

Potential Qs for DD's call [REDACTED]

From: "\"strzok\" <>, \"peter p. \" <[REDACTED]>\"
To: [REDACTED] <-@-> [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Cc: BAKER <-@->, JAMES A. <[REDACTED]>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>, [REDACTED] <[REDACTED]>
Date: Tue, 24 Jan 2017 06:46:58 -0500

[REDACTED]

I'm sure he's thought through these, but for DD's consideration about how to answer in advance of his call with Flynn:

Am I in trouble?

Am I the subject of an investigation?

Is it a criminal investigation?

Is it an espionage investigation?

Do I need an attorney?

Do I need to tell Priebus? The President?

Will you tell Priebus? The President?

Will you tell the WH what I tell you?

What happens to the information/who will you tell what I tell you?

Will you need to interview other people?

Will our interview be released publically? Will the substance of our interview be released?

How long will this take (depends on his cooperation – I'd plan 45 minutes)?

Can we do this over the phone?

I can explain all this right now, I did this, this, this [do you shut him down? Hear him out? Conduct the interview if he starts talking? Do you want another agent/witness standing by in case he starts doing this?]

Thanks,

Pete

[REDACTED]

RE: Question regarding 1001

From: [REDACTED]"
To: Page <-@->, Lisa C. <peter.strzok@...>
Date: Mon, 23 Jan 2017 22:04:41 -0500

I haven't read the policy lately, but if I recall correctly, you can say it at any time. I'm 90 percent sure about that, but I can check in the am.

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

From: "Page, Lisa C. (OGC) (FBI)" <[REDACTED]>
Date: 01/23/2017 9:30 PM (GMT-05:00)
To: [REDACTED] (OGC) (FBI)" <[REDACTED]>, "Strzok, Peter P. (CD) (FBI)" <[REDACTED]>
Subject: Question regarding 1001

[REDACTED], I have a question for you. Could the admonition re 1001 be given at the beginning at the interview? Or does it have to come following a statement which agents believe to be false? Does the policy speak to that? (I feel bad that I don't know this but I don't remember ever having to do this! Plus I've only charged it once in the context of lying to a federal probation officer).

It seems to be if the former, then it would be an easy way to just casually slip that in. "Of course as you know sir, federal law makes it a crime to..."

Question regarding 1001

From: "\"page\" <>, \"lisa c. \" [REDACTED] >\"
To: [REDACTED] <peter.strzok [REDACTED]>
Date: Mon, 23 Jan 2017 21:30:41 -0500

[REDACTED], I have a question for you. Could the admonition re 1001 be given at the beginning at the interview? Or does it have to come following a statement which agents believe to be false? Does the policy speak to that? (I feel bad that I don't know this but I don't remember ever having to do this! Plus I've only charged it once in the context of lying to a federal probation officer).

It seems to be if the former, then it would be an easy way to just casually slip that in. "Of course as you know sir, federal law makes it a crime to..."

Admin's
Emplo...
could be...
01/24/2017



DD



• We have a case on Flynn + Russians
• our goal is to resolve case
• Our goal is to ^{determine if} ~~assess~~ Mike Flynn
is going to tell the truth @ his
relationship w/ Russians

• Can quote [redacted]

• Shouldnt [redacted]



Review in stand-alone

• Afterwards

I. • Interview

• I agreed yesterday that we shouldn't show
Flynn [redacted] if he didn't admit
• I thought @ it last night, + I believe we
should rethink this

• What's our goal? Truth/Admission or to
• get him to lie, so we can prosecute
him or get him fired?

• We regularly show subjects evidence,
• with the goal of getting them to admit
their wrongdoing

• I don't see how getting someone to
admit their wrongdoing is going
easy on him

• If we get him to admit to
breaking the Logan Act, give facts
to DOJ + have them decide

• Or, if he initially lies, then we
present him [redacted] + he admits
it, document for DOJ, + let them
decide how to address it

• If we're seen as playing games, WH
will be furious

• Protect our institution by not playing
games

