

ABOUT THAT PARDON ARTICLE

Just a quick post to check in and comment on an Elizabeth de la Vega article several of you have mentioned. I was in SF working with the book editor this weekend. We finalized the direction for the book (oooh, it's going to be good!) Then today I get back on a plane (to Bangkok this time) and when I come back we really hit crash and burn on the book.

We actually talked a lot about pardon this weekend—Jane, Swopa, Jen Nix, and Safir (the editor) and I. And I gotta say, I was in a distinct minority, in simply **not knowing** whether Bush will pardon Libby before the trial or in January 2009. I understand the need, for the Administration, at least as well as anyone. But I am not convinced that, as de la Vega states,

Because Scooter Libby's trial strategy is not to have a trial.

At least at the beginning, back when they set up a \$5 million fund and hired Ted Wells, they fully intended to have a trial. You hire Ted Wells to go to trial, not to await a presidential pardon. There's a part of me, too, that thinks the reason Libby's lies were so bad were to have a nice tidy trial—they were designed to minimize the importance of his machinations with their absurdity. After all, if you were **really** trying to protect Dick, wouldn't you have developed some better lies? The crappy quality of Libby's lies has already minimized the gravity of the obstruction charge in this case.