# WHY DOES LURITA DOAN STILL HAVE A JOB?

It has been over 50 days since Scott Bloch, the head of the Office of Special Counsel, sent Bush a letter advising that Lurita Doan be disciplined severely for her violations of the Hatch Act. Yet there she is, still in charge of the government's credit cards as the Administrator of the GSA.

If Doan weren't a Bush appointee, her fate would be clear—she would have been fired fifty days ago.

## **DICK ON LIBBY**

Actually, Dick's comments about Libby are actually pretty interesting, so I thought I'd give them their own post. [My transcription.]

CBS: Have you spoken to your former top aide since his verdict?

Dick: I have.

CBS: Can you tell us anything about that conversation?

Dick: No. I've seen him socially on a number of occasions.

CBS:

#### **THEY**

I'm thrilled by the news that Democrats intend to call Jack Goldsmith to testify on the domestic wiretap program.

Congressional Democrats plan to step up the heat in coming weeks, pressing for Justice memos and other documents. They also plan to calla potentially crucial witness: Jack L. Goldsmith, the former chief of Justice's Office of Legal Counsel.

# HAVE THEY DONE THIS SORT OF THING? SEND AN AMB TO ANSWER A QUESTION?, PART TWO

This is the second post in a series. In the prior post, I showed that, when Libby asked David Addington about paperwork relating to a CIA employee's spouse traveling for the CIA, he was interested in identifying all backup documents to Wilson's 2002 trip and/or the paperwork associated with Wilson's 1999 trip to Niger relating to AQ Khan.

# HAVE THEY DONE THIS SORT OF THING? SEND AN AMB TO ANSWER A

## **QUESTION?, PART ONE**

This is going to be a two part post. In this post, I'm going to show a key discrepancy between Libby's testimony about the questions he asked Addington on July 8, and Addington's. Addington's testimony suggests that (contrary to Libby's claims), Libby was looking for general details about the paperwork behind Wilson's trip, which would have exposed Valerie's role at the CIA, potentially her status, as well as prior trips Joe

#### NO LONGER OPERATIVE

It looks like we're approaching the point where some hack stands up and explains that the claim that any disagreements were not about the domestic wiretap program is no longer operative.

Documents indicate eight congressional leaderswere briefed about the Bush administration's terrorist surveillanceprogram on the eve of its expiration in 2004, contradicting swornSenate testimony this week by Attorney General Alberto Gonzales.

[snip]A Gonzales spokesman maintained Wednesday
that the attorney general stands by his

# DID HARMAN APPROVE OF THE ILLEGAL DOMESTIC WIRETAP

#### PROGRAM?

Well, that was quick work. Yesterday I suggested that the Gang of Eight who purportedly attended the March 10, 2004 meeting at which Alberto Gonzales claims to have developed consensus that they should ignore James Comey's concerns and continue to tap American citizens anyway might have some enlightenment to offer about what went on at the meeting.

# CUNNINGHAM, CIFA, AND CHENEY, A NEW CHRONOLOGY

In light of the news that Alberto Gonzales granted Cheneypresidential powers to snoop into ongoing investigations in May 2006, I thoughtit was time to update my chronology of the CIFA side of the Cunningham scandal. September 2002, then Deputy Secretary of Defense for Counter-Intelligence Burtt establishes CIFA to oversee counterintelligence units of the armed services; consulting on the new agency was James King, recently retired director of National Imagery and Mapping Agency

## LET THE SUNSHINE IN

I'm with David Kurtz. In addition to offering good reason to begin impeachment procedures, Bush's dangerous claims to executive and deliberative privilege really ought to invite us to reconsider the notion that Presidents need to hide their deliberations.

As long as we're going to be discussing the parameters of executive privilege in the weeks and months ahead, can we start by revisiting the now commonly accepted notion that the President can only get free

### **DEAR CONGRESS**

John Bates has issued a ruling I've been anticipating—dismissing the Wilson lawsuit against Cheney, Rove, Libby, and Armitage. If I'm reading correctly, Bates ruled that he has no jurisdiction to rule in this matter.

This Court therefore lacks subject matter jurisdiction over plaintiffs' tort claim for public disclosure of private facts.

He therefore did not deal with many of the arguments the Wilsons and the defendants raised in this case—including Cheney's claim to