GOOGLE SEO AND I.T. COUNTER-MEASURES TO TRY TO OFFSET THEIR ATTACKS –

DRAFT Version 2:

Lists of, and notes about, contractors who tried to overcome the Google attack and/or verified it:

Maryland Web Builders, under contract to Plaintiffs, tried extensively to push any positive articles above the Google lock and found that the Attack links on Google were locked on the front page, in the top slot, BY GOOGLE with the addition of a "P8 Credibility Rating" (An internet technical term which means that Google staff manually asserted that a story or document was "FACT" and not an opinion, a lie on their part) setting on Google's Servers which means that Google was telling the world that the article contained "FACTS" and not opinion. (**See Contract PDF, Attached**). Google over-rode the court by stating that the links pointed to "Facts" and not "Opinion", in a malicious effort to damage Plaintiffs.

Optimized Strategies, working with Plaintiffs, placed over 300 servers and hosted sites around the world as a technical sting operation validation test. Testing began in 2008 and ran through 2015. The systems were first planned for use as promotional publication and news servers but were re-tasked, and expanded for the forensic validation tests. By mapping the Internet, (a technique which Plaintiffs have been issued U.S. Government patents as the first to develop), the thousands of Non-Google Search Engines, burst attempts with positive news that later appeared about Plaintiffs and the SERP and DNS metrics; it became clear that Google was manipulating Global and domestic search results and video visibility in order to maliciously damage plaintiffs. At the same time, the IT experts mapped the occurrence of down-ranking of Plaintiff's alongside the up-ranking of the phrases: "Elon Musk" and "Tesla Motors": competitors of Plaintiffs, business partners and owned stock property of Google and a known financier of attacks. Any negatives stories mentioning Google's partner; Elon Musk or Tesla Motors were not only down-ranked by Google but, often, entirely hidden on the internet, timed with (TSLA) stock "pumps". The data from 2007 to today clearly proves that Google manipulates the mood framing, ranking, adjacent information relative to perception, intent and public perception against it's enemies and for it's business and political partners. As the tests were under way, Russia, China and a research group led by a Mr. Epstein conducted their own versions of the tests and found the same results. Near the later parts of the tests, researchers from the European Union conducted similar tests, found the same kinds of manipulations and filed national charges against Google for these types of manipulations.

(Emails with testimony and validation from other IT and SEO counter-measures services who tested and verified Google was intentionally manipulating hardware, software and process, will follow..)

Mohr Publicity Tests, Mohr Publicity is the internet and social media company run by Sandra Mohr and is responsible for the sudden rise of some of the biggest internet and reality TV stars in history. You know many of her famous entertainment industry clients, which she made famous on the internet, by the single word mention of their first or last name. Mohr is an acknowledged expert at making fame happen and has one of the most extensive social media "fame creation" systems in the world. Her team used it's top resources to push out all the positive news stories about Plaintiff but Google blocked all attempts to allow any positive media coverage to push down the attack articles it had frozen, and locked, in top place on its servers.

IT # 4 http://positivesearchresults.com His company was one of many IT contractors that we used to

try to get the positive news about me, and my two main Companies: Limnia and XP, past Google's attack flood and internet blocking. Until recently, Google has always claimed that it's "search engine algorithm" is an "arbitrary search matrix that, without human input, naturally ranks the public's interest in order of their most popular search results". In fact, Google, forced by the EU, Microsoft, Oracle, China and Russia has had to admit that it covertly sells search rankings, manually sets all top search results and manipulates the operation of "the entire internet" to harm it's enemies and favor it's friends and their investments.

His approach was to post all of the good stuff about us on thousands of servers because (probably out of India) , if Google wasn't lying, then the good stuff should "naturally" rise to the top of the first page and first lines of Google.

It never did. It never even appeared on Google. Google lied about how Google works.

He probably has to keep restarting under different names because Google keeps catching him trying to undo their attacks or he did his trick against some politician. He may have been a bad guy, don't know, but the results he came up with were also discovered by every other IT SEO specialist we hired, at a cost of many, many thousands of dollars. Every single one found quantified, scientific, mathematical data proof that Google was manually manipulating search results.

His company was one of many outside IT firms that said that they couldn't get past Google's attack because it was so massive and so hard-coded or locked, manually, into Google's search engine and public results settings. These outside IT experts can help prove that Google lies when they say anything on Google is "the luck of the draw" or "automatically sorted by public interest". It never is. Google manually rigs its first 4 pages, (because few members of the public ever look past the first 4 pages on Google) so that the results are exactly what Eric Schmidt says that the results should be, according to his mood that day.

IT # 5 Adams SEO Services

IT #6

The following articles prove that research by third parties has also discovered Google manipulating results for it's personal ends:

How Google Bribed It's Way To The Top: The Buying Of The U.S. Congress and The White House

- Google has, literally, bribed Congressmen, and White House staff, with cash, search manipulation, intelligence reports on opposition, campaign resources and revolving door job trades.

- Is Google a "Criminal Empire" that flourishes under the wing of certain U.S. Senators?

https://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2015/12/17/18781056.php

The Guardian

Revealed: how Google enlisted members of US Congress it bankrolled to fight $6bn EU antitrust case

US tech firm has stepped up lobbying efforts with $3.5m charm offensive to persuade EU to drop punitive action over alleged abuse of monopoly position

Simon Marks in Brussels and Harry Davies

Google enlisted members of the US congress, whose election campaigns it had funded, to pressure the European Union to drop a €6bn antitrust case which threatens to decimate the US tech firm's business in Europe.

The coordinated effort by senators and members of the House of Representatives, as well as by a congressional committee, formed part of a sophisticated, multimillion-pound lobbying drive in Brussels, which Google has significantly ramped up as it fends off challenges to its dominance in Europe.

How Google's antitrust siege began not far from Windsor Castle ramparts

An investigation by the Guardian into Google’s multifaceted lobbying campaign in Europe has uncovered fresh details of its activities and methods. Based on documents obtained under a freedom of information request and a series of interviews with EU officials, MEPs and Brussels lobbyists, the investigation has also found:

• Google’s co-founder and CEO Larry Page met the then European commission chief privately in California in spring 2014 and raised the antitrust case despite being warned by EU officials that it would be inappropriate to do so.

• Officials and lawmakers in Brussels say they have witnessed a significant expansion of Google lobbying efforts over the past 18 months as the company faces increased scrutiny of its business activities in Europe.

• Google has employed several former EU officials as in-house lobbyists, and has funded European thinktanks and university research favourable to its position as part of its broader campaign.

Capitol Hill’s aggressive intervention in Brussels came as the European parliament prepared to vote

through a resolution in November 2014 that called on EU policymakers to consider breaking up Google's online business into separate companies.

Republican and Democratic senators and congressmen, many of whom have received significant campaign donations from Google totalling hundreds of thousands of dollars, leaned on parliament in a series of similar – and in some cases identical – letters sent to key MEPs.

In another letter, the US House judiciary committee wrote to MEPs concerning the antitrust case against Google. The committee's chairman, Bob Goodlatte, said the committee was "troubled to learn" some MEPs were "encouraging antitrust enforcement efforts that appear to be motivated by politics" that would ultimately undermine free markets.

Google has consistently donated to Goodlatte's election campaigns, while members on the judiciary committee that he chairs collectively received more than $200,000 (£133,000) from the company during the 2014 election cycle.

Google declined to comment on the letters or its ties to the committee, including the fact one of its senior lawyers in Washington had joined the firm straight from the judiciary committee where he served as an antitrust counsel to its Republican members. A spokeswoman for the committee did not respond to the Guardian's requests for comment.

Scaling up

Google's expansion of its lobbying activities in Brussels has come in response to a growing number of threats to its business in the EU, where it dominates about 90% of the search market. It argues that its rivals lobby just as hard against it, if not harder.

In April, a long-running antitrust investigation came to a head when the newly installed EU competition commissioner, Margrethe Vestager, formally accused Google of abusing its market dominance by systematically favouring its shopping price-comparison service.

Google, which could face a heavy fine of more than €6bn (£4.3bn) if found guilty, has rejected Vestager's case as "wrong as a matter of fact, law and economics". But this is only one of the battles Google is fighting in Brussels.

The European commission has also launched a separate competition investigation into Google's mobile

operating system, Android, and indicated additional inquiries are being considered. This follows the symbolic blow MEPs dealt the US company late last year with the so-called “unbundling” resolution.

Under pressure to defend itself, Google has opened its cheque book. Last year, the company spent more than twice as much on lobbying in Brussels than Apple, Facebook, Yahoo, Twitter and Uber combined. Yet Google is still being outspent by Microsoft, which some in Brussels suspect is backing a vocal anti-Google lobby in Brussels. Microsoft declined to comment.

Official transparency data shows Google has increased its annual lobbying spending from €600,000 in 2011 to almost €4m last year. In addition to its team of in-house lobbyists – many of whom have come from jobs in the commission or the European parliament – the company has employed eight European lobbying firms. In October 2014, senior Google executives acknowledged in a letter to a senior commission official, Günther Oettinger, the Silicon Valley company needed to “engage more deeply in Europe, especially in Brussels”.

This strategy is borne out by records of meetings with the commission. Between December 2014 and June 2015, Google held more high-level meetings with commission officials than any other company.

Google sympathisers accept it is lobbying hard, but suggest no company would sit back and not ensure its side of the story is being heard when so much is at stake, especially when claimants in the antitrust case have formed well-funded lobby groups to fight the firm.

One such group, ICOMP, receives funding from numerous complainants in the antitrust case, including Microsoft, and is closely associated with Burson-Marsteller, a large public relations firm previously paid by Facebook to plant negative stories about Google.

Latest data shows ICOMP spent €400,000 on lobbying in Brussels between 2013-14. It does not disclose how much it spent on legal costs incurred in connection with the case against Google.

One senior EU official speaking on condition of anonymity said Google’s lobbying in Brussels stood out because of the intricate, often subtle yet powerful mechanisms it employs.

“What is striking is the comprehensive and strategic approach they have. They are not only doing PR but they are doing everything. They are using proxies, which is much more powerful than just the usual stuff,” he told the Guardian.

For instance, as part of its broader public affairs programme, Google has paid for academic research supportive of its public policy objectives, through its funding of work at prestigious European universities and leading Brussels thinktanks, including the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) and the Bruegel Institute.

A spokesman for the US tech firm said European politicians had “many questions for Google and about the internet”. To help answer those questions, he added, Google sometimes commissioned independent research, but always asked the academics to disclose funding they received from the company.

Olivier Hoedeman, a research and campaign coordinator at Corporate Europe Observatory and a seasoned observer of Brussels’s lobbying scene, characterised the company’s efforts as unprecedented

in both its spending and textured lobbying techniques.

“Google has in an unprecedented manner stepped up their Brussels lobbying efforts during the last few years, massively increasing their spending on lobbying and on other activities in a very comprehensive and multifaceted lobbying campaign aimed at influencing the European commission’s decisions,” he said.

Among MEPs, this became particularly apparent in November last year when the European parliament voted yes to the motion to break up Google’s search business from its advertising and other businesses.

“At the time of the November parliamentary session, Google’s lobby activity clearly stepped up in a way that we have never seen before,” said Ramon Tremosa, a Spanish MEP from Catalonia involved in putting forward the unbundling resolution.

Tremosa said that during the week of the vote Google’s Brussels-based lobbyists were joined by its public affairs officers for each of the 28 EU-member states in filling the corridors of parliament.

According to Jacques Lafitte, a veteran lobbyist at Avisa Partners whose clients include a complainant in the antitrust case, Google’s lobbying in Brussels is unrivalled.

“Before Google, the most sophisticated company in terms of political influence was Goldman Sachs. But Google beats them any day because contrary to Goldman they don’t just focus on the top,” Lafitte said. “Google makes its influence felt absolutely everywhere.”

High-level interventions

Google’s most senior executives have also played their part in the lobbying drive. In May 2014, with less than six months to persuade the commission to abandon the antitrust action before a change in leadership at Europe’s executive arm, Google co-founder Larry Page met the then commission president, José Manuel Barroso, at the company’s headquarters in Mountain View, California.

Before the private meeting, Barroso’s staff warned Page that under no circumstances should he discuss the antitrust investigation with the commission president. But Page was running out of time.

A letter sent by Google’s executive chairman, Eric Schmidt, to Barroso months later shows the case was discussed. Page told Barroso Google could implement a new set of commitments designed to allay fears about European rivals being unable to compete with it. For an hour, the commission president sat and listened.

“We loved having you in Mountain View and I enjoyed our discussion tremendously,” Page later wrote to Barroso. “Next time you’re in the Valley please come and visit again.”

The timing of the meeting, according to Hoederman, was “very awkward” as the European commission was weighing the antitrust case against the company.

“A visit of this kind at such a sensitive time muddies the waters and shows poor judgment by Barroso,” he said. “It would have been understandable if the EU’s competition policy officials felt that Barroso’s visit risked undermining their integrity of the investigation.”

Julia Reda, a Green MEP from Germany, noted: “This is not the first time there have been reports of Google trying to influence the outcome of the commission’s antitrust investigation through high-level interventions.

“As it is difficult to tell what is going on behind closed doors, I am not in a position to judge whether the communication between the commission and Google during this competition inquiry has been atypical, though it certainly raises questions.”

A spokesman for the commission defended its dealings with Google. “In line with its normal procedures, the commission’s antitrust investigation into Google’s business practices has been handled in an open and transparent way,” he said.

In September 2014, with the clocking ticking and less than a month before Barroso stepped down, Schmidt joined in the lobbying of Barroso, having previously left the task to Google’s chief in-house lobbyists in Brussels.

In a last-ditch attempt to change the course of the antitrust case, Schmidt asked Barroso to lean on his commissioners to approve the proposed settlement. Calling it a “crucial stage in the process”, Schmidt

warned in pointed language that a failure to approve the settlement would undermine the commission's credibility and result in "drawn-out litigation".

Less than a week later, the commission reopened the long-running antitrust investigation, dealing Google a major setback. In a surprise move, it rejected Google's third settlement offer following "very, very negative" responses from complainants to the proposed settlement.

Trouble ahead?

After changes in leadership at the European commission in November 2014, Google's lobbyists in Brussels have become increasingly frustrated.

Documents show the company's repeated attempts to set up meetings with senior commission officials including the president, Jean-Claude Juncker, have thus far been unsuccessful. In one instance, Google requested a meeting with a senior adviser to Juncker shortly after the commission formally issued its antitrust case. However, her assistant bluntly declined the request and directed them to the new competition commissioner, Vestager.

There is a feeling among some EU officials that Google may have underestimated the strict legal procedures that dictate how antitrust cases progress in Europe. However, others say the US firm's mistake has more to do with underestimating the influence of an "anti-Google lobby", backed by the likes of Microsoft and German media empire Axel Springer.

In the US, Google saw off a potentially damaging antitrust investigation by the Federal Trade Commission, which dropped its case in early 2013. But the landscape in Brussels differs from that in Washington, where Google enjoys more clout and personal connections with the highest levels of government.

John Simpson, of Consumer Watchdog in the US, believes Google has been successful at positioning itself in and around the corridors of power in Washington. "They're masters at it and it's worked very, very well for them," he said.

But he claims Europe's acceptance of Google's size, power and dominance is less than what it is in the US. "I think there may be a failure to understand the European perspective on certain issues," he said, "I don't think that they at the core understand how privacy is viewed as a fundamental right in Europe."

Alarmingly for Google, its investors are beginning to wake up to the trouble it faces in Brussels. Scott Kessler, an equity analyst at S&P Capital IQ who watches Google closely, said many investors had become apathetic about the charges levelled against the company, but the mood is beginning to change.

"Google have been facing these issues in Europe for a number of years and some people believe that now is the time that they will have to account for some of these actions in some way," he said.

Once again the clock is ticking for Google. Vestager is treating her investigations as a high priority and has indicated EU regulators will actively pursue its new parent company, Alphabet, on multiple fronts.

Topics

- Google
- Lobbying
- Alphabet
- European commission
- Europe
- European Union

https://www.indybay.org/newsitems/2015/11/02/18779563.php

Debbie Wasserman and Obama's covert news network airs Obama-friendly news (parody)

INFLUENCE: State-run GOOGLE is the little-seen power behind a global web of news Internet manipulation and character assassination attacks on voters. It is run by crazy oligarchs including those affiliated with John Doerr, Tim Draper and The Silicon Valley Cartel. The programming sticks close to the The Silicon Valley billionaire Cartel line. REUTERS/Stringer; Debbie Wasserman or Obama Association USA/ (Parodied from a Reuters article on China)

Slide: 1 / of 1 .

Caption: Getty Images

Google's Search Algorithm Could Steal the Presidency

 Getty Images

Imagine an election—a close one. You're undecided. So you type the name of one of the candidates into your search engine of choice. (Actually, let's not be coy here. In most of the world, one search engine dominates; in Europe and North America, it's Google.) And Google coughs up, in fractions of a second, articles and facts about that candidate. Great! Now you are an informed voter, right? But a study published this week says that the order of those results, the ranking of positive or negative stories on the screen, can have an enormous influence on the way you vote. And if the election is close enough, the effect could be profound enough to change the outcome.

In other words: Google's ranking algorithm for search results could accidentally steal the presidency. "We estimate, based on win margins in national elections around the world," says Robert Epstein, a psychologist at the American Institute for Behavioral Research and Technology and one of the study's authors, "that Google could determine the outcome of upwards of 25 percent of all national elections."

Epstein's paper combines a few years' worth of experiments in which Epstein and his colleague Ronald Robertson gave people access to information about the race for prime minister in Australia in 2010, two years prior, and then let the mock-voters learn about the candidates via a simulated search engine that displayed real articles.

One group saw positive articles about one candidate first; the other saw positive articles about the other candidate. (A control group saw a random assortment.) The result: Whichever side people saw the positive results for, they were more likely to vote for—by more than 48 percent. The team calls that number the "vote manipulation power," or VMP. The effect held—strengthened, even—when the

researchers swapped in a single negative story into the number-four and number-three spots. Apparently it made the results seem even more neutral and therefore more trustworthy.

But of course that was all artificial—in the lab. So the researchers packed up and went to India in advance of the 2014 Lok Sabha elections, a national campaign with 800 million eligible voters. (Eventually 430 million people voted over the weeks of the actual election.) “I thought this time we’d be lucky if we got 2 or 3 percent, and my gut said we’re gonna get nothing,” Epstein says, “because this is an intense, intense election environment.” Voters get exposed, heavily, to lots of other information besides a mock search engine result.

The team 2,150 found undecided voters and performed a version of the same experiment. And again, VMP was off the charts. Even taking into account some sloppiness in the data-gathering and a tougher time assessing articles for their positive or negative valence, they got an overall VMP of 24 percent. “In some demographic groups in India we had as high as about 72 percent.”

The effect doesn’t have to be enormous to have an enormous effect.

The fact that media, including whatever search and social deliver, can affect decision-making isn’t exactly news. The “Fox News Effect” says that towns that got the conservative-leaning cable channel tended to become more conservative in their voting in the 2000 election. A well-known effect called recency means that people make decisions based on the last thing they heard. Placement on a list also has a known effect. And all that stuff might be too transient to make it all the way to a voting booth, or get swamped by exposure to other media. So in real life VMP is probably much less pronounced.

But the effect doesn’t have to be enormous to have an enormous effect. The Australian election that Epstein and Robertson used in their experiments came down to a margin of less than 1 percent. Half the presidential elections in US history came down to a margin of less than 8 percent. And presidential elections are really 50 separate state-by-state knife fights, with the focus of campaigns not on poll-tested winners or losers but purple “swing states” with razor-thin margins.

So even at an order of magnitude smaller than the experimental effect, VMP could have serious consequences. “Four to 8 percent would get any campaign manager excited,” says Brian Keegan, a computational social scientist at Harvard Business School. “At the end of the day, the fact is that in a lot of races it only takes a swing of 3 or 4 percent. If the search engine is one or two percent, that’s still really persuasive.”

The Rise of the Machines

It’d be easy to go all 1970s-political-thriller on this research, to assume that presidential campaigns, with their ever-increasing level of technological sophistication, might be able to search-engine-

optimize their way to victory. But that's probably not true. "It would cost a lot of money," says David Shor, a data scientist at Civis Analytics, a Chicago-based consultancy that grew out of the first Obama campaign's technology group. "Trying to get the media to present something that is favorable to you is a more favorable strategy."

That's called, in the parlance of political hackery, "free media," and, yes, voters like it. "I think that generally people don't trust campaigns because they tend to have a low opinion of politicians," Shor says. "They are more receptive to information from institutions for which they have more respect." Plus, in the presidential campaign high season, whoever the Republican and Democratic nominees are will already have high page ranks because they'll have a huge number of inbound links, one of Google's key metrics.

Search and social media companies can certainly have a new kind of influence, though. During the 2010 US congressional elections, researchers at Facebook exposed 61 million users to a message exhorting them to vote—it didn't matter for whom—and found they were able to generate 340,000 extra votes across the board.

But what if—as Harvard Law professor Jonathan Zittrain has proposed—Facebook didn't push the "vote" message to a random 61 million users? Instead, using the extensive information the social network maintains on all its subscribers, it could hypothetically push specific messaging to supporters or foes of specific legislation or candidates. Facebook could flip an election; Zittrain calls this "digital gerrymandering." And if you think that companies like the social media giants would never do such a thing, consider the way that Google mobilized its users against the Secure Online Privacy Act and PROTECT IP Act, or "SOPA-PIPA."

In their paper, Epstein and Robertson equate digital gerrymandering to what a political operative might call GOTV—Get Out the Vote, the mobilization of activated supporters. It's a standard campaign move when your base agrees with your positions but isn't highly motivated—because they feel disenfranchised, let's say, or have problems getting to polling places. What they call the "search engine manipulation effect," though, works on *undecided* voters, swing voters. It's a method of persuasion.

If executives at Google had decided to study the things we're studying, they could easily have been flipping elections to their liking with no one having any idea. Robert Epstein

Again, though, it doesn't require a conspiracy. It's possible that, as Epstein says, "if executives at Google had decided to study the things we're studying, they could easily have been flipping elections to their liking with no one having any idea." But simultaneously more likely and more science-fiction-y is the possibility that this—oh, let's call it "googlemandering," why don't we?—is happening without any human intervention at all. "These numbers are so large that Google executives are irrelevant to the issue," Epstein says. "If Google's search algorithm, just through what they call 'organic processes,' ends up favoring one candidate over another, that's enough. In a country like India, that could send millions of votes to one candidate."

As you'd expect, Google doesn't think it's likely their algorithm is stealing elections. "Providing relevant answers has been the cornerstone of Google's approach to search from the very beginning. It would undermine people's trust in our results and company if we were to change course," says a Google spokesperson, who would only comment on condition of anonymity. In short, the algorithms Google uses to rank search results are complicated, ever-changing, and bigger than any one person. A regulatory action that, let's say, forced Google to change the first search result in a list on a given candidate would break the very thing that makes Google great: giving right answers very quickly all the time. (Plus, it might violate the First Amendment.)

The thing is, though, even though it's tempting to think of algorithms as the very definition of objective, they're not. "It's not really possible to have a completely neutral algorithm," says Jonathan Bright, a research fellow at the Oxford Internet Institute who studies elections. "I don't think there's anyone in Google or Facebook or anywhere else who's trying to tweak an election. But it's something these organizations have always struggled with." Algorithms reflect the values and worldview of the programmers. That's what an algorithm is, fundamentally. "Do they want to make a good effort to make sure they influence evenly across Democrats and Republicans? Or do they just let the algorithm take its course?" Bright asks.

That course might be scary, if Epstein is right. Add the possibility of search rank influence to the individualization Google can already do based on your gmail, google docs, and every other way you've let the company hook into you…combine that with the feedback loop of popular things getting more inbound links and so getting higher search ranking…and the impact stretches way beyond politics. "You can push knowledge, beliefs, attitudes, and behavior among people who are vulnerable any way you want using search rankings," Epstein says. "Now that we've discovered this big effect, how do you kill it?"

How to Rig an Election: Confessions

How to **Rig** an **Election**: Confessions of a Republican Operative...
amazon.com/How-Rig-Election-Confessions-Republican/d...

How Google results could rig an election - The Week

Rick Santorum has a Santorum problem, in that the top **Google** results when you search his name are not about the man himself, but rather about a dirty sexual neologism.
theweek.com/speedreads/453430/how-google-results-coul...

More results

How to Rig an Election | Harper's Magazine

Election rigging, Long might have ... Secret skullduggery is not even necessary these days such is the

boldness of the attempts by the GOP to "**rig elections**".
harpers.org/archive/2012/11/how-to-rig-an-election/

More results

APC planning to rig election in North - Musiliu Obanikoro ..

APC planning to **rig election** in North ... Have you forgotten so soon that **elections can** only be rigged for a ... Your Nigerian Online News Source: Nigerianeye.com ...
nigerianeye.com/2015/01/apc-planning-to-rig-election-in-n...

More results

FOCUS | How to Rig an Election - Reader Supported News

How to **Rig** an **Election**. By Victoria Collier, Harper's Magazine. 26 October 12 t was a hot summer in 1932 when Louisiana senator Huey "Kingfish" Long arranged to **rig** ...
readersupportednews.org/opinion2/277-75/14198-focus-how-to-rig-an...
More results

Electoral fraud - Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

Electoral fraud can occur at any stage in the democratic process, but most commonly it occurs during **election** campaigns, voter registration or during vote-counting.
en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Electoral_fraud
More results

How I Hacked An Electronic Voting Machine | Popular Science

What do you need to **rig** an **election**? A basic knowledge of electronics and $30 worth of RadioShack gear, professional hacker Roger Johnston reveals.
popsci.com/gadgets/article/2012-11/how-i-hacked-elec...

More results

Rodger A. Payne's Blog: Could Google Rig an Election?

I'm interested in international relations, American foreign policy, climate change, US presidential **elections**, public debate, Kansas Jayhawks basketball ...
rpayne.blogspot.com/2013/05/could-google-rig-election.html

More results

How Republicans Plan to Rig Elections in 2016

How Republicans Plan to **Rig Elections** in 2016. By Ian Millhiser, Josh Israel, ThinkProgress. 12 November 12 . ast year, Pennsylvania's Republican Gov. Tom Corbett ...

readersupportednews.org/news-section2/318-66/14492-how-republican...
More results

How to Rig an Election | Harper's Magazine - Part 4

Secret skullduggery is not even necessary these days such is the boldness of the attempts by the GOP to "**rig elections**".
harpers.org/archive/2012/11/how-to-rig-an-election/4/

More results

Proven voting fraud! Gov't programmer testifies voting ..

Rep. Tom Feeney (Fmr. Speaker of The House in Florida) employed this man from Oviedo, FL to **rig elections** and flip them 51% to 49%. Exit polling data was ...
youtube.com/watch?v=t4aKOhbbK9E
More results

Rigged USA Elections Exposed - YouTube

Computer Programmer testifies that Tom Feeney (Speaker of the Houe of Florida at the time, currently US Representative representing MY district) tried to ...
youtube.com/watch?v=JEzY2tnwExs
More results

How To Rig An Election In The United States

How To **Rig** An **Election** In The United ... But the second table can be hacked and altered to produce fake **election** totals without affecting spot check reports derived ...
whatreallyhappened.com/WRHARTICLES/rigvote.html

More results

NEW YORK POST

KYLE SMITH

NEWS

Google controls what we buy, the news we read – and Obama's policies

By Kyle Smith

March 28, 2015 | 5:00pm

Photo: EPA

MORE FROM KYLE SMITH

Ferrell and Hart's 'Get Hard' is totally limp

Depardieu's 'Welcome to New York' is a boring retelling

'The Riot Club' is an angry takedown of rich British boys

'Kimmy Schmidt' shows the irrelevance of NBC

It's 2020. The New England Patriots, winners of six straight Super Bowls, are having yet another routine meeting with the Commissioner's Office.

Deputy NFL Commissioner Tom Brady and his chief of staff, Rob Gronkowski, OK a rule change that forgives the Patriots for illegally taping other teams and deflating football over the preceding years. Meanwhile, members of the Patriots continue to happily contribute funding for the commissioner's new 45-room castle in Turks and Caicos, and Bill Belichick agrees to continue coaching the commissioner's 12-year-old son in Pop Warner football.

Would that bother anyone? Because the above is pretty much going on today, only the team is called Google and the commissioner is the president of the United States.

Mashable ▾ SOCIAL MEDIA ▾ TECH ▾ BUSINESS ▾ ENTERTAINMENT ▾ WORLD ▾ LIFESTYLE ▾ WATERCOOLER ▾ MORE ▾

Google falls from grace

Analysis

"I think Google is likely 75% fucked," Paul Kedrosky, a venture capitalist, wrote in an email to *Mashable*. "Nothing's totally fucked, but... they're at a precipice, and no one is calling them on it."

IMAGE: VIRGINIA MAYO/ASSOCIATED PRESS

BY SETH FIEGERMAN

1 DAY AGO

Analysis

"I think Google is likely 75% fucked," Paul Kedrosky, a venture capitalist, wrote in an email to *Mashable*. "Nothing's totally fucked, but... they're at a precipice, and no one is calling them on it."

Just a few years ago — heck, even a few months ago — that statement would have come

Why Google Is the New Evil Empire

By Steve Tobak / ValleyBeat / Published April 20, 2015 / FOXBusiness

Print

"We don't need you to type at all because we know where you are. We know where you've been. We can more or less guess what you're thinking about … Is that over the line?" – Google Chairman Eric Schmidt

A long time ago in a galaxy far, far away there was a Galactic Empire, a beady-eyed Emperor and his heavy-breathing sidekick, Darth Vader. Ever since, we've identified the corporate villains we

TECHNOLOGY

Inside the U.S. Antitrust Probe of Google

Key FTC staff wanted to sue Internet giant after finding 'real harm to consumers and to innovation'

Google's Eric Schmidt testified in 2011 about the Internet giant's business practices and defended how it displayed search results.
PHOTO: GETTY IMAGES

By BRODY MULLINS, ROLFE WINKLER and BRENT KENDALL

49 COMMENTS

Updated March 19, 2015 7:38 p.m. ET

WASHINGTON—Officials at the Federal Trade Commission concluded in 2012 that Google Inc. used anticompetitive tactics and abused its monopoly power in ways that harmed Internet users and rivals, a far harsher analysis of Google's business than was previously known.

The staff report from the agency's bureau of competition recommended the commission bring a lawsuit challenging three Google practices. The move would have triggered one of the highest-profile antitrust cases since the Justice Department sued Microsoft Corp. in the 1990s.

The 160-page critique, which was supposed to remain private but was inadvertently disclosed in an open-records request, concluded that Google's "conduct has resulted—and will result—in real harm to consumers and to innovation in the online search and advertising markets."

RELATED

- How Google Skewed Search Results
- Digits: Excerpts from FTC Staff Report on Google's Search Practices
- Google Dodges Antitrust Hit (Jan. 3, 2013)
- EU Prepares to Step Up Google

POPULAR ON W

1. Roadies: Survivo

JOHN CRUDELE

BUSINESS

Stock market rigging is no longer a 'conspiracy theory'

By John Crudele March 22, 2015 | 9:52pm

Photo: Getty Images

MORE FROM JOHN CRUDELE

Presidents and student-athletes are more alike than you think

Dear John: And the market taketh away

Why interest rates can't rise yet

An Apple on the wrist? Not on my watch, Tim

Dear John: Swift sailing in rigged market

The stock market is rigged.

When I started making that claim years ago — and provided solid evidence — people scoffed. Some called it a conspiracy theory, tinfoil hats and that sort of stuff. Most people just ignored me.

But that's not happening anymore. The dirty secret is out.

With stock prices rushing far ahead of economic reality over the last six or so years, more experts in the financial markets are coming to the same conclusion — even if they don't fully understand how it's being rigged or the consequences.

Ed Yardeni, a longtime Wall Street guru who isn't one of the clowns of the bunch, said flat out last week that the market was being propped up. "These markets are all rigged, and I don't say that critically. I just say that factually," he asserted on CNBC.

READ NEXT SEC chief takes aim at predatory traders in 'dark pools'