They have always believed in fronts, but I can't say that they purposely reduced the party membership. I am talking in terms of tens of thousands of members. I am talking in terms of 90 percent of the members.