Senate Cools on Security

By John H. Averill
Los Angeles Times

The Senate has taken a rare swipe at one of its most secretive, expensive and insulated institutions—the Internal Security subcommittee.

The subcommittee, created 21 years ago to investigate Communist activities and domestic subversion, is among the Senate's biggest spenders. In the past three years, it has operated on around half a million dollars a year and until this year it usually got every penny it requested.

But with complaints mounting that Internal Security's productivity was diminishing as rapidly as its budget was rising, the budget-clearing Rules Committee suddenly became less generous. It slashed \$66,500 from the \$599,000 Internal Security had requested.

The Senate, without comment, ratified the 11 per cent reduction.

To be sure, Internal Security emerged with more money than its better-known counterpart, the House Internal Security Committee (formerly the Committee on Un-American Activities). The House committee, whose 53-man staff is more than twice that of the Senate subcommittee, was given \$525,000 for its 1972 operations.

Nevertheless the cut handed the Senate subcommittee was a highly unusual fiscal affront to its crusty 67-year-old chairman, Sen. James O. Eastland (D-Miss.), who also is chairman of the parent Judiciary Committee.

Reflecting a growing Senate resentment about the subcommittee's high spending and low output, Sen. Marlow W. Cook (R-Ky.) terms its budget request "just too darn large." Cook is one of the four Republicans on the subcommittee.

Cook's remarks were polite in contrast to the private comments by some of the staff people who work on other Judiciary subcommittees and are well acquainted with Internal Security's operations.

"The whole thing is just a sinecure for a bunch of old guys," one staffer said. "It's a hell of a big staff and they are paid a lot of money for doing practically nothing."

Another staffer said, "It's just a device to employ a lot of ex-McCarthyites who sit around thinking evil thoughts and talking about the Communist conspiracy." Chief Counsel's Role

Those who seek to determine what the Internal Security subcommittee does and how it spends its money get little cooperation from Eastland or the subcommittee staff. These are details that are kept close to the broad vest of the subcommittee's hefty, 63-year-old chief counsel, J. G. Sourwine.



SEN. JAMES O. EASTLAND ... subcommittee chairman

Easland manifests only an occasional interest in the subcommittee, letting Sourwine run the show—and Sourwine is anything but talkative.

"I don't have to account to you for the work habits of people on the subcommittee staff," Sourwine told a reporter. "It is not public information, sir. That is my view."

When pressed for certain details, Sourwine often would say that was information that could be obtained only from Eastland, the subcommittee chairman. But Eastland persistently declined to be interviewed.

The visible evidence of what Internal Security does



J. G. SOURWINE
...chief counsel

with its money and its 26 (at peak strength) staffers shows up in its printed reports.

President Nixon's revelation last July that he had been invited to visit Peking stirred Internal Security into its swiftest action of the year. Within two weeks, the subcommittee authorized printing a report titled "The Human Cost of Communism in China." Since Mr. Nixon was headed there. Sen. Eastland wrote in the introduction, "It is imperative that we in America have an appreciation of the nature and objectives of Chinese Communism."

Later in the 28 pages of

Panel's Spending

this report, Eastland said "if we are to have relations with Red China ... let us not close our eyes to the unpleasant fact that the fundamental hostility of Red China to the United States is spelled out, with undeviating vehemence and consistency, in thousands of doctrinal pronouncements and propaganda statements over the years."

Most of the report was written by a University of South Carolina professor. The cost could not be determined.

As Sourwine and the subcommittee have advanced in age, both have assumed a much lower profile and now only infrequently break into the news.

Critics contend that about all the subcommittee does these days is call in old favorites, people who defected from some Communist country years ago, who regale the staff with horror stories of life under communism.

Although that's an exaggeration, it is impossible to pin down the extent of the subcommittee's activities because of its secrecy policy.

Sourwine, when asked what the subcommittee did in 1971, produced 18 docu-ments. Five of them were transcripts of closed-door hearings held in 1970 but not released until last year. Another document, entitled "World Communism, 1964-1969 - A Selected Bibliography," was prepared by the Library of Congress at no cost to the subcommittee. It listed the titles and authors of 5,938 publications dealing with communism written in that five-year period.

One document, covering 220 pages, was prepared by the subcommittee staff and entitled "The Assault on Freedom." It was described in a press release as "an upto-date collection of writings and statements from the left which in combination make up the current 'Communist Party line'."

Ten of the documents dealt with subcommittee hearings held in 1971. There were four days of testimony by Cuban refugees on the topic, "Communist threat to the United States through the Caribbean," three days of public hearings on proposed changes in the internal security laws, a one-day appearance by a defector from Czechoslovakia, and six days of testimony from a former Stanford student, Thomas Edward Mosher, who became a ranking member of Students for a Democratic Society while working as an FBI undercover agent.

In submitting his subcommittee's budget to the Rules Committee last year, Chairman Eastland cited as part of the justification a continued investigation of "the socalled New Left." But the Mosher testimony was the only evidence offered by Sourwine of work on that

subject.