

USEFUL DETAILS ABOUT ARMITAGE MIGHT BE IN THERE

As [predicted](#), [Tom Maguire links](#) to the [two affidavits](#) I made available yesterday without pointing out what those affidavits say: that in Fall 2004, Fitzgerald was still actively investigating Armitage and Novak and Rove and Libby on the Novak leak—because their stories all contradicted what the others were saying. Let me help you out, Tom, by quoting the entire passage on Armitage and the Novak column:

A brief discussion is in order to place the Libby conversation with Miller—and the evidence of a broader effort to disseminate information discrediting Wilson—in context with the Novak column and to address the assertion by Miller that Miller's interview may not be necessary "if the government has already interviewed or otherwise queried Mr. Novak."

Let me interject two points. First, Miller's complaint might as well stand in for the Libby Lobby, since the complaint is the same, that Fitzgerald shouldn't have to proceed beyond Novak. And second: note that Fitzgerald references "evidence of a broader effort" to smear Wilson. That means Fitzgerald saw the Novak leak—with or without Richard Armitage's role—to be part of a larger effort. Now back to Fitzgerald:

The investigation to date has conclusively established that columnist Robert Novak spoke to Deputy Secretary of State Richard Armitage on July 8, 2003, in the afternoon. In the course of that conversation, Armitage revealed to Novak that the wife of Ambassador Joseph Wilson worked at the CIA. The

investigation is still trying to determine precisely what was said during the conversation and Armitage's intent in informing Novak of Wilson's wife's employment.

See that, "investigation is still trying to determine"? That means Armitage may still have been on the hook for espionage or IIPA or what have you. In August 2004, when the Libby Lobby swears (!) that Fitzgerald should have been done investigating.

Armitage has been interviewed and has testified to the grand jury as to his account of the conversation. Novak has been interviewed several times and, when presented with a waiver form executed by Armitage (a form identical to the one signed by Libby), testified before the grand jury as to his conversation with Armitage. Novak and Armitage agree on several important facts, such as the time, date and place of the meeting during which the conversation took place, and the fact that Wilson's wife and employment by the CIA was disclosed to Novak by Armitage in response to a question by Novak as to why the CIA had sent Wilson on the trip. Their testimony diverges as to whether Armitage provided the first name of Ms. Plame, though both agree the last name, "Plame" was not provided. Novak recalls being told by Armitage that Wilson's wife worked in the area of weapons of mass destruction — [redacted] Armitage does not recall discussing the area in which Wilson's wife worked. Novak and Armitage give differing accounts of other materials not germane to the instant motion. The investigation of Armitage's conduct is ongoing.

See that? Testimony diverging on points having to do with whether Armitage shared the name

Valerie with Novak and that she worked in WMD?
And the "differing accounts of other materials"?
Sure sounds like the changing Novak story and
the Armitage story didn't exactly corroborate
each other.

All that, spelled out plainly, and yet Maguire
says only, "Useful details about Armitage might
be there."

I guess it's too much to hope that he'll read
further and see that Rove's and Libby's
testimony similarly contained some, um,
inconsistencies with Novak's story, huh?