

By Sanford J. Ungar Washington Post Staff Writer

The Soviet Embassy here thorities believe to have been a complete set of the top-secret Pentagon Papers during June, 1971, while the Justice Department was in court fighting to cut off newspaper publication of aroff ticles based on the documents.

ments. According to Nixon ad-ministration sources, the Pa-pers were delivered to the embassy on 16th Street NW on June 16, 1971, the day af-ter U.S. District Court Judge Murray I. Gurfein, in New York, issued a tempo rary restraining order rary restraining against The New Times. order York

who delivered The man the documents, apparently alone at the time, included a letter, signed with an alias, stating his reasons for pass-ing the Pentagon Papers on to the Soviet government, the sources said,

He has been sought for al-most two years, they added, but still has not been even tentatively identified. The tentatively identified. The alias with which he signed the letter apparently could not be traced.

Nonetheless, the sources said, the federal government knew that the embassy had the documents in advance of arguments before the Su-preme Court on whether preme Court on whether The Times, The Washington Post and other newspapers were entitled to continue publishing the documents. But the government continued to press its case, and the high court ruled 6 to 3 on June 30, 1971, that the Justice Department had not sustained its burden of proof in the civil suits against the newspapers.

The sources stressed that the FBI has no evidence dithe copy of the documents obtained by the Soviets to any of the newspapers which published them or to Daniel Ellsberg, the former government employee who photocopied the Pentagon Papers and leaked them to the press after he was un-successful in getting members of Congress to release them.

(Ellsberg and Anthony J. Russo Jr., both one-time re searchers with the Rand Corporation in California, were charged with conspir-acy, espionage and theft of government government property in con-nection with disclosure of the documents.

3 10 ~ 73

(But U.S. District Court Judge W. Matt Byrne Jr., citing severe governmental misconduct, last month dis-missed the case against the two men before it went to a federal jury in Los Angeles.) Fifteen copies of the final

47-volume version of Pentagon Papers were the distributed to federal offices and former government offi-

See PAPERS, A14, Col. 1

civil suits against the newspapers or the criminal pro-ceedings against Ellsberg and Russo.

In attempting to prove their espionage case against those two defendants, the Justice Department prosecu-tors relied on the alleged damage that might have been done to the "national defense" had a hypothetical foreign intelligence analyst gained access to the Papers in 1969, when Ellsberg and Russo photocopied them at a Hollywood advertising agency.

(Although the jury never got to hear Judge Byrne's charge or to deliberate on the case, most jurors, in in-terviews after the dismissal, said they were unconvinced on that point.)

Ellsberg insisted porters after the Krogh affi-davit was submitted that he knew nothing about the Soviet Embassy obtaining the documents and that Krogh's allegations were a "false" justification for the activi-ties of the White House

"plumbers." Federal officials now acknowledge that they too are. puzzled about why Krogh, who is widely known for his sensitivity to "national secu-rity" questions, would have raised the issue for public speculation in his affidavit.

Attorney General Elliot L. acknowledged Richardsön Richardson acknowledged during his recent confirmation hearings before the Senate Judiciary Committee that Krogh had consulted with him before submitting his affidavit to the court in Los Angeles.

Richardson said he had personally encouraged

PAPERS, From A1

cials in June, 1969. At least five copies of an earlier draft of the study, divided into 38 volumes, were also in circulation between 1969 and 1971.

Although Soviet posses sion of the Papers became known to U.S. authorities almost immediately, the in-formation has been a closely guarded secret ever since.

Some details of the situation recently became public, in incorrect however — in form, according to The form, according to fine Post's sources — during the final stages of the Pentagon Papers trial and during hearings of the Senate se-lect committee investigating the Watergate affair.

Former White House aide Egil Krogh Jr., for example, swore in an affidavit submitted to Judge Byrne in Los Angeles, that in the summer of 1971 he "was informed by the Federal Purcey of the Federal Bureau of Inves tigation that the so-called Pentagon Papers were in the possession of the Soviet Embassy, Washington, D.C., prior to their publication by The New York Times newspaper suggesting an effort to aid and abet an enemy of the United States (North Vietnam) through the ally (the Soviet Union)."

Krogh's affidavit was in-tended to explain the rea-sons for establishment of "an independent investiga-tory unit" in the White House, known as the "plumbers," to investigate leaks of national security information.

He acknowledged that the group, which included E. Howard Hunt Jr. and G.

Gordon Liddy, later con-victed as Watergate conspir-ators, had broken into the ators, had broken into the Beverly Hills office of Ells-former psychiatrist berg's former psychiatrist and obtained assistance from the Central Intelligence Agency in probing what it considered a major breach of national security.

Bernard L. Barker, an-other convicted Watergate conspirator, told the Senate Watergate committee under oath on May 25 that he participated in the burglary at the psychiatrist's office to discover "information about a person (Ellsberg) who I had been told by Mr. Hunt was a traitor, who was pass-ing, he or his associates, to a foreign embassy."

Contacted recently on the subject, Justice Department and FBI officials declined to elaborate, citing their con-cern for national security and foreign relations and a general reluctance to dis-cuss unsolved cases.

A Soviet Embassy press spokesman said that Krogh's sworn allegation was "sheer nonsense."

The Post's sources within the Nixon administration, however, said that the for-mer presidential aide merely erred on one signifi-cant detail_the question of whether the Soviet Embassy obtained the documents be-fore or after their initial publication in The New York Times.

They also said it was in-They also said it was in conceivable that Krogh had been misinformed by the FBI on the matter in 1971 and that he must have re-lied on some other source outside the bureau. Krogh, through his attor-

ney, refused to meet with a

reporter to discuss his affi-davit and his sources of in-formation in 1971, or to submit answers to specific questions. The attorney said that Krogh, on the basis of "straight national security considerations," does not feel "at liberty" to go fur-The ther.

administration sources said that, contrary to other earlier reports, the documents did not come to the Soviet Embassy by mail and the embassy never con-tacted the State Department about returning them.

They said there is some question, however, as to the dustion, however, as to the completeness of the copy of the Pentagon Papers ob-tained by the Soviets. It is believed that the copy included the four "diplomatic volumes" deal-

ing with early third-party contacts between the United States and North Vietnam aimed at a negotiated settle-ment of the conflict in Southeast Asia.

Those volumes, constituting a separate part of the top-secret history of U.S. in-volvement in Vietnam, were held back from the newspapers by Ellsberg in 1971, but were obtained by The Post and other publications through syndicated colum-nist Jack Anderson in June, 1972. Although still classi-fied, they also eventually became public court exhibits in Los Angeles during the trial of Ellsberg and Russo. For reasons that were not

immediately clear, the mat-ter of Soviet possession of the documents was never brought to the attention of the federal courts—publicly or privately—during the TIME

L

たえ

*

Krogh to "make a clean breast" of his involvement in the White House investigation of Ellsberg.

The details now available about the Soviet Embassy's possession of the Pentagon Papers help to explain President Nixon's statement of May 22 that when the papers were published "there was every reason to believe this was a security leak of unprecedented proportions." But those details also raise serious implications con-

cerning the administration's past and future conduct in court cases concerning the documents.

If the man who delivered them to the embassy is ever identified and located, for example, he could be the subject of a far stronger espionage case than the abortive one against Ellsberg and Russo.

Some Justice Department sources suggested that this possibility may help explain the administration's refusal thus far to say that it is definitively dropping a separate federal grand jury investigation of the Pentagon Papers leak that was begun in Boston in the summer of 1971, but suspended in late 1972.

One major unanswered question is why the Justice Department continued to press its case against the, newspapers at the Supreme Court in 1971, if it already knew that the documents were in the hands of Soviet officials. The Post's sources said that Solicitor General Erwin N. Griswold was unaware of the information at the time he argued the government's case before the high court and the U.S. Court of Appeals here. If he had been, he might

not have told the justices on June 26, 1971, that publication of the most sensitive material in the Pentagon Papers "will affect lives. It will affect the process of termination of the war. It will affect the process of recovering prisoners of war."

Other government attorneys, arguing before federal judges at the time, urged that it was essential to keep the documents secret so that the information in them would not fall into the hands of foreign powers.

Sau.

1. 10 000

One Justice Department official offered the opinion that if the federal courts had been let in on what the FBI already knew, the cases against the newspapers might have been rendered immediately "invalid."

Some judges, the official suggested, "might have said," "Why keep this stuff from the people any longer, as long as the opposition (the Russians) have it?" The Post's sources said they had no idea what the

The Post's sources said they had no idea what the Soviets might have done with the Pentagon Papers on obtaining them or whether the Moscow government found them "useful."

100 5

輸設

ないい

185 A