

MARK ZUCKERBERG AND ERIC SCHMIDT COULD BE ARRESTED FOR TREASON FOR RIGGING NATIONAL ELECTIONS SINCE 2007

RESEARCHERS AND WHISTLE-BLOWERS PROVE THAT A CARTEL OF LEFT WING SOCIAL MEDIA COMPANIES IN SILICON VALLEY HAVE BEEN USING [CIA](#) AND [STASI](#)-CREATED MASS SOCIAL MANIPULATION TECHNOLOGIES TO RIG ELECTIONS

Republicans Have No Clue About What Google Is About To Do To Them!

SHARE THIS WITH YOUR SOCIAL MEDIA -  [Share](#)



GOOGLE DOES THINGS TO YOU THAT ARE TOO TECHNICAL FOR YOU TO UNDERSTAND AND TOO DANGEROUS FOR YOU TO IGNORE!

REPUBLICANS WILL BE DESTROYED IN THE MID TERM ELECTIONS BECAUSE THEY REFUSE TO ACKNOWLEDGE GOOGLE'S CIA-LIKE TRICKS



Republicans don't do technology and they sure don't do Silicon Valley. That is why they do not understand that Google and Facebook have rigged every election since Obama.

Now Google and Facebook are pulling out all of the stops to do "it" again in the next elections.

What is the "it" that Google does?

Google uses automated technologies to manipulate the minds of hundreds of millions of Americans.

That statement alone will scare most GOP members but almost none of them will understand it and most of them will refuse to believe it.

The easiest way to make one understand the evil "it" that Google does is to watch the movie (usually on Netflix) called **THE PUSH**. This movie shows how easy it is to get people to do unnatural things or to kill without thinking about it.

Google acquired the CIA psychological warfare manuals, the CIA/IN-Q-TEL experts and billions of dollars to use the tactics in those manuals. Ask The Corbett Report, ask Attkisson, Ask Epstein the Google data researcher, ask Historian Niall Ferguson... A thousand people have said this and provided stats to prove it but the GOP does not get it!

Google has used these methods to take over the DNC and to put people in office who will steer money and power to Google.

GOP bosses: "GET A F*CKING CLUE!"

If you have not gotten the message by now, you are done. If you don't amp up your war on Google by a thousand; you are done!

You may not understand what Google does, or how they do it, but you will understand the loss of your entire candidate layout by the time the next elections are over!

Historian Niall Ferguson: Midterms Going to Be Much Worse Than GOP Can Imagine Because of Tech Giants Targeting of Conservatives

by Jim Hoft 150 Comments



Historian Niall Ferguson warned Republican lawmakers that the midterms are going to be much worse than they can imagine because of the targeting and banning of conservative sites by Facebook, Google and Twitter.


***Niall Ferguson:** The midterms are going to be worse, a lot worse. Because never again will the network platforms in Silicon Valley allow them to use them as Donald Trump's campaign used them in 2016. The sound of heads exploding on November the 9th of 2016 was deafening in California. They couldn't believe that Facebook advertising had been so vital to Trump's success. Which it was. I don't think he would have become president without Facebook. As people think more and more about this they will I think begin to grasp the power of the platforms. I think the Russia issue is a distraction from the real question.*

Via [Josh Caplan](#):

*Hoover Institution's Niall Ferguson on censorship: 'Silicon Valley will never again allow conservatives to use social networks like Trump did in 2016,' midterms could be 'a lot worse than you already think.' pic.twitter.com/UIDYDUoqqU
— Josh Caplan (@joshdcaplan) [March 15, 2018](#)*

As TGP reported [earlier](#) this month:

Conservative Publishers Hit Hard By Facebook Algorithm Changes – Gateway Pundit Hit the Hardest



Tech Giants Google and Facebook are currently purging conservative content from Facebook and YouTube — They are hiding conservative stories on Google — They are shadow-banning conservative news on all social media.

In February Facebook [launched a new algorithm](#) to ensure that conservative news would not spread on the social media platform.

This was after Facebook announced it was losing 50,000,000 user hours a day in the previous quarter.

The algorithm change caused President Donald Trump's engagement on Facebook posts to plummet a whopping 45%.

In contrast, Senators **Elizabeth Warren** (D-MA) and **Bernie Sanders** (I-VT) do not appear to have suffered a comparable decline in Facebook engagement.

Top conservative Facebook pages with daily traffic in the millions have seen 75% to 95% drop in traffic.

Young Cons, Western Journalism, SarahPalin.com, Independent Journal Review, Right Wing News, and *several others* have seen dramatic loss in traffic.

In 2016 we were one of the few conservative sites that supported candidate Trump – along with Breitbart, The Drudge Report, Infowars, Zero Hedge and Conservative Treehouse. We are proud of our efforts to report the truth that led to Trump's historic win.



In 2017 Harvard and Columbia Journalism Review found that The Gateway Pundit was the 4th most influential conservative news source in the 2016 election.

Because of this we were targeted and have seen our numbers related to Facebook and Twitter decline dramatically.

The Gateway Pundit does not rely on Facebook for our traffic numbers.

Still, we saw a significant drop in Facebook traffic in the last month.

And this past weekend Facebook shut down our traffic stream from the social media platform.

This is corrupt, if not criminal, behavior.

Meanwhile, liberal sites are doing fine.

Now this...

A new report by the far left Outline organization confirmed the conservative publishers were hit the hardest by the recent Facebook news feed changes.


The study also found the The Gateway Pundit was hit the hardest by these changes.

Via The Outline:

Facebook's January 12 announcement that it would begin to de-prioritize news publishers and their posts in users' News Feeds has had a surprisingly profound and partisan impact. According to The Outline's analysis of Facebook engagement data obtained from research tool BuzzSumo, conservative and right-wing publishers (such as Breitbart, Fox News, and Gateway Pundit) were hit the hardest in the weeks following the announcement, with Facebook engagement totals for February dropping as much as 55 percent for some, while the engagement numbers of most predominantly liberal publishers remained unaffected. Both liberal and conservative publishers of clickbait and highly polarizing content also experienced a significant drop in engagement following Facebook's News Feed de-prioritization announcement. The Outline drew these conclusions after analyzing the Facebook engagement data of 20 publishers from March 5, 2017 to February 28, 2018.


The Outline then posted results from several top US news publishers.

You can see The New York Times has not suffered by the recent changes.



But conservative news publishers were hit hard.

Here is Breitbart.com's Facebook page.



And here is The Gateway Pundit's Facebook numbers through February.




In March Facebook shut down our content. You cannot even share a Gateway Pundit story without getting a warning now. And this is after we spent tens of thousands of dollars advertising on Facebook in the past.

 GOOGLE MANIPULATES YOUR MIND AND YOUR POLITICS.png

**GOP IS INCAPABLE OF REALIZING
HOW MUCH GOOGLE'S CIA TACTICS
WILL DESTROY THEM IN THE MID-
TERMS**

THE CENSORSHIP OF CONSERVATIVES ON THE INTERNET IS APPROACHING CRITICAL LEVELS OF BAD BUT GOOGLE AND FACEBOOK ARE DOING WORSE BY TRICKING VOTERS MINDS

by [Brandon Morse](#)



Social media censorship may be entering a dark age.

Two things happened over the last few days that have me worried about the future of information distribution for conservatives on social media.

That the current corporate entities that control the major internet ports of thought are blatantly leftist is no mystery. We've seen time and again their willingness to lean into regressive, and social justice agendas to the point where they would fire an employee simply for saying men and women are different. Google will even [punish a highly popular YouTuber for exposing the nasty behavior of a social justice leader](#) to his viewers, as well as [punish him for not making a pro-Hillary Clinton video during the 2016 presidential elections](#).

Two events recently have me worried that the left's censorship of the right's commentary and opinions has gone into full overdrive, however.

The first came on Monday when I attempted to share an article written by Town Hall writer Kurt Schlichter titled "[Why Democrats Would Lose the Second Civil War, Too.](#)"

If you haven't read it yet, I suggest you click the link above and give it a once, twice, and three times over. It's a must-read, and one of the most fascinating articles I've read so far this year. The premise of the article is that should America's left further embolden itself to become violent against its political opponents to the point of a 2nd civil war — going from groups of violent radicals like Antifa, to a full-on sanctioned military strike — then the left would lose a second time, and they would lose badly.

I read the article while sitting in my car in Austin during SXSW. There's a lot to see and do there, but I couldn't stop reading the article. The moment I finished I went to share it, and....nothing. Twitter wouldn't allow me to tweet the article out.

 GOOGLE IS THE COMMIES.png

I tried tweeting out a few other things to make sure it wasn't just my signal, or maybe an error on Twitter's end. They went through just fine. A third attempt to tweet out Schlichter's article resulted in another error message. I brought this point up on Twitter, but didn't receive much of a response about it. Perhaps I was one of the few having that problem, and it wasn't censorship. At least, that's what I wanted to believe. The opposite idea was worrisome.

It wasn't until the following Thursday that I mentioned my trouble of tweeting it out in a conversation with Stacy Washington, who was also having trouble tweeting certain things.

□ Stacy Washington ✓@StacyOnTheRight

So. I'm not permitted to tweet certain things. I am getting an error message!

5:58 PM - Mar 14, 2018

- 858
- 480 people are talking about this

Twitter Ads info and privacy.

□ Brandon Morse ✓@TheBrandonMorse

I tried to tweet @KurtSchlichter's civil war article, and Twitter wouldn't let me. <https://twitter.com/stacyontheright/status/974087517514452994...>

6:59 AM - Mar 15, 2018

- 45
- 43 people are talking about this

 YOUTUBE IS THE STASI

Then NRA spokeswoman, and currently the left's public enemy number one Dana Loesch mentioned she had trouble tweeting out certain things as well.

15 Mar

□ Brandon Morse ✓@TheBrandonMorse

I tried to tweet @KurtSchlichter's civil war article, and Twitter wouldn't let me. <https://twitter.com/stacyontheright/status/974087517514452994...>

□ Dana Loesch ✓@DLoesch

I've noticed this, too.

6:59 AM - Mar 15, 2018

- 19

- [See Dana Loesch's other Tweets](#)

Three sources confirming their inability to disseminate certain bits of information.

The nature of Schlichter's article could be considered a call to violence...by anyone who didn't read it with a comprehension level past grade 3. What Schlichter wrote about, in no uncertain terms, is that in the midst of leftist groups feeling completely free to resort to violence and attempt to limit our free speech, any attempt to come to blows would end badly for everyone involved, but specifically so for blue America, currently living in a carefully temperature controlled bubble.

The left went so far as to call Schlichter crazy for this article. They wrote it off as nonsense, or the ramblings of a macho-conservative type trying to flex his muscles. Odd that for all their minimization of Schlichter and his article, they felt the need to restrict its distribution.

But perhaps Twitter didn't want any ideas of violence on either side roaming around their platform any more than it already had. Okay, but then on Wednesday, Twitter did some more censorship, this time with something that had nothing to do with violence at all.

Yesterday, I wrote on how [conservative comedian and commentator Steven Crowder and members of his crew were suspended by Twitter](#) for posting a video wherein they play a prank on a gender-fluid gathering at SXSW in Austin. Click on the link for the whole story, but the summary is that the video was taken down by Google/YouTube, and Twitter punished any of the Crowder crew for attempting to spread it around. Crowder himself was given a seven-day suspension for it.

Crowder and co. were punished for their making light of a social justice sacred cow. Apparently, poking fun at gender-fluidity crossed a very stark line for the social justice driven tech companies, and so he was punished for it.

Interestingly, while Crowder was being silenced for daring to make fun of a protected group on the left, and Schlichter's article was being restricted for his warning AGAINST becoming violent, Twitter has little problem allowing depictions of violence against Republicans.

8 Mar

□ [Patrick@TrickFreee](#)

The @NRA & @DLoesch made its ad — now this Parkland student is clapping back with an unyielding reply. #parkland #neveragain @sarahchad_ pic.twitter.com/UEEU15uRJ9

□ [Darwin Woods@darwinsforest](#)

pic.twitter.com/Ae6Awp762

11:51 PM - Mar 8, 2018

- 81
- 684 people are talking about this

Believe me, this image has been reported many times to Twitter. It remains completely available for viewing.

Twitter, Google, Facebook, et al, are private companies. They may restrict whomever they want at their leisure. However, the kinds of information they are censoring, vs the things they let flourish tell a much darker story than simple censorship.

Violence is okay, so long as it's violence against the right people.

Comedic ribbing at the expense of certain groups will not be tolerated.

Fake news is bad...but unproven leftist claims can go unchecked (until the bias becomes too obvious).

Many of these companies rely on leftist groups to police their internet. Google relies on the radical leftist group, the "Southern Poverty Law Center," among other leftist groups. Twitter has a "trust and safety council" that was accurately described as "Orwellian."

Silicone Valley is getting more and more bold about their censorship of the right every day. The question is, how long until the silencing and punishments result in more than just suspensions?

Congress Gets Silicon Valley Social Media Cartel To Admit That They Rig Elections

By Jay Warner

Google, Twitter, Facebook and Congress had it out in Washington today. What the world heard is that these companies have built hundreds of tools that actually do affect billions of people.

We learned that Russian lobbyists only spent a few hundred thousand dollars buying ads but that the DNC and Hillary Clinton spent hundreds of millions of dollars buying ads and “media impressions” from them in order to manipulate public perceptions.

The Silicon Valley companies were cagey and evasive.

Sen. Al Franken (D-Minn.) took aim at Facebook.

“How did Facebook, which prides itself on being able to process billions of data points and instantly transform them into personal connections for its user[s] somehow not make the connection that electoral ads — paid for in rubles — were coming from Russia?” he said. “Those are two data points: American political ads and Russian money, rubles. How could you not connect those two dots?”

Franken, in his inquiry, exposed the fact that the Silicon Valley companies know exactly what all of of their data is doing but they hide the facts for the sake of profiteering.

The question that Google, Twitter, Facebook and Silicon Valley must now answer is:

“How much did Hillary Clinton, Elon Musk, Debbie Wasserman Schultz’s DNC and Barack Obama pay you each to rig election news and public perceptions?”

Facebook also wasn’t willing to offer much in the form of a definitive answer when Sen. Mazie Hirono (D-Hawaii) asked the company if it felt like content on its platform had an effect on the election. *“In an election where a total of about 115,000 votes would have changed the outcome, can you say that the false and misleading propaganda people saw on your Facebook didn’t have an impact on the election?”* Hirono asked. Stretch dodged in response. *“We’re not well-positioned to judge why any one person or an entire electorate voted as it did,”* he said, purposefully avoiding answering the question.

Facebook won’t say no to accepting election-related foreign money said Facebook’s executive. Facebook admitted that it can be bought by anybody, anywhere.

Not a single one of the three tech giants would commit to supporting Sen. Amy Klobuchar (D-Minn.), Mark Warner (D-Va.) and John McCain (R-Ariz.)’s Honest Ads Act, which would require disclosures about political advertising on their platforms

By [Brian Fung](#) at the same time, exposed that Google opens, reads and studies every single document you post on Google Docs, no matter how personal or confidential it is. Imagine you’re working on a Google Doc when, seemingly out of nowhere, your ability to edit the online file gets revoked. What you see instead is an error message indicating that you’ve violated Google’s terms of service.

For anyone who stores work in the cloud, suddenly being unable to access your data — especially due to a terms of service violation — may sound scary. And it's really happening to some people, according to reports on Twitter. Rachael Bale, a wildlife crime reporter for National Geographic, said Tuesday that a draft of her story was "frozen" by Google.

Has anyone had @googledocs lock you out of a doc before? My draft of a story about wildlife crime was just frozen for violating their TOS.

— Rachael Bale (@Rachael_Bale) [October 31, 2017](#)

Others have reported similar errors.

Tfw your finalizing a piece on E. Europe post-socialist parties in Google Drive and Google removes it because it's in violation of its ToS??

— Bhaskar Sunkara (@sunraysunray) [October 31, 2017](#)

In response to some of these reports, a Google employee [tweeted](#) that the team handling Google Docs was looking into the matter. Later Tuesday, Google said in a statement that it had "made a code push that incorrectly flagged a small percentage of Google Docs as abusive, which caused those documents to be automatically blocked. A fix is in place and all users should have full access to their docs."

Although the error appeared to be a technical glitch, the fact that Google is capable of identifying "bad" Google Docs at all is a reminder: Much of what you upload, receive or type to Google is monitored. While many people may be aware that [Gmail scans your emails](#) — for instance, so that its smart-reply feature can figure out what responses to suggest — this policy extends to other Google products, too.

"Our automated systems analyze your content to provide you personally relevant product features, such as customized search results, and spam and malware detection," reads the terms of service for Google Drive, the suite of productivity tools of which Google Docs is a part. "Google's [Privacy Policy](#) explains how we treat your personal data and protect your privacy when you use Google Drive."

If you visit Google's privacy policy, you'll find that Google is up front there, too, about the data it collects.

"We collect information about the services that you use and how you use them, like when you watch a video on YouTube, visit a website that uses our advertising services, or view and interact with our ads and content," it says.

What does it mean when Google says "collect information"? [This page](#) says more:

"This includes information like your usage data and preferences, Gmail messages, G+ profile, photos, videos, browsing history, map searches, docs, or other Google-hosted content. Our automated systems analyze this information as it is sent and received and when it is stored."

Google explicitly refers to docs — albeit in a lower-case fashion — as an example of the type of content from which Google extracts information. I've asked Google for clarification on whether they actually read the contents of a person's Google Docs and will update if I get a response.

"This kind of monitoring is creepy," Bale [tweeted](#). Google, clearly, loves to spy on the voters.

Could Google, Facebook and Twitter be any bigger liars?

WHY ARE THE DEMOCRAT SILICON VALLEY COMPANIES SO FULL OF EX CIA AGENTS?

Are all of Their Business Plans Just Based On "Dirty Tricks" Campaigns And Nixon's "Rat-Fucking" Tactics?



The Democrats are Running CIA Agents as Candidates (youtube.com)

submitted 2.5 hours ago by [GizaDog](#) to [news](#) (+30|-0)

[3 comments](#) <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=aKC51CZ6sKc>

IT'S TIME TO BUST THE ONLINE TRUSTS

Anti-competitive practices by Google and Facebook made election interference possible.

By

Luther Lowe

This week some of America's most beloved internet companies will follow the footsteps of Big Tobacco and Wall Street in a dreaded rite of passage: the Capitol Hill perp walk. The top lawyers for Google, [Facebook](#) and [Twitter](#) will try their best to explain to the Senate Intelligence Committee how misinformation spread through their platforms in the months leading up to the 2016 election.

They are also likely to argue that the best response to their platforms' negligence is not government regulation. If Google and Facebook are lucky, the result will be the passage of the bipartisan Honest Ads Act, which would merely require buyers of online political advertisements to reveal their identities. This is a necessary move to increase transparency, but it is not sufficient to protect the electorate from manipulation.

Focusing on the narrow question of online advertising will only distract lawmakers from the true problem: In the absence of rigorous antitrust enforcement, the consumer internet has become too concentrated in a few dominant companies, creating easy targets for bad actors.

There is a reason Congress did not have to investigate foreign meddling after the 2008 or 2012 elections. Back then the internet was still a diverse, decentralized network. Anyone could create a website or blog to satisfy the demand for popular or niche content. This older form of online community building has largely been supplanted by tools provided by the dominant players. Facebook Groups allows people to create communities without requiring much technical skill. It does, however, require a Facebook account, meaning participants have no choice but to share their identity and their data. Today, many internet services are inaccessible unless you have joined Facebook's "community" of two billion users.

Google used to be the engine that drove the open web. In a 2004 interview, co-founder Larry Page denounced powerful intermediaries on the internet, saying that "we want you to come to Google and quickly find what you want. Then we're happy to send you to the other sites. In fact, that's the point. The portal strategy tries to own all of the information."

Over time, Google's philosophy shifted in the opposite direction, making the internet less open and pluralistic than even a few years ago. Now people are nudged to stay on Google.com. The company has committed to presenting a single "answer" to every inquiry, even ones that are subjective opinions based on sparse Google-owned content, like "best pediatrician NYC." The result has been a decline of traffic to swaths of the web.

Facebook's walled garden is even more stringent, requiring all third-party content accessed from its app to run through its frame. As web activity is drawn within the confines of these two tech giants, so is the revenue that follows.

Of every new dollar spent in online advertising last year, Google and Facebook captured 99 cents. Yet neither company has ever faced serious antitrust scrutiny in the U.S. A fleeting opportunity to foster competition came in 2011, when the Federal Trade Commission opened an investigation into Google's conduct. But the FTC closed the case in 2013 without taking meaningful action.

Regulators ostensibly decided to settle after being persuaded the marketplace was adequately competitive, but the assumptions baked into their conclusion have not aged well. When the investigation was begun in 2011, smartphones were a nascent product and Google's market share of internet search was 66%. Today, most search traffic has migrated to smartphones—nearly 4 in 5 Americans own one—where Google has 97% market share.

The economics have also changed for internet startups hoping to reinvent the web. Early-stage capital has dried up, dropping more than 40% since 2015, as investors have become pessimistic that any new Googles and Facebooks will ever be capable of disrupting the deeply entrenched incumbents.

The internet has turned into a pair of walled gardens, offering economies of scale for attackers. Ad dollars from Google products like YouTube and AdSense provide economic incentives to “content farms” that peddle misleading or outright false news. Russia Today, Moscow's official English-language television network, is a “premium partner” on YouTube, entitling it to higher shares of revenue from advertisements sold by Google. A quick estimate—multiplying standard rates of revenue-sharing by RT's view counts—suggests Google could be sending the Russians seven-figure annual payouts. Facebook has already identified at least \$100,000 spent by Russians on its platform to influence voters. Paid ads have the ability to amplify the virality of the fake content. This suggests a feedback loop optimized for mischief: monetize on Google, and spend the proceeds to propagandize on Facebook.

Policy makers can solve this problem by compelling large information firms to embrace interoperability. Instead of trying to own everything, Google could power its local searches with services like [TripAdvisor](#), [ZocDoc](#) and [Yelp](#). This would dilute Google's position as an advertising monopoly and help smaller players to compete. Facebook could allow users to export their full social graph, which would allow them to bargain for better terms from new social startups. Such efforts would diffuse information once again across the web, ensuring that future attempts at malfeasance cannot scale.

For the most egregious examples of anticompetitive conduct by a dominant internet firm, antitrust enforcers should fight to spin off newer business lines that leverage the legacy platform. If regulators find that Facebook is using its social data to foreclose competing messaging apps, they should consider structurally separating the company's social and messaging functions. Instead of steering users to its house products, Google should rely on its merit-based algorithms to power services like local search.

Requiring transparency for political advertising online is a good step, but it isn't enough. Until the structural problems in the technology markets are addressed, American voters will continue to consume information from a pair of barrels—Google and Facebook—in which we are much easier to shoot.

Senator demands Mark Zuckerberg testify before Senate committee over massive election rigging

 Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg speaks as he hosts a town hall meeting with Indian Prime Minister Narendra Modi at Facebook headquarters in Menlo Park, Calif., on Sunday, Sept. 27, 2015. (Jim Gensheimer/Bay Area News Group)

Jim Gensheimer/Bay Area News Group

Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg in 2015. (Jim Gensheimer/Bay Area News Group)

By **ETHAN BARON** | ebaron@bayareanewsgroup.com | Bay Area News Group

MENLO PARK — A U.S. senator is demanding that Facebook CEO Mark Zuckerberg testify before the Senate Judiciary Committee, after reports that a company employed by President Donald Trump’s 2016 campaign accessed profile data from more than 50 million Facebook users without their permission.

“This is a major breach that must be investigated,” Sen. Amy Klobuchar, a Minnesota Democrat and member of the committee, tweeted Saturday. “It’s clear these platforms can’t police themselves ... They say ‘trust us.’ Mark Zuckerberg needs to testify before Senate Judiciary.”

The Judiciary Committee oversees the Department of Justice and examines proposed legislation. Klobuchar is ranking member of the subcommittee on antitrust, competition policy and consumer rights. The committee, Republican led, has subpoena power.

Facebook did not immediately respond to a request for comment on the senator’s demand.

Furor over the Menlo Park social media giant's leak comes as major Silicon Valley tech firms face increasing calls for their regulation, driven by concerns about market dominance, use of their platforms by Russian trolls for election meddling, and extremist, exploitative and offensive content. Klobuchar, with fellow Democratic Sen. Mark Warner and Republican Sen. John McCain, has proposed a bill called the Honest Ads Act to force large tech companies such as Facebook, Google and Twitter to make public certain information about political ads on their platforms.

Europe in May will begin imposing strict new rules on the processing and movement of personal data, mandating "unambiguous" consent by consumers and allowing fines up to 4 percent of a company's global annual revenue.

Cambridge Analytica harvested profile information from more than 50 million Facebook users without their permission, the Associated Press reported.

On Friday evening, Facebook — with the New York Times poised to publish on Saturday an article about the massive data leak — admitted in a news release that Cambridge Analytica had years ago obtained user data from a "personality prediction" app that was downloaded by about 270,000 people.

The app developer could then access "information such as the city they set on their profile, or content they had liked, as well as more limited information about friends who had their privacy settings set to allow it," Facebook said.

The developer accessed the data through what were the proper channels at the time, but "lied to us and violated our Platform Policies by passing data (to) Cambridge Analytica," the company said.

Facebook subsequently changed the rules governing developers' use of its data, and now requires them to justify and explain proposed data collection before they're allowed to access user information or ask for it, the company said.

Cambridge Analytica denied wrongdoing, saying it had deleted the data it received from the developer. Facebook, however, said in its news release that it had received reports several days ago that not all the data was deleted.

"We are moving aggressively to determine the accuracy of these claims," the company said.

Cambridge Analytica, linked to Trump campaign strategist Steve Bannon, used the data to develop techniques that formed the foundation of its work on the Trump campaign, The New York Times and The Guardian reported.

Cambridge said in a statement none of the data it received from the developer was used for services provided to the Trump campaign.

“Cambridge Analytica only receives and uses data that has been obtained legally and fairly,” said the company, adding that it had deleted the developer’s data when it “became clear” that it broke Facebook’s terms of service.

Facebook executives took to Twitter on Saturday to argue strenuously that the data leak was not a data breach.

“This was unequivocally not a data breach,” tweeted longtime executive Andrew Bosworth. “People chose to share their data with third party apps and if those third party apps did not follow the data agreements with us/users it is a violation. No systems were infiltrated, no passwords or information were stolen or hacked.”

One of the New York Times reporters who wrote the newspaper's story on the leak responded. "Facebook officials today playing semantic — but legally very important to regulators — word games about a data 'breach,'" Nick Confessore tweeted. "But who needs to steal passwords when Facebook will just give some dude access to your profile and not even check his app out that closely?"

How Facebook And Google Exploited the Personal Data of Hundreds Of Millions Of Americans To Rig The Elections For Obama And Hillary

Palo Alto, California — Facebook and Google harvested private information from the Facebook profiles and Google user files of hundreds of millions of users without their conscious permission, making it one of the largest spy leaks in history.

While Cambridge Analytica has suddenly been pushed into the news as an “arsenal of weapons” in a culture war. The appearance of the Cambridge story is actually a John Podesta produced smoke-screen created out of desperation because of other whistle-blowers coming forward about Google and Facebook doing something a thousand times bigger and much, much worse. The Cambridge scandal is only 1% of the true Silicon Valley psychodynamic manipulation story.

Facebook and Google say that “..Every user gives us permission to use their data in any way we want to in our EULA and user disclosures..” But they are lying and manipulating semantics in order to keep their scam with the DNC from being uncovered.

Facebook, Google, Twitter, LinkedIn and Amazon have been doing something to the public that no user has ever agreed to. The manipulation of your thoughts, intents and impressions is something that no Facebook, Google, Twitter, LinkedIn and Amazon user has ever, or would ever, agree to; no matter how Big Tech company lawyers try to spin it.

This Silicon Valley Cartel of Left-Wing Lobbyists exploited the private social media activity of a huge swath of the American electorate, developing techniques that underpinned its work on President Obama's first campaign to be President. Google and Facebook made Obama the President by doing very tricky psychological data things to the voting public.

An examination by digital forensic analysts exposes the drive to bring to market a powerful and deadly new political weapon. Facebook, Google, Twitter, LinkedIn and Amazon are actively reshaping politics — and need to be brought under scrutiny from investigators and lawmakers on both sides of the Atlantic.

This image shows a man discussing the thousands of examples of election manipulation data that exist in the digital world Bryan Bedder/Getty Images

As Christopher Wylie, who helped found Cambridge and worked there until late 2014, said of its leaders: "Rules don't matter for them. For them, this is a war, and it's all fair." His comments apply to the DNC more than any other entity.

Silicon Valley works with the DNC to exploit so-called psychographic modeling techniques. But the full scale of the Silicon Valley abuse involving Americans has not been previously disclosed — and Facebook, until now, has not acknowledged it.

The DNC pays Facebook, Google, Twitter, LinkedIn and Amazon to acquire the personal information through intermediaries that Facebook, Google, Twitter, LinkedIn and Amazon know to be DNC processors. Facebook and Google are lying when they claimed to have "thought that they were only collecting it for academic purposes."

Most savvy digital insiders know that Facebook, Google, Twitter, LinkedIn and Amazon are a facade. "This was a scam — and a fraud," agreed Paul Grewal, a vice president and deputy general counsel at the social network, said in a statement to The Times earlier on Friday.

The documents also raise new questions about Facebook, which is already grappling with intense criticism over the spread of Russian propaganda and fake news. The data Cambridge collected from profiles, a portion of which was viewed by The Times, included details on users' identities, friend networks and "likes." Only a tiny fraction of the users had agreed to release their information to a third party.

How Facebook, Google, Twitter, LinkedIn and Amazon Are Reading Voters' Minds In Order To Rig Election Dynamics

The lucrative new world of political data was created by Silicon Valley to try to sell its dying services to folks with government budgets. The DNC's Silicon Valley Cartel is using inherent psychological traits to affect voters' behavior and has assembled a team of psychologists, CIA PsyOps specialists, IN-Q-TEL spy experts and data scientists to exploit these resources for left-wing candidates.

Building psychographic profiles on a national scale required data that only a Facebook or a Google could wrangle. The Silicon Valley Cartel has the cash to easily gather this material. Traditional analytics firms used voting records and

consumer purchase histories to try to predict political beliefs and voting behavior.

But those kinds of records were useless for figuring out whether a particular voter was, say, a neurotic introvert, a religious extrovert, a fair-minded liberal or a fan of the occult. Those were among the psychological traits that Google, Facebook and The DNC Cartel found would provide a uniquely powerful means of designing political messages and taking an active hold of voters minds. Researchers have developed a technique to map personality traits based on what people had liked on Facebook. The researchers paid users small sums to take a personality quiz and download an app, which would scrape some private information from their profiles and those of their friends, activity that Facebook permitted at the time. The approach, the scientists said, could reveal more about a person than their parents or romantic partners knew.

What is the bottom line here?

Facebook, Google, Twitter, LinkedIn, Amazon and The Silicon Valley Cartel are raping your minds for political control. It is almost impossible for you to understand how they are doing it but it has now been proven that they ARE doing it. If you care about your right to vote then you must care that a group of companies have taken part of your rights, and rigged election outcomes, without your knowledge or permission!



An email from Dr. Kogan to Mr. Wylie describing traits that could be predicted. Facebook has a capability list ten times larger that it offered to the DNC executives