

and the Army and Navy and Air Force can better answer these questions, although I believe if they had had any complaints they would have registered them with the Department of Justice, I think the proper procedure would be to bring these various agencies in here and then get their direct testimony on it because he has already answered quite positively "no" in reference to all of these things.

Mr. CULVER. The only thing I am trying to suggest, Mr. Watson, is that if Mr. Yeagley does consider himself in a position to make a response to the questions you directed to him, that certainly responding to a hypothetical question concerning his posture on the recommendations regarding the veto message in 1950 I don't think is any reflection on his fine integrity or indeed the memory of one of the greatest Presidents we have had.

Mr. YEAGLEY. I naturally don't want to sit in judgment on any President. I don't want to completely duck the answer to your question, Congressman Culver. As I indicated in my earlier testimony, I think the law has had a good effect from the standpoint of the U.S. Government in relation to the Communist Party, the nature of its operation, the extent of its influence, and the number of its members.

As you have pointed out, we encountered constitutional difficulties in enforcing several of the provisions of the law. I was not in the Department when the veto message was written or issued, nor when the Attorney General prepared his recommendations, so that I can't help in that area.

Mr. CULVER. On this business about hurting the Communist Party, again I think we have had some discussion on that point before. But it seems to me that it has been of great value to the Communist Party to have the United States Government for 18 years before the Supreme Court, with a poor batting average, dramatically propagandizing to the world that the United States does not live up to the high example in the Bill of Rights and judicial due process, and so forth.

It seems to me that the leadership of the Communist Party in making a decision to vigorously combat legally every possible challenge to the statute are certainly not insensitive to the worldwide propaganda value of such an exercise and it seems to me that before the eyes of world opinion the United States can't say that this statute has necessarily put us in an attractive light.

The fact that some other governments have adopted far more stringent, far more narrow, far more sweeping statutes regarding internal security doesn't surprise me in the least.

What concerns me is whether or not the United States, the leader of the free world, whether or not the United States, who I think and I hope represents a standard to mankind in the area of individual freedom, can make an effort to reconcile the national security interest consistent with individual freedom in a much more refined way with less consequences to individual liberties.

So that it seems to me that the question here is with regard to how much it hurt the Communist Party. I can't see where, standing and viewed from their vantage point, this has been such a disastrous exercise to take the United States Government through the courts for 18 years and win most of the important substantive decisions.

Mr. TUCK. You have just made a long speech, and, if you have some questions, ask a question. He has already answered the question.