

DATA-MINING THREE

This is just a quick post to register two disagreements with Glenn Greenwald's post claiming the NYT's data-mining story is a shiny object. First, Glenn claims that the stories were floated by "anonymous sources seeking to protect Alberto Gonzales" and "anonymous pro-Bush sources." But then he goes on to point out that the NYT story (unlike the WaPo story) includes a detail—which I pointed out in my post on the story—that doesn't help Gonzales.

A half-dozen officials and former officials interviewed for this article would speak only on the condition of anonymity, in part because unauthorized disclosures about the classified program are already the subject of a criminal investigation. **Some of the officials said the 2004 dispute involved other issues in addition to the data mining,** but would not provide details. [Glenn's emphasis]

In other words, the story relies on six sources, but at least two of those sources are actually pointing out the same thing that the blogosphere is pointing out: the problem was data-mining, **plus** other issues. At least two of the sources for the story are **not** "pro-Bush sources ... seeking to protect Alberto Gonzales."

Now, I'm not going to bet any money that the NYT, if two of its sources stated, "well, yeah, data-mining was a problem, but the real problem ..." would faithfully render that point of emphasis. But at least as reported, these at-least-two sources who are not helping Bush still confirm that data-mining is part of the problem.