

The FBI Has Been Lying About Seth Rich

By [Craig Murray](#)

Global Research, January 30, 2020

[Craig Murray](#) 28 January 2020

Region: [USA](#)

Theme: [Intelligence](#), [Law and Justice](#),
[Media Disinformation](#)

A persistent American lawyer has uncovered the undeniable fact that the FBI has been [continuously lying](#), including giving false testimony in court, in response to Freedom of Information requests for its records on Seth Rich. The FBI has previously given [affidavits](#) that it has no records regarding Seth Rich.

A Freedom of Information request to the FBI which did not mention Seth Rich, but asked for [all email correspondence](#) between FBI Head of Counterterrorism Peter Strzok, who headed the investigation into the DNC leaks and Wikileaks, and FBI attorney Lisa Page, has revealed two pages of emails which do not merely mention Seth Rich but have "Seth Rich" as their heading. The emails were provided in, to say the least, heavily redacted form.

Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)

From: Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 7:49 PM
To: Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)
Subject: Fwd: Seth Rich

----- Original message -----

From: [REDACTED] (WF) (FBI)" [REDACTED]
Date: 08/10/2016 7:09 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: "Moffa, Jonathan C. (CD) (FBI)" [REDACTED] "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)"
Subject: Fwd: Seth Rich

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Just FYSA. I squashed this with [REDACTED]

b6 -1
b7C -1

--

----- Original message -----

From: [REDACTED] (WF) (FBI)" [REDACTED]
Date: 08/10/2016 1:25 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [REDACTED] (WF) (FBI)" [REDACTED] (WF) (FBI)"
[REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] (WF) (FBI)" [REDACTED] (WF) (FBI)"
[REDACTED] (WF) (FBI)" [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Seth Rich

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Thank [REDACTED] will do.

From: [REDACTED] (WF) (FBI)
Sent: Wednesday, August 10, 2016 1:00 PM
To: [REDACTED] (WF) (FBI); [REDACTED] (WF) (FBI)
Cc: [REDACTED] (WF) (FBI); [REDACTED] (WF) (FBI); [REDACTED] (WF) (FBI)
Subject: RE: Seth Rich

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Hi [REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

b5 -1
b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -9

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/10/2016 12:54 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (WF) (FBI)* [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (WF) (FBI)* [redacted] (WF) (FBI)*
[redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Subject: RE: Seth Rich

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Adding [redacted] for real. Stupid Samsung.

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/10/2016 12:53 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (WF) (FBI)* [redacted] (WF) (FBI)*
[redacted]
Subject: RE: Seth Rich

b5 -1
b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Adding [redacted] I'm aware of this reporting from earlier this week but not any specific involvement in any related case. [redacted]

----- Original message -----

From: [redacted] (WF) (FBI) [redacted]
Date: 08/10/2016 10:32 AM (GMT-05:00)
To: [redacted] (WF) (FBI)* [redacted]
Cc: [redacted] (WF) (FBI)* [redacted] (WF) (FBI)*
[redacted]
Subject: Seth Rich

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1

I hope you are well. I heard from the front office that you are covering for [redacted] this week. Various news outlets are reporting today that Julian Assange suggested during a recent overseas interview that DNC Staffer, Seth Rich was a Wikileaks source, and may have been killed because he leaked the DNC e-mails to his organization, and that Wikileaks was offering \$20,000 for information regarding Rich's death last month. Based on this news, we anticipate additional press coverage on this matter. I hear that you are in a class today; however, when you have a moment, can you please give me a call to discuss what involvement the Bureau has in the investigation.

Thanks,

[redacted]

FBI Washington Field Office
Public Affairs

Des

Cell

[redacted]

b6 -1
b7C -1
b7E -6

Before I analyse these particular emails, I should make plain that they are not the major point. The major point is that the FBI claimed it had no records mentioning Seth Rich, and these have come to light in response to a different FOIA request that was not about him. What other falsely denied documents does the FBI hold about Rich, that were not fortuitously picked up by a search for correspondence between two named individuals?

To look at the documents themselves, they have to be read from the bottom up, and they consist of a series of emails between members of the Washington Field Office of the FBI (WF in the telegrams) into which Strzok was copied in, and which he ultimately forwarded on to the lawyer Lisa Page.

The opening email, at the bottom, dated 10 August 2016 at 10.32am, precisely just one month after the murder of Seth Rich, is from the media handling department of the

Washington Field Office. It references Wikileaks' offer of a reward for information on the murder of Seth Rich, and that Assange seemed to imply Rich was the source of the DNC leaks. The media handlers are asking the operations side of the FBI field office for any information on the case. The unredacted part of the reply fits with the official narrative. The redacted individual officer is "not aware of any specific involvement" by the FBI in the Seth Rich case. But his next sentence is completely redacted. Why?

It appears that "adding" references a new person added in to the list. This appears to have not worked, and probably the same person (precisely same length of deleted name) then tries again, with "adding ... for real" and blames the technology - "stupid Samsung". The interesting point here is that the person added appears not to be in the FBI - a new redacted addressee does indeed appear, and unlike all the others does not have an FBI suffix after their deleted email address. So who are they?

(This section on "adding" was updated after commenters offered a better explanation than my original one. See first comments below).

The fourth email, at 1pm on Wednesday August 10, 2016, is much the most interesting. It is ostensibly also from the Washington Field Office, but it is from somebody using a different classified email system with a very different time and date format than the others. It is apparently from somebody more senior, as the reply to it is "will do". And every single word of this instruction has been blanked. The final email, saying that "I squashed this with", is from a new person again, with the shortest name. That phrase may only have meant I denied this to a journalist, or it may have been reporting an operational command given.

As the final act in this drama, Strzok then sent the whole thread on to the lawyer, which is why we now have it. Why?

It is perfectly possible to fill in the blanks with a conversation that completely fits the official narrative. The deletions could say this was a waste of time and the FBI was not looking at the Rich case. But in that case, the FBI would have been delighted to publish it unredacted. (The small numbers in the right hand margins supposedly detail the exception to the FOIA under which deletion was made. In almost every case they are one or other category of invasion of privacy).

And if it just all said "Assange is talking nonsense. Seth Rich is nothing to do with the FBI" then why would that have to be sent on by Strzok to the FBI lawyer?

It is of course fortunate that Strzok did forward this one email thread on to the lawyer, because that is the only reason we have seen it, as a result of an FOI(A) request for the correspondence between those two.

Finally, and perhaps this is the most important point, the FBI was at this time supposed to be in the early stages of an investigation into how the DNC emails were leaked to Wikileaks. The FBI here believed Wikileaks to be indicating the material had been leaked by Seth Rich who had then been murdered. Surely in any legitimate investigation, the investigators would have been absolutely compelled to check out the truth of this possibility, rather than treat it as a media issue?

We are asked to believe that not one of these emails says "well if the publisher of the emails says Seth Rich was the source, we had better check that out, especially as he was murdered

with no sign of a suspect". If the FBI really did not look at that, why on earth not? If the FBI genuinely, as they claim, did not even look at the murder of Seth Rich, that would surely be the most damning fact of all and reveal their "investigation" was entirely agenda driven from the start.

In June 2016 a vast cache of the DNC emails were leaked to Wikileaks. On 10 July 2016 an employee from the location of the leak was murdered without obvious motive, in an alleged street robbery in which nothing at all was stolen. Not to investigate the possibility of a link between the two incidents would be grossly negligent. It is worth adding that, contrary to a propaganda barrage, Bloomingdale where Rich was murdered is a very pleasant area of Washington DC and by no means a murder hotspot. It is also worth noting that not only is there no suspect in Seth Rich's murder, there has never been any semblance of a serious effort to find the killer. Washington police appear perfectly happy simply to write this case off.

I anticipate two responses to this article in terms of irrelevant and illogical whataboutery:

Firstly, it is very often the case that family members are extremely resistant to the notion that the murder of a relative may have wider political implications. This is perfectly natural. The appalling grief of losing a loved one to murder is extraordinary; to reject the cognitive dissonance of having your political worldview shattered at the same time is very natural. In the case of David Kelly, of Seth Rich, and of Wille Macrae, we see families reacting with emotional hostility to the notion that the death raises wider questions. Occasionally the motive may be still more mixed, with the prior relationship between the family and the deceased subject to other strains (I am not referencing the Rich case here).

You do occasionally get particularly stout hearted family who take the opposite tack and are prepared to take on the authorities in the search for justice, of which Commander Robert Green, son of Hilda Murrell, is a worthy example.

(As an interesting aside, I just checked his name in the Wikipedia article on Hilda, which I discovered describes Tam Dalyell "hounding" Margaret Thatcher over the Belgrano and the fact that ship was steaming away from the Falklands when destroyed with massive loss of life as a "second conspiracy theory", the first of course being the murder of Hilda Murrell. Wikipedia really has become a cesspool.)

We have powerful cultural taboos that reinforce the notion that if the family do not want the question of the death of their loved one disturbed, nobody else should bring it up. Seth Rich's parents, David Kelly's wife, Willie Macrae's brother have all been deployed by the media and the powers behind them to this effect, among many other examples. This is an emotionally powerful but logically weak method of restricting enquiry.

Secondly, I do not know and I deliberately have not inquired what are the views on other subjects of either Mr Ty Clevenger, who brought his evidence and blog to my attention, or Judicial Watch, who made the FOIA request that revealed these documents. I am interested in the evidence presented both that the FBI lied, and in the documents themselves. Those who obtained the documents may, for all I know, be dedicated otter baiters or believe in stealing ice cream from children. I am referencing the evidence they have obtained in this particular case, not endorsing - or condemning - anything else in their lives or work. I really have had enough of illogical detraction by association as a way of avoiding logical argument by an absurd extension of ad hominem argument to third parties.

*

Note to readers: please click the share buttons above or below. Forward this article to your email lists. Crosspost on your blog site, internet forums. etc.

The original source of this article is [Craig Murray](#)

Copyright © [Craig Murray](#), [Craig Murray](#), 2020

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Craig Murray](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca