THESE ARE THE WASHINGTON POST DIRECTORS IN ADDITION TO KATHARINE GRAHAM. FOR those whose addresses are not given, write to them at The Washington Post, Washington, D. C. 20071.

Donald E. Graham, Publisher

Richard D. Simmons, President

Warren E. Buffet (one of two directors apart from the Grahams who owns a lot of shares, all non-voting)
5505 Farnam St., Omaha, NE 68132

George J. Gillespie, III (the other big shareholder) Cravath, Swaine & Moore One Chase Manhattan Plaza New York, N. Y. 10005 Nicholas deB. Katzenbach, Gen. Counsel IBM Corp.
Old Orchard Rd., Armonk, N.Y. 10504

Robert S. McNamara 2412 Tracy Pl., Washington, D.C. 20008

Arjay Miller 225 Mtn. Home Rd., Woodside, CA 94062

Richard M. Paget

32 Lakeview Ave.

Short Hills, N. J. 07078

THE WASHINGTON POST BEHAVED DIFFERENTLY FROM ALL THE OTHER NEWS ORGANIZATIONS IN the country on this matter in that it arrogated to itself the responsibility of deciding what was in the national security in an area in which it lacks the technical expertise to make that decision. The paper ran an editorial in which it said that the offending story had been "conscientiously vetted for national security considerations." By whom? It had certainly not been checked out with the Department of Defense. Leonard Downie, the managing editor of The Post, told me that the editors had gone over the story carefully with the reporter, Walter Pincus. He told them what the experts who had fed him the information, or perhaps others that he consulted, had indicated might be damaging to national security. Downie said they left a lot out of the published story. He refused to identify the experts who had indicated that what was printed was not damaging to national security since they were sources.

NOTE THAT HERE WE HAVE PEOPLE WHO ARE VIOLATING THEIR TRUST, DISCLOSING TO A REporter information of a highly sensitive nature, and they are the ones that The Washington Post relies upon to determine what is damaging to national security and what is not. I asked Mr. Downie if the editors had checked with these sources to find out if Pincus was even reporting correctly their alleged opinion that the material they printed would not be harmful.

"WALTER PINCUS IS NOT A LIAR," HE REPLIED. "IF ANYBODY WORKING FOR US WERE, THEY wouldn't work for us any longer," he added. Doesn't anyone at The Washington Post remember Janet Cooke? She was the author of the article about the 8-year-old heroin addict who turned out to be a figment of her imagination. The editors of The Post had so much confidence in her that they nominated her story for a Pulitzer Prize, and it won! Even if one were to assume that Walter Pincus never lied or exaggerated or made a false assumtion in his entire life, there is still the possibility that he might have made an error, that he might have misunderstood something told to him by one of his expert consultants. As a matter of fact, Mr. Downie readily admitted that the story contained a major boner. It said the satellite was going to be placed in a geosynchronous orbit over the USSR, which is impossible. Downie didn't think that showed a lack of expertise, however. He said it was the kind of error that occurs sometimes when more than one person works on a story.

SHOULD WE LEAVE IT TO WALTER PINCUS TO DETERMINE WHERE OUR NATIONAL SECURITY LIES? According to Harold Brown, Sec. of Defense in the Carter administration, Pincus was instrumental in halting the planned deployment of neutron warheads in Western Europe in 1977. A high ranking defector agrees. "We knew his name well," he told me.

thing. The more each side knows what the other knows, the less chance there is for miscalculation." One might conclude that Moyers thinks it's a good thing if The Post helped the Soviets learn more about our new intelligence satellite. The next morning on the CBS Morning News he strengthened that impression when he said: "Fortunately the Soviets have better intelligence than CBS and The Washington Post, and they know most of what is going on up there anyway."

Syndicated columnist Carl Rowan, director of the U.S. Information Agency in the Johnson administration said: "Everything I know of The Washington Post's article . . . convinces me that Defense Secretary Caspar Weinberger's verbal assaults against The Post are much ado about nothing except Mr. Weinberger's need to assert his own warped sense of power." Rowan was confident that "there was not a sentence in that Washington Post article that revealed anything the Soviet Union did not already know," and he was convinced that Mr. Weinberger was just floating "a trial balloon to see how much of the public—and the press—can be turned against The Post."

Another syndicated columnist, Jack Germond, assured the viewers of "The McLaughlin Group" program that Bradlee and The Washington Post were not frivolous and that they had "thought seriously about this." He was sure the Russians knew as much about the space shuttle's cargo as we do, "so I don't think that this cry of national security being in danger makes a lot of sense." Germond said he would "stick with Ben Bradlee over Weinberger any time."

The Critics Have Their Say

Those in the media who had honored the Defense Department's request for secrecy did not rise up in their wrath and attack The Washington Post for having done what they refused to do—override the opinion of the Defense Department that secrecy in this matter was important to our national security. NBC, CBS and AP promptly released at least portions of the stories they had been withholding, providing additional detail to the Soviets. The Post had helped the Soviets both by providing the information in its story, but also by breaking the dam of secrecy. Larry Grossman, president of NBC News, had felt obliged to honor the Defense Department's request for secrecy, but he saw nothing wrong with what The Post had done, even though implicit in Bradlee's action was the judgment that the secrecy request should not have been honored. That reaction had been foreshadowed by John Chancellor's sour commentary on the NBC Nightly News on December 18. He had said that NBC had "been forced to accept the government's word on faith." "It's a dangerous precedent," Chancellor said.

Ed Fouhy, ABC's Washington bureau chief who had been such a champion of the media's respect for national security in July, sounded a less certain trumpet in December. He told AIM that he couldn't comment on the propriety of what The Post had done because he was still trying to find out whether or not the information had been disclosed previously.

However, some negative commentary was aired by the electronic media. As already noted, John McLaughlin,

Washington editor of National Review and host of two TV shows, was invited to appear on the CBS Morning News to comment on The Post's action. He was pitted against Bill Moyers and Terrence Smith of The New York Times. He got a little help from anchorman Bill Kurtis, who countered Moyers' suggestion that the Soviets know everything that's going on in space with an observation that some people claimed that two of our military satellites had gone undetected by the Soviets for a period of six months to a year.

George Carver, a former high-ranking CIA official now with the Georgetown Center for Strategic and International Studies, appeared on ABC's "Nightline." He condemned The Post's action as "unconscionable, irresponsible, unpatriotic and childish." Answering the claim that everything The Post printed was already in the public record, Carver cited a book published in 1945 by Henry Smythe about the Manhattan project, the wartime crash program to build the atomic bomb. The book was criticized for telling too much, but Smythe defended it on the ground that it was all in the public domain. Carver said that ten years later the Russians said that they had worked with Smythe's book constantly at their side and that he had saved them considerable time in developing their own atomic bomb. Carver quoted Prsident Truman as having said, "Whether it be treason or not, it does as much harm to the United States for its secrets to be given to the enemy by open publication as for them to be given by the clandestine operation of spies."

Reed Irvine appeared on Cable News Network on the night of December 19 to say that he agreed with Sec. Weinberger that The Post had behaved irresponsibly, and that experts he had talked to had called the newspaper's action deplorable and rotten. Irvine said that The Washington Post staff was not capable of deciding what ought to be disclosed or kept secret in the national interest. He said that our elected and appointed government officials had been given that responsibility, not editors and reporters. He thought such matters were best left to the experts, not to reporters such as The Post's Walter Pincus, who apparently didn't even know that a geosynchronous orbit had to be over the equator and could not be over the Soviet Union.

Jack Landau of the Reporters' Committee for Freedom of the Press defended the Post, arguing that we need not take the word of the president of a construction company that some action would hurt national security just because the man had been appointed secretary of defense.

The Post Can Keep a Secret

The Washington Post demonstrated that it can resist the impulse to publish everything interesting that comes to its attention. It withheld from its readers any account of a demonstration that had taken place on December 21 in front of The Washington Post building in Washington, D. C. A group of 30 protestors gathered in rain to protest The Post's contemptuous disregard of national security in disclosing details of the space shuttle's secret payload. Reed Irvine and Phil Nicolaides, executive director of Accuracy in Media, Maj. Gen. George Keegan, USAF (Ret.), former chief of Air Force