

# RANDOM THOUGHTS ON THE PURGEGATE DOCUMENT DUMP

Eric Lichtblau and Eric Lipton have an article on the Purgegate document release in today's New York Times. There were a few paragraphs by the two Erics that stood out to me:

Aides to former President George W. Bush have asserted that the Justice Department took the lead in the dismissals, which set off a political firestorm that lasted months. Mr. Rove played down his role in the firings in a recent interview and in closed testimony last month before Congressional investigators.

Well that was clearly a pack of lies; let's call it what it is fellas.

"The amount of backstabbing and treachery involved is just breathtaking," Mr. Iglesias said of the White House e-mail, in an interview on Tuesday. "It's astounding that without reviewing the evidence or talking to the F.B.I. or anything, the White House would assume that these were provable cases and that I needed to file them for the political benefit of the party. That's not what U.S. attorneys do."

Hey Dave, they didn't give a damn if the charges were provable, they just wanted them filed to prejudice Democrats before the election. Iglesias was wronged here, but he keeps consistently soft pedaling what occurred so as to remain a good Republican, and the distinction is a critical and clear one. It wasn't that they "assumed provable cases"; they just didn't care about the sufficiency of the charges. I really like Iglesias in a way, but this isn't

the first time he has treaded too lightly, he was all mushy over Scott Bloch too. Enough.

Robert Luskin, a lawyer for Mr. Rove, said the material released Tuesday demonstrated that there was “absolutely no evidence” the White House had used inappropriate political motivations to punish federal prosecutors. Mr. Luskin said Mr. Rove and other White House aides were legitimately concerned about voter fraud and were debating “completely reasonable and legitimate policy questions.”

Gold Bars is such a total tool. And man does he get around with the media outlets. Does he rent space at all of them or something?

Bush administration officials have publicly suggested that Mr. Iglesias was dismissed because of a subpar performance and absences from the office – he was a Navy reservist.

Those issues do not surface in the newly released e-mail. Rather, the dissatisfaction of New Mexico Republicans over the investigations was the focus in 2005 and 2006. Nonetheless, one message shows that the White House was told that the Justice Department planned to say the New Mexico investigations played no role in the dismissal.

In that exchange, in February 2007, William K. Kelly, of the White House Counsel’s Office, wrote an e-mail message to several senior officials, including Fred Fielding, the White House counsel, and Tony Snow, the press secretary. Referring to the Justice Department, Mr. Kelly wrote, “They are planning to deny that the investigation in question played any role in DOJ’s decision, and to deny that any Member

contacted main Justice to complain about the conduct (or not) of any particular investigation.”

Hard evidence of a predetermined plan to deceive the public and obstruct any investigation that could occur (presumably by Congress). And The DOJ was front and center with the WH in complicity. Anybody else see a conflict of interest here in a DOJ investigation by say, I dunno, Nora Dannehy? By the way, when can we expect the charges on all these facts and implications Nora? There are certainly grounds, on several fronts, against several individuals, first and foremost Gonzales, but others as well. Anybody taking odds on whether any charges are filed at all?

As the first Purgegate document thread is getting long in the tooth, do not hesitate to continue here using this as another working thread.