

THE WAPO'S SCHIZOPHRENIA

What a stark comparison. We've been treated to a four-day series unveiling the secrets of Cheney's power. And in the same week, Eric Boehlert takes on the WaPo's consistent attempt to belittle the Plame investigation, along with its absolute capitulation to the Libby Lobby.

Meanwhile, searching through the Nexisnews database going back more than 40 months, I cannot find a single outsidecontributor who was invited by the newspaper to write a piece that included sustained criticism of Libby during the scandal. Since the Plame story brokebig in September 2003, the *Post* has likely published more than 1,000 guest columns on all sorts of topics. None, however, was built around criticizing Libby or cheering Fitzgerald's investigation. Not one.

By contrast, the newspaper has employed something of an open-door policy for outside contributors who want to use the paper's opinion pages to belittle the Fitzgerald investigation, wallow in pity for Libby, and purposefully misstate the facts of the case. (More on that later.)

Boehlert's got a stronger stomach than I, because he proceeds to examine the depths to which the WaPo was willing to go to help Libby's cause.

Here's the thing. Carol Leonnig is, IMO, the best mainstream reporter on this story. As the Cheney series proves, the WaPo can not only lead in reporting, but in its use of the Internet medium (this is the first blockbuster story that I remember, for example, that links to all the documents it discusses).

But it insists on brainless stupidity on its

editorial page. At some point someone's going to have to cut off Fred Hiatt its head to save its honor.