

FBI Wants You To Believe It Examined 650,000 Emails In 691,000 Seconds

By [Claire Bernish](#)

Global Research, November 08, 2016
[Activist Post](#) 7 November 2016

Region: [USA](#)

In-depth Report: [Election Fraud in America, U.S. Elections](#)

In no surprise to anyone paying even marginal attention, the FBI's clearing Hillary Clinton of wrongdoing in its briefly reopened investigation — however, the time it took the agency to reach this conclusion is not only bereft of logic and reason, it constitutes the most hubristic of insults to the public's intelligence.

In just 691,000 seconds from announcement to conclusion, FBI Director James Comey wants you to believe that agents thoroughly examined over 650,000 emails newly 'discovered' on Anthony Weiner's computer — including any threads resulting, as well as all attachments — before deciding Clinton innocent of wrongdoing.

We, the people of this planet, are just not that stupid — nor are we even mildly amused by this farcical bullshit passed off as a credible investigation.

Seriously.

Indeed, the lightning pace of this putative second investigation not only boggles the mind, it forces uneasy questions concerning the true motivation and apparent exceeding necessity to ensure Hillary Clinton walks away scot-free amid rapidly mushrooming evidence of flagrant corruption and mendacious collusion.

Just a cursory comparison of two investigations shows such marked differences it would be impossible not to question legitimacy of the FBI's findings.

In the summer of 2015, the FBI commenced its first probe into the former secretary of state's use of a private email server during her tenure in office, after John Giacalone — then Director of the National Security Branch — met with Comey to [voice concerns](#) emanating from the Intelligence community about classified information possibly handled carelessly.

For nearly a full year — 365 days, or 31,536,000 seconds — a sizable task force of FBI agents pored over an [enormous cache](#), first comprised of 30,000 emails, but later totaling 44,900 after additional documents not originally handed over by the Clinton camp to the State Department were discovered.

This means — rounding off the rough estimate of one year — the Bureau combed an average of just over 123 documents every day.

While that might seem to be manageable with a slew of investigators on the job, a basic comparison of the two probes proves the literal inanity of the reopened investigation.

Later in the day on October 28, Comey [announced](#) the commencement of the secondary probe — albeit to the consternation of current and former officials who felt his telling Congress broke a number of investigatory guidelines, including possibly influencing the outcome of the presidential race.

According to Comey, an additional [650,000](#) documents located on the computer of Clinton aide Huma Abedin's now-disgraced and estranged husband Anthony Weiner deserved careful scrutiny for pertinence and relevance to the original investigation of the Democratic nominee.

Public and official speculation predicted a months- or years-long investigation, even with substantial manpower dedicated to the task.

But on Sunday, November 6, in yet another shocker of an announcement from the FBI director, Comey inexplicably declared nothing of relevance to the Clinton investigation — [“no new conclusions”](#) — had been revealed in its secondary probe.

This means — again rounding for brevity to eight days the total length of the investigation — FBI agents inspected some 81,250 documents each day.

Granted, both estimates have been averaged and roughened, but only for comparison's sake — and that contrast doesn't survive the scantiest litmus test of believability.

Not at *all*.

Before the naysayers jump in with a *there's no comparison* deflection, consider the following points.

Although an algorithm or program combing those documents might indeed retrieve subjects of interest to investigators — keywords, germane subjects, accordant people's names, and the like — in no way would such technological gatekeepers reveal subtle nuance as has been displayed in emails published by WikiLeaks from Hillary Clinton, campaign chair John Podesta, and the Democratic National Committee.

Such fine gradations of meaning, naturally found in the English language but also purposefully employed to throw off investigators and interlopers, could not possibly be revealed by artificial means — at least not that quickly and particularly not with currently available technologies.

Still not convinced?

Consider that if such technology did indeed exist to that discerning level of scrutiny in our heightened and overarching surveillance and police states, no criminal would ever roam free.

Law enforcement departments and the National Security Agency together have amassed astonishingly voluminous data sets on every person in this country, including through emails and online activities. A technology advanced enough to comb for subtleties in language would home in on criminal behavior and activity with incredible frequency.

And while NSA programs have been revealed to hunt for keywords, there are limits to its effectiveness — no terrorist plot has yet been halted in progress because the intelligence to



discover it hasn't yet solidified to that point.

Technology experts immediately weighed in [claiming](#) such technology does indeed exist, is frequently employed, and can do the job perfectly in a mere eight days — *no worries*.



But, as WikiLeaks rebutted in a number of tweets, it isn't quite so simple.

Emails between Clinton, her campaign staff, the DNC, and other insiders have proven to be a literal trove of revealing details — including Hillary's use of the name of aide Huma Abedin as a deflection, and President Obama's use of a pseudonym to communicate on the private server in an attempt to thwart future investigators.

Programs and algorithms would have to be fed such information, but not all of those pseudonyms were known — and that represents only one such complication.

**General Flynn**  @GenFlynn 6 Nov



It took 1 year to review 60K and 8 days to review 650K? Smart machines or not, something does not jive. Thoughts?

**WikiLeaks**  @wikileaks [Follow](#)



@GenFlynn 1/ We've published >7mil emails. Clinton uses pseudonyms and proxies, of which Huma is one, so most need to be read by hand.

9:09 PM - 6 Nov 2016

↩️ ↺ 4,774 ❤️ 4,878

**General Flynn**  @GenFlynn 6 Nov


It took 1 year to review 60K and 8 days to review 650K? Smart machines or not, something does not jive. Thoughts?

**WikiLeaks**  @wikileaks [Follow](#)

@GenFlynn 2/ At 3 min per email thats 504 officers for 8 days, not including all support and management. So you need around 1000 officers.

9:12 PM - 6 Nov 2016

↩️ ↺ 3,678 ❤️ 3,792



Even working around the clock, as Comey alleged the FBI did in its second probe, 82,000 documents daily isn't even worth comparing to the 123 averaged each day in the initial investigation.

So, what *are* we to believe about the clearing of Hillary Clinton for a second time?

That's up to you — *to each of us* — to draw a conclusion.

But to characterize that second investigation as anything other than a charade to placate an irate public would be criminal *willful* denial of conspicuous evidence — criminal willful denial that the utter bullshit the FBI just brazenly served the American people *doesn't* somehow stink.

The original source of this article is [Activist Post](#)
Copyright © [Claire Bernish](#), [Activist Post](#), 2016

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

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Claire Bernish](#)

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