Does Google Have a Liberal Bias? Search Results for Roger Ailes Speak Volumes

By Ian Miles Cheong

The former Chairman and CEO of Fox News, Roger Ailes, has passed. He was arguably one of the most consequential individuals in media and politics in the last century, and he leaves behind a loving wife and son. He also leaves behind a cadre of loyal former employees who love and respect him.

But if you run a Google search on him, you'll find that the top results consist almost entirely of articles from several liberal publications savaging his reputation as a person. The search results — both on mobile and desktop platforms — begin with entries that are strikingly cruel and meanspirited — and raise new questions about Google's objectivity.

The top results on "Roger Ailes" include a piece by leftist activist Matt Taibbi of *Rolling Stone* declaring Ailes "one of the worst Americans ever," an article by NBC's Joy Reid on *Time* stating that Ailes "built a kingdom on exploited bias," and a Bret Stephens op-ed in the *New York Times*, that calls him "the man who wrecked conservatism." An op-ed on *The Guardian* by Arwa Mahdawi condemning Ailes for helping to "create this nightmare world" shows up alongside the other articles savaging him, way above obituaries or any neutral pieces about the man.

The *New York Times*' (surprisingly) more balanced article about Ailes' life achievements, published shortly after his passing yesterday, is buried beneath the rest. You'd have to dig deep to

look for any unbiased articles about Ailes, much less articles written in praise of his accomplishments as a political genius and the founder of Fox News, one of the most successful cable networks in history.

Regardless the opinion anyone might hold about Roger Ailes, the only thing certain is that Google's search algorithm is deeply biased in favor of publications who oppose his role as a leader in the conservative movement. To play on Roger Ailes' mischievously brilliant slogan for Fox News, Google's search results are neither fair nor balanced.

Ian Miles Cheong is a journalist and outspoken media critic. You can reach him through social media at [@stillgray on Twitter](#) and on [Facebook](#).

More

1. [Good and Ugly: Google Promotes Indoor Maps and 'Preferred Pronouns' With 'Ze/Hir' Nametags](#)

2. [Upside of the Google Ad Boycott: Creepy YouTuber Onision's Channel Is Dying](#)

3. [Google's 'Extremist' Video Crisis Could Cost the Company $1 Billion](#)

4. [Google Accused of 'Systematically' Discriminating Against Female Workers](#)

Also …

[Google Will Change Search Results When The Guardian Asks – But Not Trump](#)

[The search engine rushed to act on a request by the liberal bastion – but brushed off the president-Elect.](#)

[Kieran Corcoran](#)

-

[Hillary Clinton Ind... iana? Google's Search Manipulation for Hillary Clinton Poses Real Risks](#)

[Americans who use and depend on these services should demand more transparency in how they operate.](#)

[Sarah Rumpf](#)

-

MEDIA MATTERS CONTROLS WHAT GOOGLE SAYS AND DOES

#BrockGate: Playbook Shows Media Matters Has Access to Raw Data From Facebook, Twitter, and More

[Carter](#)

Following yesterday's exploration of the #BrockGate documents and our look at Media Matters' "Trump War Room", new findings indicate that Media Matters has access to the raw data of numerous social media platforms, plus the power to influence their understanding on what is and isn't "fake news".

The following is an excerpt from page 10 of the **#BrockGate** document:

"Media Matters has already secured access to raw data from Facebook, Twitter, and other social media sites. We have also put in place the technology necessary to automatically mine white nationalist message boards and alt-right communities for our archive.

We will now develop technologies and processes to systematically monitor and analyze this unfiltered data."

970% increase in Facebook engagement over the past 4 years, from 4.8 million in 2013 to 56.9 million in 2016

Media Matters has already secured access to raw data from Facebook, Twitter, and other social media sites. We have also put in place the technology necessary to automatically mine white nationalist message boards and alt-right communities for our archive.

We will now develop technologies and processes to systematically monitor and analyze this unfiltered data.

The earlier we identify a fake news story, the more effectively we can quash it. With this new technology at their fingertips, researchers monitoring news in real time will be able to identify the origins of a lie with mathematical precision, creating an early warning system for fake news and disinformation.

PREDICTIVE TECHNOLOGY

Bringing this data analysis to scale will also allow Media Matters to identify which individuals and outlets are the most destructive forces driving fake news, misinformation, and harassment.

Cutting-edge advances in cloud computing and machine learning will enable us to identify patterns and connections that would otherwise go under the radar. We will be able to assess where and how misinformation is likely to move, who will be affected by it, and what needs to be done to neutralize it.

But predictive technologies are only as good as the data that goes into them. The more data the system has to analyze, the richer its insights. Media Matters' already extensive 12-year archive gives this new system a big jump-start.

COLLABORATING WITH SOCIAL MEDIA PLATFORMS

Outlets that push fake news are completely dependent on Facebook to spread their lies, and ad networks like Google to fund them.

Media Matters has unique insight to help fix problems in this part of the media landscape.

After Facebook responded to our campaign by acknowledging the problem of fake news and agreeing to do something about it, we began a dialogue. It became clear from these conversations that Facebook needed our help in fully understanding the problem and identifying concrete solutions. Further, it also became clear that we had information and insight that they didn't have that was helpful in educating them on the full scope of the problem. For example, Media Matters had a detailed map of the constellation of right-wing Facebook pages that had been the biggest purveyors of fake news—as well as insight into the food chain of fake news and how it was moving through the Facebook ecosystem.

Similarly, after Google revised their terms of service in order to prohibit so-called fake news sites from using their advertising network, it was Media Matters that had the information necessary to identify 40 of the worst fake news sites to which this policy applied.

GOT FACEBOOK TO COMMIT TO FIGHTING THE RISE OF FAKE NEWS.

During the 2016 election, Facebook refused to do anything about the dangerous rise of fake news or even acknowledge their role in promoting disinformation: Mark Zuckerberg called the notion that fake news is a problem "crazy." In November, we launched a campaign pressuring Facebook to: 1) acknowledge the problem of the proliferation of fake news on Facebook and its consequences for our democracy and 2) commit to taking

Media Matters goes on to describe how they found a way to manipulate these social media platforms into thinking that they need their help. In fact, the following excerpt from the **#BrockGate** document speaks to this concern with precision:

"Out lets that push fake news are completely dependent on Facebook to spread their lies, and ad networks like Google to fund them.

Media Matters has unique insight to help fix the problems in this part of the media landscape.

After Facebook responded to our campaign by acknowledging the problem of fake news and agreeing to do something about it, we began a dialogue. It became clear form these conversations that Facebook needed our help in fully understanding the problem and identifying concrete solutions. Further, it also became clear that we had information and insight that they didn't have that was helpful in educating them on the full scope of the problem. For example, Media Matters had a detailed map of the constellation of right-wing Facebook pages that had been the biggest purveyors of fake news – as well as insight into the food chain of fake news and how it was moving through the Facebook ecosystem.

Similarly, after Google revised their terms of service in order to prohibit so-called fake news sites from using their advertising network, it was Media Matters that had the information necessary to identify 40 of the worst fake news sites to which this policy applied."

The following is a brief of summary of the findings in the document:

In the document, the group claims that they will push the Russia narrative forward, they assert that they will steal the best talent from the other left-wing outlets and consolidate

them into Shareblue (they will convince "top editorial and writing talent [to] leave competitors to join Shareblue"), they propose a paid "Twitter-like" social network for the "opposition" to collude, they discuss their "Antidote to Breitbart" and their goal of controlling platforms like Google and Facebook, and they also mention a "Trump War Room" and their goal of keeping President Trump "unpopular" and how they are actively trying to portray President Trump as a "weak, think-skinned [sic] 'loser' vulnerable to goading". In all, this is a comprehensive three-year game plan that the left hopes to implement to great effect in their effort to win votes in 2018 and take the White House in 2020.

For more information on the "Trump War Room", **read here**. Google is a rogue CIA operation to create a "liberal" government which sends its money to Eric Schmidt.

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:

> *I*n 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](#).