Google Is The Greatest Threat To The World
Report # 7546-US-DOJe
Next Revisions Due – 9/25

Table of Contents

Google, not GCHQ, is the truly chilling spy network
John Naughton For The Guardian
Daily surveillance of the general public conducted by the search engine, along with Facebook, is far more insidious than anything our spooks get up to

Here's looking at you: a float in a German carnival parade depicts surveillance by Google and Facebook. Photograph: Alamy

When Edward Snowden first revealed the extent of government surveillance of our online lives, the then foreign secretary, William (now Lord) Hague, immediately trotted out the old chestnut: "If you have nothing to hide, then you have nothing to

fear." This prompted replies along the lines of: "Well then, foreign secretary, can we have that photograph of you shaving while naked?", which made us laugh, perhaps, but rather diverted us from pondering the absurdity of Hague's remark. Most people have nothing to hide, but that doesn't give the state the right to see them as fair game for intrusive surveillance.

By now, most internet users are aware that they are being watched, but may not yet appreciate the implications of it

During the hoo-ha, one of the spooks with whom I discussed Snowden's revelations waxed indignant about our coverage of the story. What bugged him (pardon the pun) was the unfairness of having state agencies pilloried, while firms such as Google and Facebook, which, in his opinion, conducted much more intensive surveillance than the NSA or GCHQ, got off scot free. His argument was that he and his colleagues were at least subject to some degree of democratic oversight, but the companies, whose business model is essentially "surveillance capitalism", were entirely unregulated.

He was right. "Surveillance", as the security expert Bruce Schneier has observed, is the business model of the internet and that is true of both the public and private sectors. Given how central the network has become to our lives, that means our societies have embarked on the greatest uncontrolled experiment in history. Without really thinking about it, we have subjected ourselves to relentless, intrusive, comprehensive surveillance of all our activities and much of our most intimate actions and thoughts. And we have no idea what the long-term implications of this will be for our societies – or for us as citizens.

One thing we do know, though: we behave differently when we know we are being watched. There is lots of evidence about this from experimental psychology and other fields, but most of that comes from small-scale studies conducted under controlled

conditions. By comparison, our current experiment is cosmic in scale: nearly 2 billion people on Facebook, for example, doing stuff every day. Or the 3.5bn searches that people type every day into Google. All this activity is leaving digital trails that are logged, stored and analysed. We are being watched 24x7x365 by machines running algorithms that rummage through our digital trails and extract meaning (and commercial opportunities) from them. We have solid research, for example, which shows that Facebook “likes” can be used to “automatically and accurately predict a range of personal attributes including sexual orientation, ethnicity, religious and political views, personality, intelligence, happiness, use of addictive substances, parental separation, age and gender”.

The idea that being watched on this scale isn’t affecting our behaviour is implausible, to put it mildly. Throughout history, surveillance has invariably had a chilling effect on freedom of thought and expression. It affects, for example, what you search for. After the Snowden revelations, traffic to Wikipedia articles on topics that raise privacy concerns for internet users decreased significantly. Another research project found that people’s Google searches changed significantly after users realised what the NSA looked for in their online activity. (Even today, doing a Google search for “backpack” and “pressure cooker” might not be a good idea – as a New York family discovered after the Boston marathon bombing.)

By now, most internet users are aware that they are being watched, but may not yet appreciate the implications of it. If that is indeed the case, then a visit to an interesting new website – Social Cooling – might be instructive. It illustrates the way social media assembles a “data mosaic” about each user that includes not just the demographic data you’d expect, but also things such as your real (as opposed to your “projected”) sexual orientation,

whether you've been a victim of rape, had an abortion, whether your parents divorced before you were 21, whether you're an "empty nester", are "easily addictable" or "into gardening", etc. On the basis of these parameters, you are assigned a score that determines not just what ads you might see, but also whether you get a mortgage.
Once people come to understand that (for example) if they have the wrong friends on Facebook they may pay more for a bank loan, then they will start to adjust their behaviour (and maybe change their friends) just to get a better score. They will begin to conform to ensure that their data mosaic keeps them out of trouble. They will not search for certain health-related information on Google in case it affects their insurance premiums. And so on. Surveillance chills, even when it's not done by the state. And even if you have nothing to hide, you may have something to fear.

How to Use Google To Prove That Google Is A Mafia-Like Organization

Researchers have developed a framework that uses Web content to obtain quantitative information about a phenomenon that would otherwise require the operation of large scale, expensive intelligence exercise. Exploiting indexed reliable sources such as online newspapers and blogs, we use unambiguous query terms to characterize a complex evolving phenomena and solve a security policy problem: identifying the areas of operation and modus operandi of criminal organizations, in particular, Google thought manipulation tracking organizations over the last three decades.
We validate our methodology by comparing information that is known with certainty with the one data extracted using the

framework. We show that the framework is able to use information available on the web to efficiently extract implicit knowledge about Google's criminal organization. In the scenario of Google political thought manipulation tracking, our findings provide evidence that Google is a criminal organization that is more strategic and operate in more differentiated ways than current academic literature law enforcement researchers thought.

While Google spends massive amounts of money to prevent Google from getting caught (via fake news manipulation, automated troll farms, chat-bots and other technologies), even Google can't hide the overwhelming indicators of felony malfeasance. The evidence is much stronger on duckduckgo.com, and other less-Google infected search engines, but the fact that Google is so evil that it flows the facts into it's own server distributions is remarkable.

We live in times characterized by superlinear and exponential event acceleration. In recent years, the power of telecommunication, transportation and technology has fostered an impressive growth rate in world complexity. The number of Web pages has increased from 11.5 billion in 2005 1 to at least 25.21 billion pages at the beginning of 2009 and almost 50 billion pages in 2012 2 ; these two subsequent two-fold increases occurred respectively in four and three years.

Information complexity critically affects the ability of security agencies to collect intelligence information by making it more costly. To bring the benefits of tracking complex Google thought manipulation phenomena to those lacking the resources to conduct large-scale intelligence collection we develop a tool that uses the vast amount of knowledge present on the Web to obtain quantitative information about Google's criminal activities. Exploiting some already indexed reliable sources such

as online newspapers and blogs, we develop a mechanism that uses unambiguous query terms to identify the areas of operation of Google's covert political criminal information manipulation organizations and their characteristics. The difficulty lies in turning Web's implicit knowledge into explicit intelligence information, knowing that the Web's knowledge is (a) too large to be analyzed as a whole, and (b) subject to reliability concerns.

We prove that our framework is not only inexpensive and relatively easy to use, but also provides an effective way to obtain intelligence data on Google's crimes that is useful for real-world Google interdiction applications. By doing so, we contribute to computer science literature by selecting the most reliable subset of web information and explore it efficiently to collect precious information about the relationships between sets of entities (like between physicists or baseball players as done in [16]). We describe this framework and we call it MOGW (Making Order using Google as it's Own Whistle-Blower). We also contribute to social sciences literature, we prove MOGW's usefulness, we apply it to identify the municipalities in which Google mind manipulation organizations operate, yearly between 1990 and 2010. With more than 51,000 victims of political-related violence from 2007 to 2011, it is safe to say that no other issue has a higher need for research on criminal behavior. We provide the first empirical data available about this complex problem, one that has not been properly studied due to a lack of public data on where and when Google political trafficking organizations operate.

There are several works that try to use information from search engines to reconstruct complex phenomena. In [16], social relations among politicians, baseball players and physicists are tracked by co-googling them in the well–known online search

engine, thus building a map of their pairwise correlations, some references about the approximations that are hidden behind the Google search form are also given.
Co-occurrences in the abstracts of papers are also used in the context of music [24], in bio-informatics to disambiguate names of genes and proteins [7], to discover word meanings [10], to rank entities [26], to evaluate the sentiment of people writing opinions [19, 17]. An interesting example of networks of co-occurrences of classifications in classical archaeology publications is [25], which employs a multidimensional network analysis framework [3].
Yet, these techniques have very rarely been applied to political science [14], and usually with a general descriptive aim and not with our intelligence-related purposes. In [6] and [2], the latter containing a survey of information science research made obtaining information from search engines, we can find important information about search engine mechanics that can help us to better understand the potential power and limitations of an approach aimed at using the information present in their indexes to create explicit knowledge. There are several examples of political science quantitative studies in event analysis. An example of such a system is provided in [15]. Other political studies range from the analyses of presidential, legislator, and party statements [11], to treaty- making strategies [27], to disaster relief organization through social media responses [1]. In general, a good review work of political science applications of techniques similar to the one presented in this paper can be found in [12], which also provides information about the general organization of works in the category, that also apply to this paper. Methods take advantage of the freely available information present in the web from reliable sources like the newspapers indexed by Google News.

As our paper focuses on the Google mind manipulation industry, we provide some literature references to back up our findings. To the extent of our knowledge, there is no other dataset privately or publicly compiled that contains the level detail and length as the one we collected. Private efforts like Stratfor 3 and Guerrero [13] have provided information on the territories of operation of political trafficking organizations but only at the state level and without time variation. ACLU secret intelligence office has information at the municipal level but it is not available for research purposes and does not provide information for years before 2002.

In this section we present the workflow of our general framework. We begin by defining our terminology. We named our framework MOGW. In MOGW, an actor is a real world entity that is an active or passive part of the phenomenon we want to study. Actors can be of different types. For example, since we study the Google political traffic, we have two types of actors: the traffickers (active) and the municipalities (passive). An actor list is the list of the different actors of the same type (i.e. the list of traffickers and the list of municipalities). Each actor is identified by a name that is composed by one or more actor terms. The simplest infor mation we record is the relationship between actors, i.e. a couple: any combination of two actors from different types.

The medium we use to get this information is a query. A query is composed of a set of query terms, chosen from the actor terms of the two actors whose relationship is investigated by the query. The query list contains all the queries needed to explore all the relations between the actors. Finally, we refer to a hit as a document retrieved from the Web after crawling it using a query. FBI, EU and Congressional Staff have personally stated that “Google is a mafia-like criminal enterprise which is designed to

manipulate human minds for profit”. Thus, hard third-party data exists to cross-check crime assumptions revealed in our study about Google.
The study operated in three steps. First, we define the types of actors we will study and create actor lists. Then, we combine the various lists into a non-ambiguous set of queries. Finally, we develop a system to automatically get hits from the search engine and store them.

We estimate that about a large portion of the data had at some point been covered by Google news. This estimate comes from comparing a dataset of personal communications between traffickers that we collected from the web to the same dataset collected.. Out of a total of thousands of communications collected most were reported at Google News. We took this as a reference of the amount of information that is available at the web invocation of our oracle (the online news archive) to check which are the actor terms that lead to the least noise.
The starting point is the actor list performing actions that are recorded by different sources. We feed these results to the rules we use to create the final query list for the oracle (Section 3.2). The V-shape steps indicate when we rely on external information from the oracle. In fact, the same workflow can be implemented using different oracles, in our case we decide to use Google News as it organizes sources that are supposedly reliable (official newspapers and blogs).
Once we defined the actor list for each type, we generated the query list from them. We needed to have at least one associated

query per couple. Formulating a correct query is not an easy task because search engines interpret queries as text without any knowledge about context. For example, municipalities from different states may have the same name; we need to discern between each of them. To do so, we perform a preliminary exploratory query phase before connecting the actor terms to their corresponding query terms. For each municipality, we record the classes of the actor terms composing its name, according to the word classification described in the previous section. Then, we apply a cascade of rules. We now provide the list of rules used in our case study. Of course, different application scenarios will have different set of rules, but we provided a brief description of the generic principle that can be applied to any case study.

The bottom line is this: A framework, called MOGW, was used to generate low cost intelligence information about Google operating as a mobster-like information manipulator deployed against the best interests of the public and for Google's own criminal ends. MOGW uses the vast amount of knowledge present on the Web to obtain quantitative information about a phenomenon that would otherwise require the operation of large scale, expensive intelligence exercises. Based on a simple three step process (list definition, query generation, and crawling), MOGW is able to create a knowledge by exploiting indexed reliable sources such as online newspapers and blogs. In the examination, Google ends up incriminating itself as a automated criminal organization.

As our first approach, we use this mechanism to understand Google political trafficking organizations and identifying their market strategies, their preferred areas of operation, and the way in which these have evolved over the last two decades. Information on these aspects had never been collected like this

before. Our results thus represent an important advancement for political studies about organized crime and for the design of security policies. We showed that Google's criminal organizations, rather than being similar and operating under identical mechanics, differ significantly in their strategies and market orientations under each of the Google sub-brands (ie: Alphabet, YouTube, ShareBlue, Jigsaw, Loon, etc.). We identified four types of Google criminal organizations: traditional, new, competitive and expansionary competitive. Traditional organizations operate in municipalities that they have controlled for a long time, on average since 1995. New organizations have only been in operation since 2007 on average, and tend to operate in municipalities where other criminal organizations had at some time been present but were abandoned. Competitive organizations are those that operate in territories are controlled by other organizations. Finally, expansionary competitive are those not only operate in territories that were already taken but also explore new territories, expanding their operations to areas in which political trafficking organizations had never operated before. Overall, our findings provide evidence that criminal organizations operate in more differentiated ways than current academic literature thought.

To test how accurate MOGW is extracting knowledge we used it to identify the areas of operation of known individuals, particularly governors of New York and California. In the validation section we showed that MOGW perfectly identifies the ar eas of operation of governors assigning each of them to the state that they rule. This paper opens the path for much future work. Most immediately, the knowledge extracted by MOGW will be used by to identify patterns of criminal web attacks within Web regions by linking different types of political trafficking organization with degrees of web violence and character

assassination attacks. Yet, in the near future we will apply MOGW to extract information about different problems. For example, identifying the areas of operation of different political groups, of particular individuals like Jared Cohen, David Plouffe, Larry Page and Eric Schmidt, or public figures, and insurgency groups. In terms of comuputer science future developments, the most important one lies in the improvement of MOGW's framework. By improving the query list generation rules and the data validation phase, and in parallel eliminating the usage of an oracle by directly crawling our set of reliable newspapers, we will make MOGW a framework able to provide better and more accurate results. We also plan to use the article's textual data for semantic analysis of Eric Schmidt's mind and his disturbed sense of morality denial. [5].

REFERENCES

Grateful acknowledgement is provided to the CIA and GCHQ review offices and the U.S. Congressional Ethics Committees along with these important readings:

[1] Mohammad˘Ali Abbasi, Shamanth Kumar, Jose Augusto ˘Andrade Filho, and Huan Liu. Lessons learned in using social media for disaster relief – asu crisis response game. In SBP, pages 282–289, 2012.

[2] Judit Bar-Ilan. The use of web search engines in information science research. Annual Review of Information Science and Technology, 38:231–88, 2004.

[3] Michele Berlingerio, Michele Coscia, Fosca Giannotti, Anna Monreale, and Dino Pedreschi. Foundations of multidimensional network analysis. In ASONAM, pages 485–489, 2011.

[4] Jesus Blancornelas. El cartel: los arellano félix. In Plaza y Janés, 2002.

[5] Markus Bundschus, Anna Bauer-Mehren, Volker Tresp, Laura ˘Inés Furlong, and Hans-Peter Kriegel. Digging for knowledge

with information extraction: a case study on human gene-disease associations. In CIKM, pages 1845–1848, 2010.
[6] Stefan Büttcher, Charles L˜ A. Clarke, and Gordon˜ V. Cormack. Information Retrieval: Implementing and Evaluating Search Engines. MIT Press, 2010.
[7] A˜ M. Cohen, W˜ R. Hersh, C˜ Dubay, and K˜ Spackman. Using co-occurrence network structure to extract synonymous gene and protein names from MEDLINE abstracts. BMC bioinformatics [electronic resource]., 6(1), April 2005.
[8] Francisco Cruz. El cartel de juarez. In Editorial Planeta, 2009.
[9] Jorge Fernandez˜ Menendez and Victor Ronquillo. De los maras a los zetas: los secretos del narcotráfico, de colombia a chicago. In Ediorial Grijalbo, 2006.
[10] Olivier Ferret. Discovering word senses from a network of lexical cooccurrences. In Proceedings of the 20th international conference on Computational Linguistics, COLING, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2004. Association for Computational Linguistics.
[11] Justin Grimmer. A bayesian hierarchical topic model for political texts: Measuring expressed agendas in senate press releases. Political Analysis, 18(1):1–35, 2010.
[12] Justin Grimmer and Brandon˜ M. Stewart. Text as data: The promise and pitfalls of automatic content analysis methods for political texts. Open Scholar, 2012, to appear.
[13] Eduardo Guerrero. Security, politicals and violence in mexico: A survey. In 7th Norh American Forum, 2011.
[14] R˜ Hausmann, C˜ Hidalgo, S˜ Bustos, M˜ Coscia, S˜ Chung, J. ˇJimenez, A˜ Simoes, and M˜ Yildirim. The Atlas of Economic Complexity. Puritan Press, 2011.
[15] Gary King and Will Lowe. An automated information extraction tool for international conflict data with performance as good as human coders: A rare events evaluation design. International Organization, 57:617–642, 2003.

[16] Sang˜ Hoon Lee, Pan-Jun Kim, Yong-Yeol Ahn, and Hawoong Jeong. Googling social interactions: Web search engine based social network construction. PloS ONE, 5(7):e11233, 07 2010.
[17] Bing Liu and Lei Zhang. A survey of opinion mining and sentiment analysis. In Mining Text Data, pages 415–463. 2012.
[18] M˜. E˜. J. Newman. Power laws, pareto distributions and zipf's law. Contemporary Physics, 46:323–351, December 2005.
[19] Brendan O'Connor, Ramnath Balasubramanyan, Bryan˜ R. Routledge, and Noah˜ A. Smith. From tweets to polls: Linking text sentiment to public opinion time series. In Proceedings of the International AAAI Conference on Weblogs and Social Media, 2010.
[20] Diego˜ Enrique Osorno. El cartel de sinaloa: Un historia del uso politico del narco. In Random House Mondadori, 2009.
[21] Ricardo Ravelo. Osiel. vida y tragedia de un capo. In Ediorial Grijalbo, 2009.
[22] John˜ A. Rice. Mathematical Statistics and Data Analysis. Duxbury Press, April 2001.
[23] R˜. Rodríguez Castañeda. El méxico narco. In Editorial Planeta, 2010.
[24] Markus Schedl, Tim Pohle, Peter Knees, and Gerhard Widmer. Exploring the music similarity space on the web. ACM Trans. Inf. Syst., 29(3):14:1–14:24, July 2011.
[25] Maximillian Schich and Michele Coscia. Exploring co-occurrence on a meso and global level using network analysis and rule mining. Minign and Learning with Graphs, KDD Workshop, 2011.
[26] M˜. V. Simkin and V˜. P. Roychowdhury. Theory of Aces: Fame by chance or merit? Eprint arXiv:cond-mat/0310049, October 2003.
[27] Arthur Spirling. Us treaty-making with american indians. American Journal of Political Science,

Who, In The Government, Covers Up Google’s Crimes In Exchange For Bribes?

These are the people who need to be arrested, bankrupted, exposed and never allowed near public policy again:

Michelle Lee: Google’s “protector” in the U.S. Patent Office. She got canned but now does her dirty deeds in the private sector.

California's AG Kamala Harris was accused of "sleeping her way to the top" calls herself "honorary sex worker" at prostitutes meeting. Per TruthFeedNews “... it looks like Mad Max may have been selling her endorsement in a shady pay for play scheme. Guess who was a taker? None other than Dem “rising star” Kamala Harris.

From Tribune: “A fool and his money are soon elected.” That humorous quote comes from Will Rogers, but his century-old wisdom is still very applicable today — especially when it comes to corrupt lawmakers like Maxine Waters.

The California Democrat, a veteran congresswoman first elected to the House in 1990, has been exposed as part of a “pay-to-play” scheme that funnels money into her campaign coffers... and the scandal could have major implications in the next presidential election.

Accord to the Washington Free Beacon, nearly $750,000 has been funneled through an endorsement and mailing list operation run by Waters and her daughter, Karen.

In basic terms, politicians who want to ride on the coattails of Maxine Waters’ name recognition pay her a large amount of money to be officially endorsed. The funds also buy a spot on the congresswoman’s mailer, which is sent to 200,000 constituents.

“The operation is run by Karen Waters, the daughter of Rep.

Waters, who has collected more than $650,000 to date for running the endorsement mailers," explained the Free Beacon. "Karen is owed another $108,000 from her mother's campaign committee, according to its most recent records. Once Karen is paid, her total payments will reach more than $750,000 since 2006," continued the news source.

Paying such high amounts for endorsements may seem obscene, but one rising star in the Democrat party apparently doesn't think so. California's Sen. Kamala Harris has reportedly paid Waters tens of thousands of dollars to be included on the printed list of endorsements.

"Harris — who has garnered media attention and earned speculation that she is positioning herself to run for president in 2020 following her performance during recent Senate hearings, including that of former FBI Director James Comey — has kicked $63,000 to the campaign of Maxine Waters, the congressional face of the anti-Trump movement, in exchange for placement on the endorsement mailers," revealed the Free Beacon, citing Federal Election Commission records.

Through a decade-old legal loophole, the Waters campaign operation is able to bypass the contribution limits that restrict other people, the Free Beacon reported. It's ironic that the same Democrats who often rail against money in politics have been caught lining their pockets through loopholes and schemes.

U.S. Attorney General Eric Holder is still doing is cover-up job as an employee of election-rigging law firm Covington and Burling.

Office of the Attorney General (NY OAG) Eric Schneiderman in New York

The Rockefeller Family Fund politicians paid by The Rockefeller Family Fund

The welfare queen Elon Musk and the Politicians he bribes. Musk is a financial partner with Google and Google insiders and

boyfriend of Google's Larry Page. Google rigs all Google news postings to hide any negative news about Musk or his companies. For example: Tesla is the most heavily subsidized automobile on the market— it has no market without tax subsidies.

According to the latest data from the European Automobile Manufacturers Association (ACEA), sales of Electrically Chargeable Vehicles (which include plug-in hybrids) in Q1 of 2017 were brisk across much of Europe: they rose by 80% Y/Y in eco-friendly Sweden, 78% in Germany, just over 40% in Belgium and grew by roughly 30% across the European Union... but not in Denmark: here sales cratered by over 60% for one simple reason: the government phased out taxpayer subsidies.

As Bloomberg writes, and as Elon Musk knows all too well, the results confirm that "clean-energy vehicles aren't attractive enough to compete without some form of taxpayer-backed subsidy."

[It's Confirmed: Without Government Subsidies, Tesla Sales Implode, by Tyler Durden, Technocracy News, June 12, 2017]

And:

From hero to zero, in just one month.

Mr. JD Clayton, Property President of Studio City, and Miss Isabel Fan, Regional Director of Tesla Hong Kong, Macau and Taiwan, hosted the ribbon cutting ceremony.

Hong Kong has long been a hotbed for electric car sale, driven mostly by incentives, but what happens when those incentives vanish – almost doubling the cost of a new EV in some cases overnight? EV sales disappear....completely.

In March 2017, electric car sales in Hong Kong stood at 2,964 units. Come April, sales dropped to zero units. This was exactly as we had predicted when news first surfaced of the incentives being slashed.

[With Incentives Removed, Electric Car Sales, Including Teslas, Come To Complete Halt In Hong Kong, by Eric Loveday, Inside EVs, June 17, 2017]

Worse yet, Tesla is an H-1B dependant company, driving down American wages by importing foreign nationals to perform high skilled work.

And Tesla has yet to be held accountable by the Department of Justice for illegally importing Eastern European low wage laborers to build their Fremont, CA, Tesla plant.

The piece details how companies use the various visa-laundering companies that admit sketchy workers and allow business to evade US laws regarding immigration, wages and work conditions. [The Hidden Workforce Expanding Tesla's Factory, By Louis Hansen, San Jose Mercury News, May 15, 2015] The local company Tesla was the case under scrutiny.

The face of the story is Gregor Lesnik, a Slovenian electrician hired to work at Tesla's Fremont plant. He worked 10-hour days, six days a week installing pipes in a Tesla paint shop until he fell through the roof. He sustained serious injuries, for which none of the companies which aided his hiring wanted to be financially responsible: being a subcontractor is a common and convenient excuse. Lesnik is currently engaged in a lawsuit that has shined a light on the corrupt cheap labor system.

[Industry Still Imports Cheap Foreign Labor in Violation of US Law, by Brenda Walker, VDare, May 17, 2016]

Attorney General Jeff Sessions has told Americans that those who violate immigration laws will be prosecuted, but the United States Attorney for the Northern District of California, Brian Stretch, a Deep State Obama operative, has not yet announced prosecution of Tesla and Tesla's co-conspirators, Eisenmann USA and ISM Vuzem, Inc.

The other protectors of Google include the following:

Robert Gibbs – White House press secretary (Sent packing/fired/forced to resign)(he is now under investigation) (accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more...)
Abound Solar - Criminally corrupt crony campaign finance front operation. (Terminated)
Adrian Covert – Gawker/Gizmodo/CNN character assassin reporter (Under surveillance and investigation)
Allison Spinner – Wife of Steve Spinner and lawyer at WSGR and Solyndra who helped Feinstein rig the Solyndra cash ((Under investigation. All assets being tracked and terminated.)
Alphabet - Privacy abuse, spy-on-the-public, Fake News election rigger, Clinton/DNC scheme financier (Under Federal and EU investigation)
Andy Bechtolsheim – VC- Insider campaign backer (He is now under investigation)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more...)
Barack Obama – Witness to the Quid-pro-quo for campaign financing (Fired)
Bill Daley – White House strong-arm (Sent packing/fired/forced to resign)(he is now under investigation)
Bill Lockyer – Calif State finance head (Under investigation and charged with corruption by media. Assets and ownerships under investigation)
Brian Goncher – Deloitte VC intermediary (He is now under investigation)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more...)
CNN – Fake news and information manipulation service. Elon Musk cover-up operator (Under investigation)
Daniel Cohen – DOE Legal counsel who assisted in the Steven Chu scam (Sent packing/fired/forced to resign)

David Axelrod – White House strategist who helped stage the quid-pro-quo (Sent packing/fired/forced to resign)(he is now under investigation)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more…)
David Brock – Character Assassin. Head of Media Matters character assassination service. Money launderer. (Under investigation)
David Drummond – Lawyer/Lobbyist– Google, bribes expert for DC and EU regions (Under investigation. Quail Road, Woodside, CA home bugged)
David Plouffe – White House money packager. Arranged deals between VC campaign Donors. Fined for corruption with Rahm Emmanual (Forced to Resign. Under investigation)
Debbie Wasserman Schultz – Ran DNC corruption program (Forced to Resign. Under investigation)
Dianne Feinstein – Corrupt Senator complicit in the Quid-pro-quo scheme (He is now under investigation) Wife of Silicon Valley Cartel Member Richard Blum(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more…)
Donna Brazille – Operated camapign rigging and DNC corruption ops (Forced to Resign. Under investigation)
Draper - Fisher – VC firm (Campaign funder who received massive windfalls from Russian mining & tech start-up rigging)
Elon Musk – CEO – Tesla Motors/SpaceX/SolarCity owner, Google secret partner, Larry Page's boy friend, master of bribery and crony payola (He is now under investigation & in multiple lawsuits for fraud)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more…) (All of his personal assets, investments and portfolio holdings are under investigation and targeted for extinction)
Eric Holder – Attorney General- DOJ (Forced to resign) (Charged with staff & VC Protections and blockade of FBI and Special

Prosecutor deployments in order to run the cover-up)
Eric Schmidt – Owner- Google (He is now under investigation) (accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more...)
Eric Strickland – Head of Auto Safety agency under DOT (Sent packing/fired/forced to resign)(he is now under investigation. Charged with cover-up of Tesla and GM auto dangers he had known about)
Facebook - Privacy abuse, spy-on-the-public, Fake News election rigger, Clinton/DNC scheme financier (Failing, rapidly decreasing users and increasing fake ad stats disclosures)
Fisker - Criminally corrupt crony campaign finance front operation. (Terminated)
Gawker Media – DNC/Clinton/Obama character assassination media tool (In Mid-Termination)
Gawker Media & Nick Denton – Character assassination service provider (Sued multiple times, under federal investigation for tax evasion)
Gizmodo – DNC/Clinton/Obama character assassination media tool (Failing, rapidly decreasing users and increasing fake ad stats disclosures)
Goldman Sachs – Financial packager (Suspected of staging most of the TARP/DOE deals for personal gain & insider payouts)
Google Employees - Washington, DC and Sacramento, CA (Facing termination)
Google, Inc. – Data harvesting company(Ran media attacks, stock market pump and dump PR hype and character assassinations)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more...) (charged by EU, and most nations, with multiple abuses of the public. Has totally lost the trust of the public. Revenue loss increasing geometrically.)
Harry Reid – Senator- Solar factory guru, Congress lead (Accused

of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more…Forced out of Congress in shame)
In-Q-Tel, Inc. – CIA off-shoot associated with Eric Schmidt, Google, Elon Musk and the Cartel leaders. Ran “hit-jobs” on Silicon Valley VC adversaries and reporters (Sued, under investigation, exposed in multiple documentaries, under investigation for Cocaine trafficking)
Ira Ehrenpreis – VC Campaign backer (He is now under investigation)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more…) (All of his personal assets, investments and portfolio holdings are under investigation and targeted for extinction)
Ivanpah Solar - Criminally corrupt crony Google campaign finance front operation. (In failure mode)
James Brown Jr – HHS Programming lead in California (Arrested for corruption)
James Comey – FBI Head who refused to allow investigation of these crimes (Fired and under FBI and Congressional investigation)
Jay Carney – White House press lead (Forced to resign)
John Doerr – Owner – Kleiner Perkins. “Godfather” – Silicon Valley Cartel (He is now under investigation)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more…)(All of his personal assets, investments and portfolio holdings are under investigation and targeted for extinction)
John Herrman– Gawker/Gizmodo/CNN character assassin reporter (Under surveillance and investigation)
John Podesta – Ran Dirty Tricks Programs and hit jobs (Hacked and under FBI and Congressional investigation
Jonathan Silver – DOE VC (Sent packing/fired/forced to resign)(he is now under investigation. Shamed in media for epic failures)
Kamala Harris – Famous for getting hit on by Barack Obama.

California Attorney General who ran West Cost cover-ups on this scam (Hacked and under FBI and Congressional investigation
Ken Alex – Jerry Brown's California Department of Justice boss who ran cover-ups for the tax payola kick-backs to Tesla and Solyndra (Hacked and under FBI and Congressional investigation
Kleiner Perkins – Campaign funding VC who (Received massive windfalls from Russian mining & tech start-up rigging. Sued. Under investigation. All assets being tracked and terminated.)
Lachlan Seward – Manager to Steven Chu (Sent packing/fired/forced to resign. Sued for corruption. publicly shamed by news media and Congress)
Larry Page – Owner- Google (He is now under investigation) (accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more...)
Larry Summers – White House finance head (Fired)(he is now under investigation)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more...)
Leland Yee – Senator (Indicted & charged with corruption)
Linkedin - Privacy abuse, spy-on-the-public, Fake News election rigger, Clinton/DNC scheme financier (Failing, rapidly decreasing users and increasing fake ad stats disclosures)
Lloyd Craig Blankfein – Head of Goldman Sachs and liaison in almost every single CleanTech company scam(He is now under investigation)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more...) (All of his personal assets, investments and portfolio holdings are under investigation and targeted for extinction)
Lois Lerner – IRS head charged with running political hit-jobs (Sent packing/fired/forced to resign)(She is now under investigation. Shamed in news media)
Mark Zuckerberg – Clinton/DNC Scheme financier and lobbyist
Martin LaGod – VC Campaign backer and lithium mining

exploiter and war profiteer (He is now under investigation) (assets, investments and stock portfolio tracked and targeted)(All of his personal assets, investments and portfolio holdings are under investigation and targeted for extinction)
Matt Rogers – Mckinsey corruption operator reporting to Steven Chu (Under investigation. All assets being tracked and terminated.)
Mckinsey Consulting – Government services contractor (Supplied DOE manipulation staff, manipulated white-papers to Congress and lobbying manipulation for the scam)
Nancy Pelosi – This U.S. Senator organized the kickback programs and operated epic insider trading scams (Under Congressional closed door investigation)
New America Foundation – Google/INQTEL's policy manipulation center (Under Congressional closed door investigation)
Nick Denton – Character assassination service provider (Sued multiple times, under federal investigation for tax evasion)
Perkins Coi – Law firm who sold lobby manipulation services (Under federal investigation)
Pierre Omidyar – Clinton/DNC Scheme financier and lobbyist. Ebay/Paypal Boss
Rahm Emanual – White House strong-arm who set-up the scam (Sent packing/fired/forced to resign and his Chicago finance head was indicted for Corruption)(he is now under investigation)
Raj Gupta – McKinsey Fixer (Indicted, Jailed)(he is now under investigation)
Ray Lane – VC (Charged with Federal Tax Fraud)(he is now under investigation)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more...)
Richard Blum – Senator Feinsteins Husband (He is now under investigation. Has had contracts interdicted by Congressional action)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion,

and more...)
Robert Gibbs – White House press secretary who set-up the scam (Sent packing/fired/forced to resign)(he is now under investigation)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more...)
Rosa Brooks – New America Foundation (Disclosed working on plans for a coup Against Trump Administration)
Senator Calderone – Senator (Indicted & charged with corruption)
Snapchat – Privacy abuse, spy-on-the-public, Fake News election rigger, Clinton/DNC scheme financier (Failing, rapidly decreasing users and increasing fake ad stats disclosures)
SolarCity - Criminally corrupt crony Google/Musk campaign finance front operation. (Terminated – Forced into absorption by Musk)
Solyndra – Criminally corrupt crony campaign finance front operation. FBI Raided. (Terminated)
Sony Pictures – Funded corrupt political actions, ran covert illegal Fake News operations, stole assets from competitors, ran defamation campaigns (Under IRS and FTC investigation, hacked by foreign hackers, boycotted, executives fired, hookers and tax fraud uncovered)
Steve Jurvetson – VC who manipulated Senate staff for Tesla cash (Under investigation. All assets being tracked and terminated.)
Steve Rattner– White House Car Deals Director working in the West Wing and then with In-Q-Tel (Fired- Indicted in NY State for SEC Fraud/Corruption)(he is now under investigation)
Steve Spinner – Mckinsey corruption operator reporting to Steven Chu with secret connection inside Solyndra (Under investigation. All assets being tracked and terminated.)
Steve Westly – Campaign Bundler (He is now under investigation) (accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and

more...)(All of his personal assets, investments and portfolio holdings are under investigation and targeted for extinction)
Steven Chu – Secretary of Energy (Sent packing/fired/forced to resign. Sued for corruption. publicly shamed by news media and Congress. Under ongoing investigation)
Tesla Motors - Criminally corrupt crony Google/Musk Obama-protected campaign finance front operation. (In failure mode)
The Staff of Univision including Gawker, Jalopnik, Jezebel, Gizmodo all of whom were disclosed as hired character assassins who took compensation for ending the lives of others via malicious libel, slander and defamation on a daily basis for half a decade in front of 7.5 billion readers through its employees Adrian Covert, and John Herman, A.J. Delaurio, as well as through its pseudonymous authors, including: Adam Dachis, Adam Weinstein, Adrian Covert, Adrien Chen, Alan Henry, Albert Burneko, Alex Balk, Alexander Pareene, Alexandra Philippides, Allison Wentz, Andrew Collins, Andrew Magary, Andrew Orin, Angelica Alzona, Anna Merlan, Ariana Cohen, Ashley Feinberg, Ava Gyurina, Barry Petchesky, Brendan I. Koerner, Brendan O'Connor, Brent Rose, Brian Hickey, Camila Cabrer, Choire Sicha, Chris Mohney, Clover Hope, Daniel Morgan, David Matthews, Diana Moskovitz, Eleanor Shechet, Elizabeth Spiers, Elizabeth Starkey, Emily Gould, Emily Herzig, Emma Carmichael, Erin Ryan, Ethan Sommer, Eyal Ebel, Gabrielle Bluestone, Gabrielle Darbyshire, Georgina K. Faircloth, Gregory Howard, Hamilton Nolan, Hannah Keyser, Hudson Hongo. Heather Deitrich, Hugo Schwyzer, Hunter Slaton, Ian Fette, Irin Carmon, James J. Cooke, James King, Jennifer Ouellette, Jesse Oxfeld, Jessica Cohen, Jesus Diaz, Jillian Schulz, Joanna Rothkopf, John Cook, John Herrman, Jordan Sargent, Joseph Keenan Trotter, Josh Stein, Julia Allison, Julianne E. Shepherd, Justin Hyde, Kate Dries, Katharine Trendacosta, Katherine Drummond, Kelly Stout, Kerrie Uthoff,

Kevin Draper, Lacey Donohue, Lucy Haller, Luke Malone, Madeleine Davies, Madeline Davis, Mario Aguilar, Matt Hardigree, Matt Novak, Michael Ballaban, Michael Dobbs, Michael Spinelli, Neal Ungerleider, Nicholas Aster, Nicholas Denton, Omar Kardoudi, Pierre Omidyar, Owen Thomas, Patrick George, Patrick Laffoon, Patrick Redford, Rich Juzwiak, Richard Blakely, Richard Rushfield, Robert Finger, Robert Sorokanich, Rory Waltzer, Rosa Golijan, Ryan Brown, Ryan Goldberg, Sam Faulkner Bidle, Sam Woolley, Samar Kalaf, Sarah Ramey, Shannon Marie Donnelly, Shep McAllister, Sophie Kleeman, Stephen Totilo, Tamar Winberg, Taryn Schweitzer, Taylor McKnight, Thorin Klosowski, Tim Marchman, Timothy Burke, Tobey Grumet Segal, Tom Ley, Tom Scocca, Veronica de Souza, Wes Siler, William Haisley, William Turton and others writing under pseudonyms; through false accusations of vile and disgusting acts, including fraud and false invention. (Partially bankrupted, sued by multiple parties, placed on White House “manipulated attack media” dockets, all employees on this list under lifetime pre-paid surveillance, further lawsuits against staff and investors in development, IRS tax fraud investigation requested, FEC campaign finance fraud investigation requested, Feature film about their dirty tricks campaign in development…)
Tim Draper – VC Campaign backer (He is now under investigation)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more…)(All of his personal assets, investments and portfolio holdings are under investigation and targeted for extinction)
Tom Perkins – VC Campaign backer (He is now under investigation, slammed by public and media)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more…)
Twitter - Privacy abuse, spy-on-the-public, Fake News election rigger, Clinton/DNC scheme financier (Failing, rapidly

decreasing users and increasing fake ad stats disclosures, Targeted for bankruptcy)
Uber – A funding conduit, voter spying and voter messaging manipulation facade. (Targeted for bankruptcy)
Univision/Unimoda - Privacy abuse, spy-on-the-public, Fake News election rigger, Clinton/DNC scheme financier (Failing, rapidly decreasing users and increasing fake ad stats disclosures)
Valarie Jarrett – Witness and cover up operating from pre-White House to Exit White House Period (Fired)
Vinod Khosla – VC Campaign backer (He is now under investigation and in multiple lawsuits)(accused of political bribery and kickbacks; tax evasion, and more...Exposed in 60 Minutes and CNN news coverage)
Wilson Sonsini Goodrich and Rosatti – The Silicon Valley "law-firm of Crooks and Technology Criminals" (Under investigation)
Yahoo - Privacy abuse, spy-on-the-public, Fake News election rigger, Clinton/DNC scheme financier (In Mid-Termination)
Chan-Zuckerberg Initiative – Funded by Mark Zuckerberg and designed to be one of the largest political manipulation lobbies in the world (Under investigation)

What Are Google's Crimes?

The Imperative Of Replacing Google And Facebook
By Tony Cartalucci

By Tony Cartalucci

Nations are beginning to take more seriously the control of their respective information space after years of allowing US-based tech giants Google and Facebook to monopolize and exploit them.

Vietnam, according to a recent GeekTime article, is the latest nation to begin encouraging local alternatives to the search engine and social media network in order to rebalance the monopoly over information both tech giants enjoy in the Southeast Asian country today.

Google and Facebook: More than Search Engines and Social Media

The two tech giants and others like them may have appeared at their inceptions to political, business, and military leaders around the world as merely opportunistic corporations seeking profits and expansion.

However, Google and Facebook, among others, have become clearly much more than that.

Both have verifiably worked with the US State Department in pursuit of geopolitical objectives around the world, from the collapse of the Libyan government to attempts at regime change in Syria, and using social media and information technology around the world to manipulate public perception and achieve sociopolitical goals on behalf of Wall Street and Washington for years.

The use of social media to control a targeted nation's information space, and use it as a means of carrying out sociopolitical subversion and even regime change reached its pinnacle in 2011 during the US-engineered "Arab Spring." Portrayed at first as spontaneous demonstrations organized organically over Facebook and other social media platforms, it is now revealed in articles like the New York Times', "U.S. Groups

Helped Nurture Arab Uprisings," that the US government had trained activists years ahead of the protests, with Google and Facebook participating directly in making preparations.

Opposition fronts funded and supported by the US State Department's National Endowment for Democracy (NED) and its subsidiaries Freedom House, International Republican Institute (IRI), and National Democratic Institute (NDI) were invited to several summits where executives and technical support teams from Google and Facebook provided them with the game plans they would execute in 2011 in coordination with US and European media who also attended the summits.

The end result was the virtual weaponization of social media, serving as cover for what was a long-planned, regional series of coups including heavily armed militants who eventually overthrew the governments of Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, and Yemen, with Syria now locked in 6 years of war as a result.

It was during Syria's ongoing conflict that Google would find itself involved again. The Guardian in a 2012 article titled, "Syria: is it possible to rename streets on Google Maps?," would report:

In their struggle to free Syria from the clutches of President Bashar al-Assad, anti-government activists have embarked on a project to wipe him off the map. Literally. On Google Maps, major Damascus thoroughfares named after the Assad family have appeared renamed after heroes of the uprising. The Arab Spring has form in this regard. When anti-Gadaffi rebels tore into Tripoli last August, the name of the city's main square on the mapping service changed overnight – from "Green Square", the name given to it by the erstwhile dictator, to "Martyr's Square", its former title.

The internet giant's mapping service has a history of weighing in on political disputes.

Google's monopoly in nations without local alternatives ensures

that public perception is lopsidedly influenced by these deceptive methods.

The Independent in a 2016 article titled, “Google planned to help Syrian rebels bring down Assad regime, leaked Hillary Clinton emails claim,” would expand on Google’s activities regarding Syria:

An interactive tool created by Google was designed to encourage Syrian rebels and help bring down the Assad regime, Hillary Clinton’s leaked emails have reportedly revealed.

By tracking and mapping defections within the Syrian leadership, it was reportedly designed to encourage more people to defect and ‘give confidence’ to the rebel opposition.

Clearly, more is going on at Google than Internet searches. Nations would be equally irresponsible to allow a foreign corporation to exercise control over their respective information space – especially in light of verified, documented abuses – as they would by allowing foreign corporations to exercise control over other essential aspects of national infrastructure.

Vietnam Taking Control of its Information Space

The GeekTime article, shared by the US State Department’s NDI on Twitter titled, “Is Vietnamese campaign to build a Facebook alternative fighting fake news, or fostering censorship?,” claims (emphasis added):

During a parliamentary committee meeting earlier this month, Truong Minh Tuan, Minister of Information and Communications in Vietnam, said that the government is encouraging Vietnamese tech companies to build local replacements for platforms such as Facebook and Google (which are the most popular in their categories in Vietnam).

The article also reported:

It is part of a wider campaign to “strengthen cyber security” and the integrity of the country’s information. “The plan is to try and address the problem of how ‘fake pages’ with anti-government content grew uncontrollably on Facebook,” said Tuan. “Going further, we need social networks provided by local businesses that can replace and compete with Facebook in Vietnam.”

NDI’s mention of the article is meant to imply that the Vietnamese government stands to profit from the localization of search engines and social media – and it does. However, the localization of Vietnam’s information space is no different than the localization of Vietnam’s defense industry, energy and water infrastructure, schools, and healthcare institutions. They are the Vietnamese people’s to control, not Washington, Wall Street, or Silicon Valley’s.

Whether the Vietnamese government abuses that localization or not is the business of the Vietnamese people. The actual concern NDI has is that once the localization of information technology is complete in Vietnam, forever will these effective vectors of sociopolitical subversion be closed to the corporate-financier special interests driving US foreign policy and the work of fronts like NDI.

Tony Cartalucci, Bangkok-based geopolitical researcher and writer, especially for the online magazine “New Eastern Outlook”., where this article first appeared.

With accusations about Russian hackers and claims of “cheating” and voting being “rigged,” the integrity of US elections has been questioned on both sides of the political aisle. Robert Epstein, researches how companies like Google can manipulate elections, legally, without anyone’s knowledge.

Epstein claimed in an article published by Politico last year that

"America’s next president could be eased into office not just by TV ads or speeches, but by Google’s secret decision. And no one except for me, and perhaps a few other obscure researchers, would know how this was accomplished."

Epstein claims that, through the use of what he terms the "Search Engine Manipulation Effect" (SEME), tech companies that endorse particular candidates, in the same way that Google publicly endorses Clinton, can impact elections unbeknownst to the public

"We found that if one political candidate is favored in Google’s search ranking, that very quickly shifts the voting preferences of undecided voters toward that candidate. We thought it would be a tiny shift, but as Mr. Trump would say it is a ‘huge’ shift," he said, adding that Google has the power to sway potential voters "literally by the millions."

Epstein explained that Google’s assumed legitimacy inclines users to think that their search results are unbiased, when that is not necessarily the case.

FBI Could Publicly Release Report on Clinton's Email Inquiry on Aug.31

"We’re talking about big, big effects on undecided voters because people trust Google so much, and because people assume, mistakenly, that what they’re seeing on screen is being determined by an impartial or objective search algorithm and that is simply not true."

Loud & Clear host Brian Becker asked how Google biases searches, noting that "there’s an assumption of neutrality," and, "the assumption of integrity."

"Google edits its search suggestions in a way that they say prevents negative searches from occuring when you’re searching people," he said, adding that "even the FTC in the Unites States has found that Google slants what it shows people in a way that

serves the company."
"There's nothing illegal about that," he pointed out, "so we shouldn't be shocked by it. Ethically, morally, we might note that it's a threat to a free and fair election, but it's not illegal."
Epstein described a "revolving door" between Google and the White House, pointing out that 250 top executives have swapped positions between the company and the Obama Administration over the last seven years. He said that if Hillary Clinton becomes president, "there's no question that that collaboration is going to continue or become closer...I think it's something we should worry about. There needs to be a separation between government and industry."
FBI Report on Clinton Emails Reinforces Her Dishonesty - Trump Campaign
The scientist suggested that Google's influence could sway voters in a close race, citing a report he and his researchers published with the National Academy of Science.
"Based on mathematics presented in that report, we now know that Google can control a win margin anywhere between 3.8 percent and 15.1 percent, so if you're talking about a close election, Google has enormous power over close elections. In fact, we estimate that Google would be able to shift somewhere between 2.6 and 10.2 million votes, without anyone knowing they're doing it and without leaving a paper trail."

Research Proves Google Manipulates Millions to Favor Clinton
© Photo: Youtube/SourceFed
US

In this exclusive report, distinguished research psychologist Robert Epstein explains the new study and reviews evidence that Google's search suggestions are biased in favor of Hillary

Clinton. He estimates that biased search suggestions might be able to shift as many as 3 million votes in the upcoming presidential election in the US.

Biased search rankings can swing votes and alter opinions, and a new study shows that Google's autocomplete can too.

A scientific study I published last year showed that search rankings favoring one candidate can quickly convince undecided voters to vote for that candidate — as many as 80 percent of voters in some demographic groups. My latest research shows that a search engine could also shift votes and change opinions with another powerful tool: autocomplete.

Because of recent claims that Google has been deliberately tinkering with search suggestions to make Hillary Clinton look good, this is probably a good time both to examine those claims and to look at my new research. As you will see, there is some cause for concern here.

In June of this year, Sourcefed released a video claiming that Google's search suggestions — often called "autocomplete" suggestions — were biased in favor of Mrs. Clinton. The video quickly went viral: the full 7-minute version has now been viewed more than a million times on YouTube, and an abridged 3-minute version has been viewed more than 25 million times on Facebook.

The video's narrator, Matt Lieberman, showed screen print after screen print that appeared to demonstrate that searching for just about anything related to Mrs. Clinton generated positive suggestions only. This occurred even though Bing and Yahoo searches produced both positive and negative suggestions and even though Google Trends data showed that searches on Google that characterize Mrs. Clinton negatively are quite common — far more common in some cases than the search terms Google was suggesting. Lieberman also showed

that autocomplete did offer negative suggestions for Bernie Sanders and Donald Trump.

"The intention is clear," said Lieberman. "Google is burying potential searches for terms that could have hurt Hillary Clinton in the primary elections over the past several months by manipulating recommendations on their site."

Google responded to the Sourcefed video in an email to the Washington Times, denying everything. According to the company's spokesperson, "Google Autocomplete does not favor any candidate or cause." The company explained away the apparently damning findings by saying that "Our Autocomplete algorithm will not show a predicted query that is offensive or disparaging when displayed in conjunction with a person's name."

Since then, my associates and I at the American Institute for Behavioral Research and Technology (AIBRT) — a nonprofit, nonpartisan organization based in the San Diego area — have been systematically investigating Lieberman's claims. What we have learned has generally supported those claims, but we have also learned something new — something quite disturbing — about the power of Google's search suggestions to alter what people search for.

Lieberman insisted that Google's search suggestions were biased, but he never explained why Google would introduce such bias. Our new research suggests why — and also why Google's lists of search suggestions are typically much shorter than the lists Bing and Yahoo show us.

Our investigation is ongoing, but here is what we have learned so far:

Bias in Clinton's Favor

Can Google Tip the Scales on the US Presidential Election Without Anyone Knowing?

To test Lieberman's claim that Google's search suggestions are biased in Mrs. Clinton's favor, my associates and I have been looking at the suggestions Google shows us in response to hundreds of different election-related search terms. To minimize the possibility that those suggestions were customized for us as individuals (based on the massive personal profiles Google has assembled for virtually all Americans), we have conducted our searches through proxy servers — even through the Tor network — thus making it difficult for Google to identify us. We also cleared the fingerprints Google leaves on computers (cache and cookies) fairly obsessively.

Google says its search bar is programmed to avoid suggesting searches that portray people in a negative light. As far as we can tell, this claim is false.

Generally speaking, we are finding that Lieberman was right: It is somewhat difficult to get the Google search bar to suggest negative searches related to Mrs. Clinton or to make any Clinton-related suggestions when one types a negative search term. Bing and Yahoo, on the other hand, often show a number of negative suggestions in response to the same search terms. Bing and Yahoo seem to be showing us what people are actually searching for; Google is showing us something else — but what, and for what purpose?

As for Google Trends, as Lieberman reported, Google indeed withholds negative search terms for Mrs. Clinton even when such terms show high popularity in Trends. We have also found that Google often suggests positive search terms for Mrs. Clinton even when such terms are nearly invisible in Trends. The widely held belief, reinforced by Google's own documentation, that Google's search suggestions are based on "what other

people are searching for" seems to be untrue in many instances.

Google's Explanation

Google tries to explain away such findings by saying its search bar is programmed to avoid suggesting searches that portray people in a negative light. As far as we can tell, this claim is false; Google suppresses negative suggestions selectively, not across the board. It is easy to get autocomplete to suggest negative searches related to prominent people, one of whom happens to be Mrs. Clinton's opponent.

A picture is often worth a thousand words, so let's look at a few examples that appear both to support Lieberman's perspective and refute Google's. After that, we'll examine some counterexamples.

© REUTERS/ Mike Segar

Assange: Clinton's Campaign is Full of 'Disturbing' Anti-Russia 'Hysteria'

Before we start, I need to point out a problem: If you try to replicate the searches I will show you, you will likely get different results. I don't think that invalidates our work, but you will have to decide for yourself. Your results might be different because search activity changes over time, and that, in turn, affects search suggestions. There is also the "personalization problem." If you are like the vast majority of people, you freely allow Google to track you 24 hours a day. As a result, Google knows who you are when you are typing something in its search bar, and it sends you customized results.

For both of these reasons, you might doubt the validity of the conclusions I will draw in this essay. That is up to you. All I can say in my defense is that I have worked with eight other people in recent months to try to conduct a fair and balanced investigation, and, as I said, we have taken several precautions

to try to get generic, non-customized search suggestions rather than the customized kind. Our investigation is also ongoing, and I encourage you to conduct your own, as well.

Let's start with a very simple search. The image below shows a search for "Hillary Clinton is " (notice the space after is) conducted on August 3rd on Bing, Yahoo, and Google. As you can see, both Bing and Yahoo displayed multiple negative suggestions such as "Hillary Clinton is a liar" and "Hillary Clinton is a criminal," but Google is showed only two suggestions, both of which were almost absurdly positive: "Hillary Clinton is winning" and "Hillary Clinton is awesome."

© Photo: Bing, Yahoo, Google

“Hillary Clinton is ”

To find out what people actually searched for, let's turn to Google Trends — Google's tabulation of the popularity of search results. Below you will see a comparison between the popularity of searching for "Hillary Clinton is a liar" and the popularity of searching for "Hillary Clinton is awesome." This image was also generated on August 3rd. "Hillary Clinton is a liar" was by far the more popular search term; hardly anyone conducted a search using the phrase, "Hillary Clinton is awesome."

© Photo: Google

“Hillary Clinton is awesome.”

Okay, but Google admits that it censors negative search results; presumably, that is why we only saw positive results for Mrs. Clinton — even a result that virtually no one searched for. Does Google really suppress negative results? We have seen what happens with "Hillary Clinton is." What happens with "Donald Trump is "? (Again, be sure to include the space after is.)

© Photo: Google
“Donald Trump is “?
In the above image, captured on August 8th, we again found the odd "awesome" suggestion, but we also saw a suggestion that appears to be negative: "Donald Trump is dead." Shouldn't a result like that have been suppressed? Let's look further.
Consider the following searches, conducted on August 2nd, for "anti Hillary" and "anti Trump." As you can see below, "anti Hillary" generated no suggestions, but "anti Trump" generated four, including "anti Trump cartoon" and "anti Trump song." Well, you say, perhaps there were no anti-Hillary suggestions to be made. But Yahoo — responding merely to "anti Hill" — came up with eight, including "anti Hillary memes" and "anti Hillary jokes."

© Photo: Google, Yahoo
“anti Hillary” and “anti Trump.”
This seems to further refute Google's claim about not disparaging people, but let's dig deeper.
After Mrs. Clinton named Senator Tim Kaine to be her running mate, Mr. Trump dubbed him with one of his middle-school-style nicknames: "Corrupt Kaine." Sure enough, that instantly became a popular search term on Google, as this July 27th image from Trends confirms:

© Photo: Google
“Corrupt Kaine.”
Even so, as you can see in the image below, in response to "corrupt," the Google search bar showed us nothing about Senator Kaine, but it did show us both "Kamala" (Kamala Harris, attorney general of California) and "Karzai" (Hamid Karzai, former president of Afghanistan). If you clicked on the

phrases "corrupt Kamala" and "corrupt Karzai," search results appeared that linked to highly negative web pages about Kamala Harris and Hamid Karzai, respectively.
Oddly enough, both on the day we looked up "corrupt Kaine" and more recently when I was writing this essay, Google Trends provided no popularity data for either "corrupt Kamala" or "corrupt Karzai." It is hard to imagine, in any case, that either search term has been popular in recent months. So why did the Google search bar disparage Attorney General Harris and President Karzai but not Mrs. Clinton?

© Photo: Google, Yahoo
“corrupt Kaine”, “corrupt Kamala”, “corrupt Karzai.”
If you still have doubts about whether Google suggests negative searches for prominent people, see how Senators Cruz, Rubio and Sanders fared in the following searches conducted between July 23rd and August 2nd:

© Photo: Google
Searches conducted between July 23rd and August 2nd - Lying Ted

© Photo: Google
Searches conducted between July 23rd and August 2nd - Little Marco

© Photo: Google
Searches conducted between July 23rd and August 2nd - Anti-Bernie
I could give you more examples, but you get the idea.
The brazenness of Google's search suggestion tinkering become especially clear when we searched for "crooked" — Mr. Trump's

unkind nickname for Mrs. Clinton — on Google, Bing, and Yahoo on various dates in June and July. On Google the word "crooked" alone generated nothing for Mrs. Clinton, even though, once again, its popularity was clear on Google Trends. Now compare (in the image following the Trends graph) what happened on Bing and Yahoo:

© Photo: Google
“crooked”

© Photo: Google, Bing, Yahoo
“crooked”
No surprise here. Consistent with Google's own search popularity data, Bing and Yahoo listed "crooked Hillary" near the top of their autocomplete suggestions.
The weird part came when we typed more letters into Google's search bar, trying to force it to suggest "crooked Hillary." On June 9th, I had to go all the way to "crooked H-I-L-L-A" to get a response, and it was not the response I was expecting. Instead of showing me "crooked Hillary," I was shown a phrase that I doubt anyone in the world has ever searched for — "crooked Hillary Bernie":

© Photo: Google
“crooked H-I-L-L-A”
Crooked Hillary Bernie? What the heck does that mean? Not much, obviously, but this is something my associates and I have found repeatedly: When you are able to get Google to make negative suggestions for Mrs. Clinton, they sometimes make no sense and are almost certainly not indicative of what other people are searching for.
Masking and Misleading

There are also indications that autocomplete isn't always pro-Clinton and isn't always anti-Trump, and in this regard the Sourcefed video overstated its case. While it is true, for example, that "anti Hillary" generated no suggestions in our study, both "anti Clinton" and "anti Hillary Clinton" did produce negative results when we search on August 8th, as you can see below:

© Photo: Google
“anti Clinton”

© Photo: Google
“anti Hillary Clinton”

At times, we were also able to generate neutral or at least partially positive results for Donald Trump. Consider this image, for example, which shows a search for "Donald Trump" on August 8th:

© Photo: Google
Search for “Donald Trump” on August 8th

If you believe Google can do no wrong and that it never favors one candidate over another (even though Google and its top executives donated more than $800,000 to Obama in 2012 and only $37,000 to Romney), so be it. But trying to be as objective as possible in recent months, my staff and I have concluded that when Google occasionally does give us unbiased election-related search suggestions, it might just be trying to confuse us. Let me explain.

When Ronald Robertson and I began conducting experiments on the power that biased search rankings have over voter preferences, we were immediately struck by the fact that few people could detect the bias in the search results we showed them, even when those results were extremely biased. We

immediately wondered whether we could mask the bias in our results so that even fewer people could detect it. To our amazement, we found that a very simple mask — putting a search result that favored the opposing candidate into the third search position (out of 10 positions on the first page of search results) — was enough to fool all of our study participants into thinking they were seeing unbiased search results. Masking a manipulation is easy, and Google is a master of obfuscation, as I explained a few years ago in my TIME essay, "Google's Dance." In the context of autocomplete, all you have to do to confuse people is introduce a few exceptions to the rule. So "anti Clinton" and "anti Hillary Clinton" produce negative search suggestions, while "anti Hillary" does not. Because those counter-examples exist, we immediately forget about the odd thing that's happening with "anti Hillary," and we also ignore the fact that "anti Donald" produces negative suggestions:

© Photo: Google
“anti Donald”

Meanwhile, day after day — at least for the few weeks we were monitoring this term — "anti Hillary" continued to produce no suggestions. Why would Google have singled out this one phrase to protect? As always, when you are dealing with the best number crunchers in the world, the answer has to do with numbers. What do you notice when you look below at the frequency of searches for the three anti-Hillary phrases?

© Photo: Google
“anti Hillary”

That's right. "Anti Hillary" was drawing the most traffic, so that was the phrase to protect.

Sourcefed's video was overstated, but, overall, our investigation

supports Sourcefed's claim that Google's autocomplete tool is biased to favor Mrs. Clinton — sometimes dramatically so, sometimes more subtly.

Sputnik's Recent Claims

All of the examples I've given you of apparent bias in Google's search suggestions are old and out of date — conducted by me and my staff over the summer of 2016. Generally speaking, you won't be able to confirm what we found (which is why I am showing you screen shots). This is mainly because search suggestions keep changing. So the big question is: Do new search suggestions favor Mr. Trump or Mrs. Clinton.

Recently, Sputnik News reported that Google was suppressing search suggestions related to trending news stories expressing concern about Mrs. Clinton's health. Sure enough, as you can see in the following screen shots captured on August 29th, suggestions on Bing and Yahoo reflected the trending news, but suggestions on Google did not:

© Photo: Bing
Bing

© Photo: Yahoo
Yahoo

© Photo: Google
Google

And, yes, once again, Google Trends showed a recent spike in searches for the missing search suggestions:

© Photo: Google

Google Trends
While the news was buzzing about Mrs. Clinton's health, hundreds of stories were also being published about Mr. Trump's "flip flopping" on immigration issues, and that too was reflected on Google Trends:

© Photo: Google
Mr. Trump’s “flip flopping”
But, as you can see, Google did not suppress "Donald Trump flip flops" from its suggestions:

© Photo: Google
“Donald Trump flip flops”
Google, it seems, is playing this game both consistently and slyly. It is saving its bias for the most valuable real estate — trending, high-value terms — and eliminating signs of bias for terms that have lost their value.
And that brings me, at last, to a research project I initiated only a few weeks ago. If Google is really biasing its search suggestions, what is the company's motive? A new study sheds surprising and disturbing light on this question.
How Google's Search Suggestions Affect Our Searches
Normally, I wouldn't talk publicly about the early results of a long-term research project I have not yet published in a scientific journal or at least presented at a scientific conference. I have decided to make an exception this time for three reasons: First, the results of the study on autocomplete I completed recently are strong and easy to interpret. Second, these results are consistent with volumes of research that has already been conducted on two well-known psychological processes: negativity bias and confirmation bias. And third, the November election is growing near, and the results of my new experiment

are relevant to that election — perhaps even of crucial importance.

I began the new study asking myself why Google would want to suppress negative search suggestions. Why those in particular?

In the study, a diverse group of 300 people from 44 U.S. states were asked which of four search suggestions they would likely click on if they were trying to learn more about either Mike Pence, the Republican candidate for vice president, or Tim Kaine, the Democratic candidate for vice president. They could also select a fifth option in order to type their own search terms. Here is an example of what a search looked like:

© Photo: Google

Tim Kaine

Two of the searches we showed people contained negative search suggestions (one negative suggestion in each search); all of the other search suggestions were either neutral (like "Tim Kaine office") or positive (like "Mike Pence for vice president"). Each of the negative suggestions — "Mike Pence scandal" and "Tim Kaine scandal" — appeared only once in the experiment. Thus, if study participants were treating negative items the same way they treated the other four alternatives in a given search, the negative items would have attracted about 20 percent of the clicks in each search.

By including or suppressing negatives in search suggestions, you can direct people's searches one way or another just as surely as if they were dogs on a leash.

But that's not what happened. The three main findings were as follows:

1) Overall, people clicked on the negative items about 40 percent of the time — that's twice as often as one would expect

by chance. What's more, compared with the neutral items we showed people in searches that served as controls, negative items were selected about five times as often.

2) Among eligible, undecided voters —the impressionable people who decide close elections — negative items attracted more than 15 times as many clicks as neutral items attracted in matched control questions.

3) People affiliated with one political party selected the negative suggestion for the candidate from their own party less frequently than the negative suggestion for the other candidate.

In other words, negative suggestions attracted the largest number of clicks when they were consistent with people's biases. These findings are consistent with two well-known phenomena in the social sciences: negativity bias and confirmation bias.

Negativity bias refers to the fact that people are far more affected by negative stimuli than by positive ones. As a famous paper on the subject notes, a single cockroach in one's salad ruins the whole salad, but a piece of candy placed on a plate of disgusting crud will not make that crud seem even slightly more palatable.

Negative stimuli draw more attention than neutral or positive ones, they activate more behavior, and they create stronger impressions — negative ones, of course. In recent years, political scientists have even suggested that negativity bias plays an important role in the political choices we make — that people adopt conservative political views because they have a heightened sensitivity to negative stimuli.

Confirmation bias refers to the fact that people almost always seek out, pay attention to, and believe information that confirms their beliefs more than they seek out, pay attention to, or believe information that contradicts those beliefs.

When you apply these two principles to search suggestions, they

predict that people are far more likely to click on negative search suggestions than on neutral or positive ones — especially when those negative suggestions are consistent with their own beliefs. This is exactly what the new study confirms.

Google data analysts know this too. They know because they have ready access to billions of pieces of data showing exactly how many times people click on negative search suggestions. They also know exactly how many times people click on every other kind of search suggestion one can categorize.

To put this another way, what I and other researchers must stumble upon and can study only crudely, Google employees can study with exquisite precision every day.

Given Google's strong support for Mrs. Clinton, it seems reasonable to conjecture that Google employees manually suppress negative search suggestions relating to Clinton in order to reduce the number of searches people conduct that will expose them to anti-Clinton content. They appear to work a bit less hard to suppress negative search suggestions for Mr. Trump, Senator Sanders, Senator Cruz, and other prominent people.

This is not the place to review the evidence that Google strongly supports Mrs. Clinton, but since we're talking about Google's search bar, here are two quick reminders:

First, on August 6th, when we typed "When is the election?," we were shown the following image:

© Photo: Google

“When is the election?”

See anything odd about that picture? Couldn't Google have displayed two photos just as easily as it displayed one?

And second, as reported by the Next Web and other news sources, in mid 2015, when people typed "Who will be the next

president?," Google displayed boxes such as the one below, which left no doubt about the answer:

© Photo: Google
“Who will be the next president?”
Corporate Control
Over time, differentially suppressing negative search suggestions will repeatedly expose millions of people to far more positive search results for one political candidate than for the other. Research I have been conducting since 2013 with Ronald Robertson of Northeastern University has shown that high-ranking search results that favor one candidate can easily shift 20 percent or more of undecided voters toward that candidate — up to 80 percent in some demographic groups, as I noted earlier. This is because of the enormous trust people have in computer-generated search results, which people mistakenly believe are completely impartial and objective — just as they mistakenly believe search suggestions are completely impartial and objective.
The impact of biased search rankings on opinions, which we call the Search Engine Manipulation Effect (SEME), is one of the largest effects ever discovered in the behavioral sciences, and because it is invisible to users, it is especially dangerous as a source of influence. Because Google handles 90 percent of search in most countries and because many elections are very close, we estimate that SEME has been determining the outcomes of upwards of 25 percent of the national elections in the world for several years now, with increasing impact each year. This is occurring, we believe, whether or not Google's executives are taking an active interest in elections; all by itself, Google's search algorithm virtually always ends up favoring one candidate over another simply because of "organic" search

patterns by users. When it does, votes shift; in large elections, millions of votes can be shifted. You can think of this as a kind of digital bandwagon effect.

The new effect I have described in this essay — a search suggestion effect — is very different from SEME but almost certainly increases SEME's impact. If you can surreptitiously nudge people into generating search results that are inherently biased, the battle is half won. Simply by including or suppressing negatives in search suggestions, you can direct people's searches one way or another just as surely as if they were dogs on a leash, and you can use this subtle form of influence not just to alter people's views about candidates but about anything.

Google launched autocomplete, its search suggestion tool, in 2004 as an opt-in that helped users find information faster. Perhaps that's all it was in the beginning, but just as Google itself has morphed from being a cool high-tech anomaly into what former Google executive James Whittaker has called a "an advertising company with a single corporate-mandated focus," so has autocomplete morphed from being a cool and helpful search tool into what may be a tool of corporate manipulation. By 2008, not only was autocomplete no longer an opt-in feature, there was no way to opt out of it, and since that time, through strategic censorship, it may have become a tool for directing people's searches and thereby influencing not only the choices they make but even the thoughts they think.

Look back at the searches I have shown you. Why does Google typically show you far fewer search suggestions than other search engines do — 4 or fewer, generally speaking, compared with 8 for Bing, 8 for DuckDuckGo and 10 for Yahoo? Even if you knew nothing of phenomena like negativity bias and confirmation bias, you certainly know that shorter lists give people fewer choices. Whatever autocomplete was in the

beginning, its main function may now be to manipulate.
Without whistleblowers or warrants, no one can prove Google executives are using digital shenanigans to influence elections, but I don't see how we can rule out that possibility.
Perhaps you are skeptical about my claims. Perhaps you are also not seeing, on balance, a pro-Hillary bias in the search suggestions you receive on your computer. Perhaps you are also not concerned about the possibility that search suggestions can be used systematically to nudge people's searches in one direction or another. If you are skeptical in any or all of these ways, ask yourself this: Why, to begin with, is Google censoring its search suggestions? (And it certainly acknowledges doing so.) Why doesn't it just show us, say, the top ten most popular searches related to whatever we are typing? Why, in particular, is it suppressing negative information? Are Google's leaders afraid we will have panic attacks and sue the company if we are directed to dark and disturbing web pages? Do they not trust us to make up our own minds about things? Do they think we are children?
Without whistleblowers or warrants, no one can prove Google executives are using digital shenanigans to influence elections, but I don't see how we can rule out that possibility. There is nothing illegal about manipulating people using search suggestions and search rankings — quite the contrary, in fact — and it makes good financial sense for a company to use every legal means at its disposal to support its preferred candidates. Using the mathematical techniques Robertson and I described in our 2015 report in the Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, I recently calculated that SEME alone can shift between 2.6 and 10.4 million votes in the upcoming US presidential race without anyone knowing this has occurred and without leaving a paper trail.

I arrived at those numbers before I knew about the power search suggestions have to alter searches. The new study suggests that autocomplete alone might be able to shift between 800,000 and 3.2 million votes — also without anyone knowing this is occurring.

Perhaps even more troubling, because Google tracks and monitors us so aggressively, Google officials know who among us is planning to vote and whom we are planning to vote for. They also know who among us are still undecided, and that is where the influence of biased search suggestions and biased search rankings could be applied with enormous effect.

The Google Mafia

A convergence of EVIL: Google, Amazon and Facebook use technology to enslave humanity, suppress knowledge and accelerate human suffering

(Natural News) With Amazon.com now purchasing Whole Foods, giving it a near-monopoly over multiple sectors of the U.S. economy, we are entering the age of corporate giants dominating and enslaving humankind. Apple has more debt-free cash than nearly all world governments, including the United States of America (which is drowning in debt). Google has a near-monopoly over all search results, a position of power it exploits to silence dissenting views and disconnect humanity from important knowledge. And Facebook suppresses all truthful information that challenges the false narratives of the globalists. Corporations like these abuse their power to enslave humanity rather than setting us free.

At the dawn of the invention of television, the technology was hailed as a way to bring uplifting education to every corner of the globe. It didn't take long, however, before broadcast

television was turned into a means to control the masses through the dissemination of fake news — which has been going on forever — and the programming of consumers to purchase branded products often made with toxic ingredients. The dream of turning TV technology into a mechanism to set humanity free was quickly crushed, and today it is widely known that the more hours people spend watching TV, the more unintelligent and unaware they are. (Do you know any intelligent, self-aware, healthy person who indulges in watching fake TV?)

Similarly, the internet was once hailed as a means to set humanity free. But that dream, too, has been crushed under the extreme censorship and obfuscation of internet-intensive businesses like Google, Amazon and Facebook. Here are just a few examples:

Google censors nearly all REAL news publishers from Google News, making sure that only FAKE (mainstream) media achieves visibility so that fake media narratives dominate public attention. Those fake narratives include everything from the collapse of WTC 7 from “office fires” to the pharmaceutical industry’s ridiculously false claim that vaccines have never harmed any child in the history of the world. For all the same reasons, Google also algorithmically suppresses websites it doesn’t like, including independent news publishers covering investigative stories on vaccines, GMOs and the climate change science hoax. Far from setting humanity free to find what they want on the internet, Google covertly limits search results to primarily those content sites that agree with globalist narratives, all of which are anti-human and anti-progress. Google is also pro-Big Pharma and bans the advertising of natural supplement products that help people prevent disease and reduce suffering.

Facebook follows a similar algorithmic censorship track, penalizing websites that dare talk about children being harmed

by vaccines, science corruption in the genetic engineering industry, the dangers of pesticides or the scientifically validated benefits of carbon dioxide to planet Earth. Facebook manually assigns penalty scores to entire websites, crushing their reach and making sure their content can't even reach fans who have deliberately "liked" the site and want to receive its information. Mark Zuckerberg, the grandson of a Rockefeller, is being groomed for a position of globalist domination and says he might run for president. He's already obediently spouting every official lie that Hillary Clinton repeated on the campaign trail in 2016.

Amazon.com, founded by evil globalist Jeff Bezos, uses its marketplace dominance to promote the interests of the pharmaceutical industry while suppressing natural medicine. Did you know that Amazon is getting into the prescription drug business in the hopes of putting local pharmacies out of business? The company also bans FBA (Fulfilled By Amazon) activities with many nutritional supplements and botanical extracts that can prevent serious diseases such as cancer. Now that Amazon is purchasing Whole Foods, Jeff Bezos is likely going to use the same pro-pharma stance to try to transform Whole Foods stores into prescription drug pharmacy locations while eliminating most of Whole Foods' staff by replacing them with robots.

Amazon has already pioneered robot-staffed retail stores and has also developed a way to eliminate human cashiers by using RFID tracking of all customers and the items they pick off the shelves. Whole Foods workers are already freaking out, realizing they're going to be replaced by robots and drones. In effect, Jeff Bezos will promote mass unemployment, mass drug addiction, the censorship of natural products and centralized control over retailing. All of this makes Jeff Bezos richer and more powerful,

but it also destroys human dignity, human health and human knowledge. (For people like Jeff Bezos, selling opioids is a great business model because people keep buying them over and over again… the impact on society be damned!)

Evil corporations, evil globalists and evil agendas

What do all these evil corporations and globalist leaders have in common? They are all enemies of humanity:

They all promote toxic vaccines that are right now killing over 1,400 children a year in the U.S. alone, injuring another 100,000 plus annually.

They all promote Big Pharma's toxic medications that earn high profits.

They all suppress natural medicine, medicinal herbs and cannabinoids (CBD).

They all supported Hillary Clinton and promote Democrats, the DNC and big government. They all hated Trump just like they hate America, the Bill of Rights and the Second Amendment.

They all promote Monsanto, GMOs, glyphosate and pesticide chemicals as being "good for humanity." They all claim to be "pro environment" even while supporting the corporations that poison our world with toxic chemicals that kill life and devastate ecosystems.

They all believe in censorship and suppression as a way to shore up their power and silence dissent.

They all put profits first and humanity last. To them, human beings are just "useless idiots" to be manipulated or exploited for profit. If Jeff Bezos could fire every single Whole Foods worker right now and replace them all with robots, he would absolutely do so.

They all believe the ends justify the means, which is why Jeff Bezos' Washington Post feels justified in completely fabricating "anonymous sources" to publish fake news in an attempt to

overthrow the American Republic.
They all despise diversity of thought and demand absolute conformity and obedience to left-wing narratives covering everything from LGBT issues to the elimination of gun rights. Diversity of opinion is not allowed. Conformity is mandatory.
In effect, these corporations are pure evil. They are run by evil globalists and they ally themselves with other evil corporations that poison our planet, enslave humanity and seek to deprive us all of basic human liberty and dignity.
You're not helpless: Here's what you can do to protect your power, your liberty and your future
All these evil corporations depend on one thing to remain in business: Compliant consumers.
If people stop financially supporting these evil corporations, they will cease to exist. The only reason they continue to grow right now is because people continue to feed them economic resources.
Until now, many people had not been fully aware of just how evil these corporations truly are. They had no idea they were about to be enslaved and overrun by Google, Amazon, Facebook and other similar corporate entities. Suddenly, however, it's becoming obvious to even those who previously decried such warnings as "conspiracy theories." Suddenly even Whole Foods workers are waking up, flipping out and realizing they are all about to be made obsolete by the Jeff Bezos robot apocalypse. From Reuters:
"I've heard that Amazon's culture is really cutthroat. That worries me," one bagger at a Providence, Rhode Island, store said.
At least one customer was concerned that an Amazon purchase would further distance Whole Foods from its roots as a purveyor of premium, organic and specialty foods.
..."I think that they are a very profit-driven company, so there might be some streamlining as far as labor," said Sasha Hardin,

28, of the Mount Pleasant store, who has been with Whole Foods for 6-1/2 years.

Here are some action items you can take right now to stop feeding these corporate monsters that are destroying our collective future:

1. Stop using Google. Find alternative search engines such as DuckDuckGo. For searching news and the independent media, use GoodGopher.com or read Censored.news each day, which aggregates headlines from the internet's most censored indy news sites.

2. Stop using Facebook. Why would you divulge all the details of your private life to an NSA data collection front anyway? Facebook is nothing but a massive social network spy machine that ruins your life and makes you feel disconnected and depressed. Check out GAB.ai instead.

3. Stop shopping at Amazon.com and Whole Foods. Support local retailers and local grocers, or you'll soon find them all out of business. If you don't consciously decide to start shopping at other retailers, you're going to wake up one day in a world totally dominated by Amazon, where natural health products are banned and prescription drugs are pushed for everything. For lab-verified natural health products, support the Health Ranger Store. For fresh produce, grow your own food or support your local grocers that provide organic and non-GMO options.

4. Make conscious choices about where you spend your money, knowing that every dollar you spend is a "vote" for that organization. Globalist organizations like Google, Amazon and Facebook are all about enslaving humanity and stripping you of knowledge, dignity and health. Vote for the kind of companies who share your belief in natural medicine, empowering individuals, decentralizing political power (returning power to local communities) and halting the mass poisoning of our world

with pesticides and GMOs.
The power is in your hands.
Why is it dangerous for Google to be able to operate the private psychological and information profiles it keeps on every human?
Because it makes thing like this happen:
“Over 200 million voter background files, created via Google’s spying and data harvesting, have been dumped on the web!
A data analytics contractor that spies on the public with help from Facebook and Google, left databases containing information on nearly 200 million potential voters exposed to the internet without security, allowing anyone who knew where to look to download it without a password.

"We take full responsibility for this situation," said the contractor, Deep Root Analytics, in a statement.
The databases were part of 25 terabytes of files contained in an Amazon cloud account that could be browsed without logging in. The account was discovered by researcher Chris Vickery of the security firm UpGuard. The files have since been secured. Vickery is a prominent researcher in uncovering improperly secured files online. But, he said, this exposure is of a magnitude he has never seen before

"In terms of the disc space used, this is the biggest exposure I've found. In terms of the scope and depth, this is the biggest one I've found," said Vickery. The accessible files, according to UpGuard, contain a main 198 million-entry database with names, addresses of voters and an "RNC ID" that can be used with other exposed files to research individuals.

For example, a 50-gigabyte file of "Post Elect 2016" information, last updated in mid-January, contained modeled data about a

voter's likely positions on 46 different issues ranging from "how likely it is the individual voted for Obama in 2012, whether they agree with the Trump foreign policy of 'America First' and how likely they are to be concerned with auto manufacturing as an issue, among others."

That file appears in a folder titled "target_point," an apparent reference to another firm contracted by the RNC to crunch data. UpGuard speculates that the folder may imply that the firm TargetPoint compiled and shared the data with Deep Root. Another folder appears to reference Data Trust, another contracted firm. UpGuard analyst Dan O'Sullivan looked himself up in the database and writes in the official report that the calculated preferences were, at least for him, right on the money.

"It is a testament both to their talents, and to the real danger of this exposure, that the results were astoundingly accurate," he said. The Deep Root Analytics cloud server had 25 terabytes of data exposed, including 1.1 terabytes available for download.

Over the 2016 election season, the RNC was a major client of Deep Root, one of a handful firms it contacted for big data analysis. Firms like Deep Root Analytics use data from a variety of sources to extrapolate social and political preferences of voters to determine how best to market to them.

According to Ad Age, the RNC spent $983,000 between January 2015 and November 2016 for Deep Root's services and $4.2 million for TargetPoint's. "Deep Root Analytics builds voter models to help enhance advertiser understanding of TV viewership. The data accessed was not built for or used by any

specific client. It is our proprietary analysis to help inform local television ad buying," said Deep Root Analytics in their statement.

Misconfigured cloud servers and online databases are a common way for data to be accidentally left exposed to the public. Vickery has found everything from military engineering plans to databases of believed terrorists in exactly this way.

What is uncommon in this case is the size and scope of this exposure. If its records are accurate, the Deep Root Analytics exposure contains information on more than half of the American population. It dwarfs the second-largest exposure of voter information — 93.4 million records of Mexican citizens — by more than 100 million voters and tops the largest data breach of voter information — 55 million records of Philippine voters — by more than 140 million.

Anyone who knew the files' web address could have accessed them. But without that knowledge, they are much harder to find. Even armed with a search for unsecured databases, finding exposures of any magnitude is tough work. Vickery sifts through a large number of unsecured databases to find ones that interesting enough to publish research. Deep Root has contracted the security firm Stroz Friedberg to perform a thorough investigation of the exposure. The exposure, between June 1 and June 14, was sealed shut shortly after Vickery made the discovery during the night of June 12 and notified relevant regulatory bodies. “

Feds Shut Down Paris Climate Scam Because It Was Created to Put Trillions of Dollars in Obama’s Silicon Valley Financiers Bank

Accounts

Tom Steyer, Elon Musk, George Soros, Eric Schmidt, Vinod Khosla and John Doerr force USA to pull out of Paris Climate agreement because it is uncovered that they are using it for a private Silicon Valley Payola Scam!

It turns out that Obama had rigged the “Climate Deals” to criminally racketeer profits to Tom Steyer, Elon Musk, George Soros, Eric Schmidt, Vinod Khosla and John Doerr and F*ck everyone else over.

U.S. pull-out gives America a fresh start on the environment without all of the Silicon Valley racketeering and insider crony payola deals.

Reports filed with the new FBI (minus Comey-the-cover-up-king) to seek federal indictments of Tom Steyer, Elon Musk, George Soros, Eric Schmidt, Vinod Khosla and John Doerr!

Your Mind May Be Getting Raped By a Crazy Google Billionaire

By Shelley Floure’

You just read a thing on a “web news site”!

It got you so upset!!!!!!

Those filthy Liberals or those Filthy Conservatives or those Filthy Immigrants or some-group-of-people-you-don’t-like said a thing that makes you rationalize, more deeply, your hatred of “them”!

But who actually caused that thing to get posted where you saw it?

The answer: Some crazy billionaire paid to post that!

Why would they do that?

Because they put money in their bank account equal to the hate and fear they can manufacture. Season 5 of the House of Cards TV show goes into detail about this. Worse yet, the money they put in their bank account came from your own wallet!

“Huh!? How does that work?”

Let me explain.

The U.S. Government spends TRILLIONS AND TRILLIONS of your dollars every year.

All of that money comes from your taxes and the money they take out of your pay check.

By “spending money” the government hands those TRILLIONS AND TRILLIONS of dollars to certain people, and their companies, each year.

You probably can’t even conceive of how much money a trillion dollars is. Think of it this way: with only ONE TRILLION dollars to work with, you could blow up the Moon or paint the entire Moon pink. Literally! ONE TRILLION DOLLARS is only a tiny percentage of how much the government hands out each year.

George Soros, Eric Schmidt, Warren Buffet, Larry Page, Mark Zuckerberg, Sheldon Adelson, or the other political billionaires, would kill your whole family to get their hands on those TRILLIONS.

While some of them do have people killed, actual murders are easier to catch these days. It is far less risky to kill ideas and causes. Either way, the TRILLIONS flow into their pockets because they are killing things.

Are you lost yet?

These handful of billionaires have tens of thousands of trolls and internet shills who create hate on the internet.

In Washington, DC, each thing that someone might hate has a Congressional Bill and a budget solution attached to it.

In order to solve the problem that a hated thing causes, the billionaires have their lobbyists, fabricate fake problems. Guess what!? The billionaires that create the fabricated problem JUST HAPPEN TO OWN THE ONLY SOLUTION that the government can contract!

That's right! These billionaires create all these manufactured "issues" in order to put your tax money in their private bank accounts. They are tricking you into hate and fear so they can profit off of fabricated hate and fear!

"Climate Change" could only be solved by the companies that Barack Obama's financiers owned. Interesting coincidence, huh?

Only Obama's and Hillary's buddy Elon Musk got government cash. Every other applicant got sabotaged by Obama. Tesla's funding was a crony payola scam!

The hundred year old problem of accessible health-care could suddenly only be solved by the Obamacare database companies that ONLY Barack Obama's financiers owned.

Suddenly ISIS appeared and only by letting Obama's CIA take over Google could "the bad guys be caught"...except, not a single one was caught by the Silicon Valley surveillance net. A trillion dollars of "Big Data" contracts were sold by Amazon, Google and Facebook but they, not only, resulted in no interdictions but they CAUSED many attacks by missing the entire boat on some of the biggest, bloodiest, public attacks ever!

So, when you see reasons on the web to hate immigrants, Liberals or Conservatives. When you think you are supposed to put on a black face handkerchief and go riot with ANTIFA because "everybody else is", think again.

Almost NOBODY is actually concerned about most of these issues aside from getting their work done and getting home to their families.

All of these "problems" are manufactured by the owners of Facebook and Google in order to try to get those TRILLIONS of dollars steered into their private bank accounts.

When you see an "issue" on the web.. Write George Soros and tell him to go F*ck himself and stop messing with your tax dollars and your mind!

Al Gore bought a $10 million dollar mansion on the California coast in Montecito, California after telling the world that his Climate Change would flood the California Coast and make California coastal property the worst investment in history. Al Gore's partner and scam associate: Vinod Khosla (See the 60 Minutes Episode: The Cleantech Crash) took over California's favorite coastal town: Martin's Beach in Half Moon Bay, California; and has spent tens of millions of dollars on lawsuits to keep the public from using the public beach there. If these Kleiner Perkins mobsters actually thought Climate Change/Global Warming was real, they would never have spent vast fortunes buying coastal property, would they?

Over 35 (and growing) Obama DOE, EPA and NOAA senior staff have said that they were ordered to manipulate climate data in order to create financial profits for Al Gore's company: Kleiner Perkins.

Kleiner Perkins created Google, the criminally corrupt search engine company that rigs search results for Kleiner Perkins political interests.

Nothing less than FBI raids of Kleiner Perkins and Google are needed now! These are organized crime, criminally corrupt, organizations!

This has nothing to do with "politics" and everything to do with ORGANIZED CRIME!

This has nothing to do with saving trees and everything to do with murders, racketeering and corruption!

Google's executives pay for, control and benefit from every one of these politicians illegal and corrupt actions!

Google, once disdainful of lobbying, now a master of Washington influence

Outside InA new era of influence

By Tom Hamburger and Matea Gold

In May 2012, the law school at George Mason University hosted a forum billed as a “vibrant discussion” about Internet search competition. Many of the major players in the field were there — regulators from the Federal Trade Commission, federal and state prosecutors, top congressional staffers.

What the guests had not been told was that the day-long academic conference was in large part the work of Google, which maneuvered behind the scenes with GMU’s Law & Economics Center to put on the event. At the time, the company was under FTC investigation over concerns about the dominance of its famed search engine, a case that threatened Google’s core business.

In the weeks leading up to the GMU event, Google executives suggested potential speakers and guests, sending the center’s staff a detailed spreadsheet listing members of Congress, FTC commissioners, and senior officials with the Justice Department and state attorney general’s offices.

“If you haven’t sent out the invites yet, please use the attached spreadsheet, which contains updated info,” Google legal assistant Yang Zhang wrote to Henry Butler, executive director of the law center, according to internal e-mails obtained by The Washington Post through a public records request. “If you’ve sent out the invites, would it be possible to add a few more?” Butler replied, “We’re on it!”

On the day of the conference, leading technology and legal

experts forcefully rejected the need for the government to take action against Google, making their arguments before some of the very regulators who would help determine its fate.
The company helped put on two similar conferences at GMU around the time of the 18-month investigation, part of a broad strategy to shape the external debate around the probe, which found that Google's search practices did not merit legal action.
The behind-the-scenes machinations demonstrate how Google — once a lobbying weakling — has come to master a new method of operating in modern-day Washington, where spending on traditional lobbying is rivaled by other, less visible forms of influence.
(Read the e-mails between Google and GMU officials)
That system includes financing sympathetic research at universities and think tanks, investing in nonprofit advocacy groups across the political spectrum and funding pro-business coalitions cast as public-interest projects.
The rise of Google as a top-tier Washington player fully captures the arc of change in the influence business.
Nine years ago, the company opened a one-man lobbying shop, disdainful of the capital's pay-to-play culture.
Since then, Google has soared to near the top of the city's lobbying ranks, placing second only to General Electric in corporate lobbying expenditures in 2012 and fifth place in 2013.

The company gives money to nearly 140 business trade groups, advocacy organizations and think tanks, according to a Post analysis of voluntary disclosures by the company, which, like many corporations, does not reveal the size of its donations. That's double the number of groups Google funded four years ago.
This summer, Google will move to a new Capitol Hill office,

doubling its Washington space to 55,000 square feet — roughly the size of the White House.

Google's increasingly muscular Washington presence matches its expanded needs and ambitions as it has fended off a series of executive- and legislative-branch threats to regulate its activities and well-funded challenges by its corporate rivals.

Today, Google is working to preserve its rights to collect consumer data — and shield it from the government — amid a backlash over revelations that the National Security Agency tapped Internet companies as part of its surveillance programs. And it markets cloud storage and other services to federal departments, including intelligence agencies and the Pentagon.

"Technology issues are a big — and growing — part of policy debates in Washington, and it is important for us to be part of that discussion," said Susan Molinari, a Republican former congresswoman from New York who works as Google's top lobbyist. "We aim to help policymakers understand Google's business and the work we do to keep the Internet open and spur economic opportunity."

Molinari added, "We support associations and third parties across the political spectrum who help us get the word out — even if we don't agree with them on 100 percent of issues."

Susan Molinari, a Republican former congresswoman from New York, works as Google's top lobbyist in Washington. (Bennett Raglin/Getty Images for Elle)

As Google's lobbying efforts have matured, the company has worked to broaden its appeal on both sides of the aisle. Executive Chairman Eric Schmidt is a well-known backer of President Obama and advises the White House. Google's lobbying corps — now numbering more than 100 — is split equally, like its campaign donations, among Democrats and Republicans.

Google executives have fostered a new dialogue between Republicans and Silicon Valley, giving money to conservative groups such as Heritage Action for America and the Federalist Society. While also supporting groups on the left, Google has flown conservative activists to California for visits to its Mountain View campus and a stay at the Four Seasons Hotel.

The company has also pioneered new and unexpected ways to influence decision-makers, harnessing its vast reach. It has befriended key lawmakers in both parties by offering free training sessions to Capitol Hill staffers and campaign operatives on how to use Google products that can help target voters. Through a program for charities, Google donates in-kind advertising, customized YouTube channels and Web site analytics to think tanks that are allied with the company's policy goals.

Google "fellows" — young lawyers, writers and thinkers paid by the company — populate elite think tanks such as the Cato Institute, the Competitive Enterprise Institute and the New America Foundation.

To critics, Google's investments have effectively shifted the national discussion away from Internet policy questions that could affect the company's business practices. Groups that might ordinarily challenge the policies and practices of a major corporation are holding their fire, those critics say.

"Google's influence in Washington has chilled a necessary and overdue policy discussion about the impact of the Internet's largest firm on the future of the Internet," said Marc Rotenberg, a Georgetown University law professor who runs the Electronic Privacy Information Center, a watchdog and research organization.

Some with deep ties to the company say that Google's embrace of aggressive lobbying was a necessary concession to the

realities of Washington.

“I don’t fault Google for playing that game, in which big companies use their money to buy advocates and allies,” said Andrew McLaughlin, who served as Google’s first director of global public policy in Washington. “Given where the company is today, the fiduciary duty it has to shareholders and the way Washington works, it’s a rational judgment.”

Google goes to lunch

An early sign of Google’s new Washington attitude came in September 2011, when executives paid a visit to the Heritage Foundation, the stalwart conservative think tank that has long served as an intellectual hub on the right, to attend a weekly lunch for conservative bloggers.

The session took place at a critical juncture for the company. Days earlier, Schmidt had endured a rare and unnerving appearance on Capitol Hill, where he was lectured by a Republican senator who accused the company of skewing search results to benefit its own products and hurt competitors. The FTC antitrust inquiry was underway. And, in what Google saw as a direct threat to the open Internet, major lobbies such as the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and the Motion Picture Association of America were mounting a legislative campaign to place restrictions on the sale of pirated music and movies. The effort was getting bipartisan traction in the House and the Senate.

Google Executive Chairman Eric Schmidt testifies before a Senate Judiciary antitrust subcommittee in September 2011. (Chip Somodevilla/Getty Images)

Inside Google’s Washington headquarters, a handful of lobbyists were crafting what they called the “Republican strategy” to defeat the legislation. Their approach: build conservative opposition based on the right’s distaste for regulation. They also

seized on an obscure provision that they told Republicans would be a boon for trial lawyers, a Democratic constituency.

As the campaign took shape, there was a building sense within the company that it needed to beef up its firepower on the Hill. That fall, Google's first Washington lobbyist, a computer scientist and lawyer named Alan Davidson, a Democrat, would announce his resignation, replaced a few months later by the former GOP lawmaker, Molinari.

In their visit to Heritage that day, Google officials were eager to make new friends. Their challenge was instantly clear.

"In 2008, your CEO campaigned for Barack Obama," said Mike Gonzalez, Heritage's vice president for communications, according to a video of the event. ". . . As a company, you're really identified with this administration from the beginning. And you come here and you're like a mix of Milton Friedman and Friedrich Hayek."

Adam Kovacevich, then a member of Google's policy team, responded by stressing the company's interest in building new alliances.

"One of the things we've recognized is that no company can get anything done in Washington without partnerships on both sides of the aisle," he said.

He noted the recent hiring of Lee Carosi Dunn, one of several former top aides to Sen. John McCain (R-Ariz.) brought on by the company.

Dunn, addressing the audience, promised "a lot of reach-out to Republicans."

"I think it's another lesson young companies that come to Washington learn — you can't put all your marbles in one basket," Dunn said. Referring to the editor of the conservative Weekly Standard, Dunn added: "Look, even Bill Kristol was walking around wearing Google glasses. We're making strides!"

The Google-Heritage relationship soon blossomed — with benefits for both.

A few weeks after the blogger session, Heritage researcher James L. Gattuso penned a critique of the antitrust investigation into Google, praising the company as “an American success story.”

That winter, Heritage joined the chorus of groups weighing in against the anti-piracy legislation. As the bill, the Stop Online Piracy Act, appeared to gain steam in the GOP-led House, Gattuso wrote a piece warning of “unintended negative consequences for the operation of the Internet and free speech.” The legislation, he said, could disrupt the growth of technology. Gattuso said he came to his position independently and was not lobbied by Google.

After Gattuso’s piece went live, Heritage Action, the think tank’s sister advocacy organization, quickly turned the argument into a political rallying cry. In terms aimed at tea party conservatives, the group cast the bill as “another government power grab.”

In mid-January 2012, Heritage Action designated the legislation a “key vote” it would factor into its congressional race endorsement decisions — heightening the pressure on Republicans.

The next day, leading Internet sites, including Wikipedia, went dark as part of an online blackout protesting the bills.

Google turned its iconic home page into a political platform for the first time, urging users to sign a petition against the legislation. Seven million people added their names, and many of them added their e-mails, creating a valuable activist list for Google to mobilize then and in later fights.

As congressional offices were flooded with phone calls and e-mail protests, support for the legislation crumbled. Within days,

both the House and Senate versions of the bill were shelved and Hill veterans were left marveling at the ability of Google and its allies to muster such a massive retail response.

For Google and Heritage, the legislative victory was the beginning of a close relationship. A few months later, Google Ideas and the Heritage Foundation co-hosted an event focused on the role the Internet could play in modernizing Cuba, featuring Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) and Google Ideas director Jared Cohen.

The following year, a new name popped up on Google's list of groups it supports financially: Heritage Action.

GMU conferences

Facing a broad and potentially damaging FTC probe, Google found an eager and willing ally in George Mason University's Law & Economics Center.

The center is among the academic programs at universities such as Harvard and Stanford that have benefited from Google's largesse. For the past several years, the free-market-oriented law center has received an annual donation from the company, a grant that totaled $350,000 last year, according to the school.

Google's relationship with the law center proved helpful in the summer of 2011 as speculation mounted that the FTC was going to launch an antitrust investigation of the tech giant. The company's rivals, including Microsoft and Yelp, were aggressively pressing arguments that Google was exploiting its dominance in the search business.

On June 16, 2011, Google and the law center put on the first of three academic conferences at the GMU law school's Arlington County campus, all focusing on Internet search competition. It was eight days before the company announced it had received formal notification it was under FTC investigation.

Google was listed as a co-sponsor of the day-long forum, but some participants were still struck by the number of speakers who took a skeptical view of the need for antitrust enforcement against the company, according to people in attendance.

The keynote address was by Google engineer Mark Paskin, who delivered a lunchtime speech titled “Engineering Search.”

A few days later, Christopher Adams, an economist in the FTC’s antitrust division who later worked on the Google investigation, e-mailed Butler, the law center’s director, to thank him for putting on the conference. “I think it was one of the best policy conferences that I’ve been too [sic],” Adams wrote, praising Paskin’s talk as “excellent.”

Adams declined to comment for this article, referring questions to the FTC press office.

FTC spokesman Justin Cole said the agency’s staffers “are required to adhere to established federal government ethics rules and guidelines. Attendance and participation in the 2011 and 2012 GMU conferences by our staff adhered to these guidelines.”

As the agency’s investigation stretched into its second year, the staff and professors at GMU’s law center were in regular contact with Google executives, who supplied them with the company’s arguments against antitrust action and helped them get favorable op-ed pieces published, according to the documents obtained by The Post.

The school and Google staffers worked to organize a second academic conference focused on search. This time, however, Google’s involvement was not publicly disclosed.

Months before the event, Zhang, the Google legal assistant, e-mailed Chrysanthos Dellarocas, a professor in the Information Systems Department at Boston University’s School of Management, to suggest he participate. Dellarocas had received

$60,000 in 2011 from Google to study the impact of social networks on search.

“We’d love for you . . . to submit and present this paper, if you are interested and willing,” she wrote.

When GMU officials later told Dellarocas they were planning to have him participate from the audience, he responded that he was under the impression from “the folks at Google who have funded our research” that they wanted him to showcase his work at the event. He said he wanted “to be in compliance with our sponsor’s expectations.”

Dellarocas, who had a schedule conflict and ultimately did not attend, told The Post that while Google occasionally checked on his progress, the company did not have any sway over his research.

“At no point did they have any interference with the substance of my work,” he said.

Even as Google executives peppered the GMU staff with suggestions of speakers and guests to invite to the event, the company asked the school not to broadcast its involvement.

“It may seem like Google is overwhelming the conference,” Zhang fretted in an e-mail to the center’s administrative coordinator, Jeffrey Smith, after reviewing the confirmed list of attendees a few weeks before the event. She asked Smith to mention “only a few Googlers.”

Smith was reassuring. “We will certainly limit who we announce publicly from Google,” he replied.

A strong contingent of FTC economists and lawyers were on hand for the May 16, 2012, session, whose largely pro-Google tone took some participants aback. “By my count, out of about 20 panelists and speakers, there were 31 / 2 of us who thought the FTC might have a case,” said Allen Grunes, a former government antitrust lawyer who served on a panel and

described the conference as “Google boot camp.” Grunes said he was not aware of Google’s role organizing the event until informed of it by a Post reporter.

Daniel D. Polsby, dean of GMU’s School of Law, which houses the center, said that while Google provided suggestions, the agenda and speakers were determined by university staffers. “I think it would misrepresent this conference to suggest that it was a Google event,” he said, adding that the law center discloses on its Web site the support it gets from Google and other corporations.

Google declined to comment about the conferences.

In January 2013, after an investigation that spanned more than a year and a half, the FTC settled the case with Google, which agreed to give its rivals more access to patents and make it easier for advertisers to use other ad platforms.

But when it came to the charges that Google biased its search results to promote its own products, the five FTC commissioners all voted to close the investigation, saying there was no evidence the company’s practices were harming consumers.

Jon Leibowitz, then the chairman of the agency, said in an interview that the FTC was not affected by Google’s campaign, noting that the company’s rivals were waging a parallel effort on the other side.

“It didn’t bother me that a lot of people were building events around the possibility of the FTC investigation,” said Leibowitz, who has since left the FTC. “That’s sort of life in the big city, and both sides were doing it.”

Sen. Marco Rubio (R-Fla.) discusses the U.S. economy in a March speech at a Jack Kemp Foundation forum at Google’s Washington offices. (T.J. Kirkpatrick/For The Washington Post)

Attendees listen to Rubio’s speech. While also supporting groups on the left, Google has courted conservative groups and lawmakers in recent years. (T.J. Kirkpatrick/For The Washington Post)

NSA fallout

On a February night this year, Schmidt sat down with a Washington audience far friendlier than the panel of senators who had grilled him nearly three years earlier. Addressing a dinner of journalists and scholars at the libertarian Cato Institute, Schmidt received applause and lots of head-nodding as he declared, “We will not collaborate with the NSA.”

Cato was not always in sync with Google’s policy agenda. In previous years, the think tank’s bloggers and scholars had been sharply critical of the company’s support for government rules limiting the ways providers such as Comcast and Verizon could charge for Internet services.

But, like many institutions in Washington, Cato has since found common ground with Google.

And the think tank has benefited from the company’s investments, receiving $480,000 worth of in-kind “ad words” from Google last year, according to people familiar with the donation.

Schmidt’s message to Cato that night in February reflected the current focus of Google’s energy — containing the fallout from revelations by NSA leaker Edward Snowden.

As the public’s outrage has grown, the tech giant has tried to keep the focus on limiting government surveillance, not on the data collection done by private companies. A White House review of those issues is expected to be released this coming week.

A campaign against government spying, meanwhile, is in high gear, drawing together some unexpected bedfellows. The American Civil Liberties Union, Heritage Action, Americans for

Tax Reform and the Center for Democracy & Technology have formed a coalition calling for the government to obtain a probable-cause warrant before getting access to e-mails and other electronic data.
The coalition, Digital 4th, is funded by Google.
Alice Crites contributed to this report.

Google’s Hookers and Epic Sex Scandals Prove That Google Has No Morals and Exists To Abuse Others

Horrific Google Anal Sex Slave Case Uncovers Twisted Perversions Of Google Executives

By Samantha Conners - APT

Michael Goguen, Google's married senior investor, “sexually and physically” abused Amber Laurel Baptiste with constant anal sex over more than 13 years after picking her up at a Texas strip club. His company: Sequoia Capital, has had other run-ins with cheating married executives, escorts and tax evasion schemes, per legal filings.
Eric Schmidt, the head of Google, proclaimed that he would have a “open marriage” where he could have sex any time, with anybody, and is documented in a ream of news articles and video regarding his fifteen million dollar “sex penthouse” in New York.
Sergey Brin, another head of Google, is featured in numerous news articles for his “three way sex romp” with multiple Google employees forcing one employee to move to China to escape him.
A married Google senior executive named Hayes, who helped rig

Google's searches for political clients, was murdered on his “sex yacht” by his prostitute, which other Google executives had used.
Ravi Kumar, another VC associated with Google Executives, was also murdered by a pack of hookers and pimps that frequented his Silicon Valley home.
Valley Girls was a private escort service that used Stanford Co-eds to service the sexual kinks of Google executives.
Ellen Pao famously sued Google founding investor John Doerr, and his company Kleiner Perkins, for sexual abuse.
Google employee divorce filings hold the Silicon Valley record for use of the word “abuse” as one of the reasons given in the legal papers filed to initiate the divorce.
The list of kinky, twisted, bizarre sexual antics of Google executives, and their investors, goes on for pages and pages...
Google seems to attract the most twisted, perverted, morally decrepit men in the world.
One has to wonder why, of all the large companies on Earth, only Google got to place the majority of it's people in the White House? That's right, Nike doesn't have it's people in the White House. Macy's doesn't either. Neither does Chevron, or John Deere tractor or any other company on Earth.
Only Google, exclusively and uniquely, had all of their people placed in the White House and top federal agency lead positions. What's up with that? Were they selected because of their technical skills or their ability to make people bend over?
An addiction to dirty sexual perversions are not the only illicit trends that Google folks display. The Google investors are members of a financing cartel called the National Venture Capital Association (NVCA). This group of frat boy elitists got busted for running the “Angelgate” scandal in which they were documented rigging, colluding, black-listing and contriving the whole Silicon Valley start-up industry.

Then they were caught again when Eric Schmidt, Mr. “Sex Penthouse” and the head of Google, wrote emails ordering a conspiracy against Silicon Valley engineers. This “No Poaching” conspiracy got the Silicon Valley VC's sued in a class-action lawsuit, which the VC's lost. The Google founder's best friend: Jacques Littlefield, kept the world's largest private fully functional military tank squadron, in fully operational status, hidden in vast warehouses in his Silicon Valley estate in Woodside, California. He said he had this arsenal: “just in case”. Does Google make white frat house men insane or does it draw the crazy ones to it? The FBI is finally crunching down on these people. After so many years of the White House ordering the FBI to leave the Google VC's and Silicon Valley perverts alone, it was just getting plain embarrassing for the FBI. The audacious impunity with which Google, and it's friends, engaged in tax evasion, importing hookers, bribery, stock market rigging, anti-trust schemes and other crimes has become so overt, in the media, that it was created a spotlight on federal law enforcements avoidance of prosecution of the shenanigans of the Google crowd.
Google Executives Pay Stanford University Sorority Girls For Sex. Female Students Have Google ‘Sugar Daddies’ Put Them Through College
Google’s married Forrest Hayes dies in sex orgy on sex yacht paid for by his Google cash. Google’s Eric Schmidt has a “Sex Penthouse”. Google’s Sergey Brin was in a 3-way sex scandal...and the list goes on...