

DANA TO TURDB: YES, I RECOGNIZE CHEAP PARSING WHEN I SEE IT

So Dan Abrams took none too kindly to being accused of constructing fables by the Walt Disney of the Conservative Movement. In a response that is about twice as long as the Turdblossom's tome, Abrams provides quote after quote to demonstrate that he had done the work Rove accused him of shirking. Abrams repeatedly pointed to the parts of his interviews where he challenged Don Siegelman and Dana Jill Simpson. Most of all, I like where Abrams provided a set of questions designed to expose Rove's cheap parsing for what it is.

1) You say you "certainly didn't meet with anyone at the Justice Department or either of the two US attorneys in Alabama about investigating or indicting Siegelman." Did you talk to, or otherwise communicate with, any of them about it even if you did not meet? Did you have any discussions with any of them about this topic?

2) What about your old friend Bill Canary, whose wife initially led the prosecution? Are you denying that you spoke with him about anything related to the case?

3) You worked for former Alabama Attorney General Bill Pryor. Did you ever talk to him about anything related to the Siegelman matter?

4) Did you ever ask anyone else to communicate with any official in the Justice Department about the Siegelman investigation or case?

5) Do you know why your lawyer told us that you would testify about this case if you were subpoenaed but now, after

you have been invited to do so, he states that there are issues of executive privilege: "Whether, when and about what a former White House official will testify ... is not for me or my client to decide" he said.

6) You have said you never spoke with the White House about the case. If true, what is the possible "executive privilege?"

7) You ask why I did not further question one of my guests when he discussed your effort to help now Governor Riley in his campaign. Did you consult in any way with Riley or anyone else working with him on the campaign?

8) Did you ever discuss, with anyone, the possibility of media leaks about the Siegelman case? Did you speak with any members of the media about Siegelman during his campaign? [my emphasis]

I'm actually having quite a bit of fun watching these two exchange their letters—I hope it lasts until football season, when there'll finally be something worth watching on the telly again. (I was always a big sucker for epistolary novels.)

Until Turdblossom crafts his next monument to cheap parsing, though, I think it wise to start keeping track of how many times Karl has been invited to give his side of the story on Don Siegelman—yet continued to parse cheaply.

- 60 Minutes contacted Rove—who denied through Luskin Simpson's allegations
- 60 Minutes contacted Rove for the follow-up—Rove said he never talked to DOJ about Siegelman, nor anyone at the White House about him

- Rove spoke to GQ—complaining in much the same way he did about Abrams
- Abrams says he "repeatedly" invited Rove to appear on his program
- Abrams invited Rove, through Luskin, after Siegelman left prison (Luskin said "sure," Rove would testify)
- John Conyers invited Rove to testify before HJC (Luskin backed off his earlier claim, explaining Rove might be prevented from testifying by executive privilege)
- With this letter, Abrams invited Rove once more to appear and answer questions

Two offers from 60 Minutes, "repeated" invitations from Abrams, and one from Conyers. Yet Rove still won't appear before a antagonistic interviewer.

As Abrams says, the ball is, and has been, in Rove's court.

Your letter poses questions that you believe I should have asked as part of our coverage, but many of the most significant ones only you can answer. I address your specific critique below, but I begin by wondering, based on many of your questions, whether you actually saw, or reviewed, all of our coverage. Or perhaps, as you put it, "you don't want the facts to get in the way of a good fable."

You accuse me of "diminishing the search for facts and evidence," yet thus far you have refused to answer any questions

under oath or even from me that would aid in that very search.

I wonder whether Rove played these same games with Patrick Fitzgerald? Now **that** would be an epistolary novel worth reading. Just imagine if Rove refused to show up eight times before finally agreeing to each of the five appearances he had before Fitzgerald and the grand jury? That'd be 40 chapters long—just with Rove's fanciful replies.