

Antitrust should be used to break up partisan tech giants like Facebook, Google

By Selwyn Duke, contributor



© Getty Images

How much face time will your news story get on Facebook? How many eyes will ogle it on Google? Too often, this is apparently determined not by whether the story is “fake” news or newsworthy, but by whether it’s politically correct. And it’s time to break up the Internet’s left-wing, information-conduit oligopoly.

If “knowledge is power” and “The pen is mightier than the sword,” entities controlling what pens you see are powerful indeed. C that Facebook and Google “account for 75% of all the referrals major news and entertainment sites now receive,” [according](#) to a Politico report in July.

ADVERTISEMENT

Facebook [boasts](#) a 40 percent share of the social media market and 1.5 billion users worldwide, making this Internet “nation” more populous than any country on Earth. [Upwards](#) of 40 percent of American adults get news from the site.

Google [accounts](#) for 64 percent of all U.S. desktop search queries. In Europe, the figure is a [whopping](#) 90 percent. The company also owns YouTube, the world’s most popular video-sharing website.

How is this power used? Earlier this year, ex-Facebook employees [admitted](#) they routinely suppressed conservative news and were ordered to place relatively unpopular but company-favored (read: liberal) stories in their “trending” news section. And trending means mind-bending because people are influenced by what’s “popular.” Make an article appear more or less so and you can cause some readers to embrace it as “consensus” or dismiss it as a fringe view. It snowballs, too: prominent placement makes a piece more popular, which makes it more prominent, which makes it yet more popular, which makes...well, you get the idea.

Now the social-media site — [dubbed](#) “Fakebook” by many — [states](#) it will label and essentially bury “fake news,” using as fact-checkers liberal outlets such as Snopes.com, Politifact and ABC, which themselves have peddled falsehoods (see [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#)).

And Google? In its June piece “The New Censorship,” U.S. News and World Report lists nine blacklists Google maintains. The site asks, “How did Google become the internet’s censor and master manipulator, blocking access to millions of websites?” Moreover, the search giant [announced](#) last year that it was considering ranking sites not just based on popularity (which reflects the market), but on “truthfulness” — as determined, of course, by Google’s [Democrat-donating](#) techies.

Blacklisting can be devastating, too, as what befell two normal businesses illustrates. As U.S. News also reported, “Heading into the holiday season in late 2013, [an online handbag business](#) suffered a 50 percent drop in business because of blacklisting. In 2009, it took [an eco-friendly pest control company](#) 60 days to leap the hurdles required to remove Google's warnings, long enough to nearly go broke.”

Likewise, stigmatize a media website with blacklisting or, more deviously, by burying its result on the eighth search page (Web users generally examine only the first few pages), and you could dry up its revenue — and readership. Thus, this tactic sends politically incorrect views to Internet Siberia, where few will hear the dissenters except their fellow Google-gulag inmates.

One victim was combative PC Magazine columnist John Dvorak, whose website and podcast site were [blacklisted](#) in 2013. This prompted him to ask, “When Did Google Become the Internet Police?” Answer: a long time before. In 2006, the company [terminated](#) its news relationship with some conservative news sites critical of Islam.

So is it time to break up Facebook and Google? In principle, I may object to such things. But here’s the issue: if antitrust laws are unjust, eliminate them. But if we’re going to have them, they should be applied where most needed. As for Google, most people admits it’s “a de facto monopoly.” Libertarian tech investor Peter Thiel and ex-Microsoft CEO Steve Ballmer both think so, and

even "Google chairman Eric Schmidt has admitted "we're in that area."

The breakup of AT&T's Bell System was mandated in 1982. That came even without Bell denying service to people, blocking their calls or hiding their phone numbers based on the content of their conversations. The Internet and social media may be more like a [party line](#), but that doesn't mean they should reflect only the Democrat Party line.

How The Silicon Valley Tech Cartel Rapes

American Innovation

By Allison Hunter

I interviewed Silicon Valley's inventors. The stories are all tragically similar:

"I worked 8 to 10 hours a day, six days a week for over 40 years and other's made billions of dollars off of my work after they came by to see how to copy it...."

"For those who say the creators should reap the benefits of their work and innovations, where are my benefits of my work? These same men came, copied, stole and laughed off any rebuke..."

*"Sony, Google and Kleiner Perkins owners and bosses dated me, (and f*cked me in so many other ways), solicited me, had me to their*

homes, came to my offices, and invited me to "show them my technology so they could see about 'investing' their venture capital" funds in my companies. In 90% of the cases they came, they saw, they copied, they blockaded and they made billions of dollars."

"Not a single one of these Silicon Valley Cartel tech mobsters had a single bit of previous experience in the technologies that I had spent decades on before they copied them. They have been proven to have had no knowledge of, or full understanding of the technologies prior to our meetings. They simply copied others and never ever paid for the rights to copy..."

The biggest thief is Google. Google put it's lawyer: Michelle Lee, in charge of the U.S. Patent Office so that she could help blockade any patents that Google didn't want Silicon Valley inventors to get. The New York Times published an article about how Google's Larry Page is "obsessed" with sneaking around at tech events and stealing inventors technologies. Google seems to have the moral code of an alley rat.

The Silicon Valley tactic involves sending an MBA graduate known as a "window-man" to harvest an entrepreneurs technology. In Silicon Valley these MBA idea bandits are called "Venture Capitalists" or "VC's". The VC comes to an entrepreneur, or has the entrepreneur send in a powerpoint, so that the VC can send the data off to a process called "due diligence". At Kleiner Perkins and Draper Fisher, two highly self-promoted VC firms, "due diligence" often involves figuring out how the VC can copy the technology without getting caught. The VC's have another person in their group copy the entrepreneur, rename the technology, author character assassination blog articles while black-listing the original entrepreneur and roll out their clone technology.

The VC's do not even use their own money. They scam retirement funds and pension aggregates into given them your parents money to play with and Ponzi around their little schemes.

The facts, federal filings, dated and signed NDA's prove that many of these big tech companies were absolutely not a matter of coincidence or "Silicon synergy" as Kleiner Perkins claims. It is clear that a number of these big companies came from outsiders who were not yuppie-enough, white frat-house-bro enough or Elite-family connected enough to get into the old boys club. The Eric Schmidt's, The Vinod Khosla's and the John Doerr simply said "Steal it" when they saw what they wanted.

The copy cat VC's make certain that the entrepreneur is bankrupted and defamed so that he can never get funded, can't compete and has no way to get the two million dollars in legal fees that it costs to sue the Silicon Valley thieves. The Silicon Valley Cartel has warned every high technology law firm that if they ever represent one of these ripped-off entrepreneurs then that law firm will get black-listed from any future contracts with Silicon Valley. This has forced many entrepreneurs to turn to Russian and Chinese law firms who will gladly sue Silicon Valley.

Of over 320 million Americans, only these thirty, or so, men, from the same club, frat houses and social meeting spots engaged in these same heinous activities over and over. These are the same exact men whose fraternity houses were involved in the take-what-you-want college rape scandals. These are also the same exact men who are involved in the high-end prostitute scandals. Notice a trend?

They are all connected to the same handful of people at Sony, Google, and Kleiner Perkins. The publicly available hacks of all of their emails and stock records prove that they conspired and colluded together. The forensic evidence proves that they all paid cash to the same small group of politicians in exchange for crony payola.

The FTC, SEC and Attorney General needs to bring crushing indictments against John Doerr, Elon Musk, Tim Draper, Larry Page, Eric Schmidt, Ira Erhenpreis, Steve Westly and the rest of

the Silicon Valley Cartel for anti-trust and intellectual property theft mill operations. These men are a sad vestige of the past criminality that the previous administration promoted. The future must hold better for America.

=====

NATIONAL CALL FOR ANTI-TRUST LAWSUITS AGAINST PARTISAN SOCIAL MEDIA COMPANIES

Antitrust should be used to break up partisan tech giants like Facebook, Google, Gawker-Univision

By Selwyn Duke, contributor

-



© Getty Images

How much face time will your news story get on Facebook? How many eyes will ogle it on Google? Too often, this is apparently determined not by whether the story is “fake” news or newsworthy, but by whether it’s politically correct. And it’s time to break up the Internet’s left-wing, information-conduit oligopoly.

If “knowledge is power” and “The pen is mightier than the sword,” entities controlling what pens you see are powerful indeed. C that Facebook and Google “account for 75% of all the referrals major news and entertainment sites now receive,” [according](#) to a Politico report in July.

ADVERTISEMENT

Facebook [boasts](#) a 40 percent share of the social media market and 1.5 billion users worldwide, making this Internet “nation” more populous than any country on Earth. [Upwards](#) of 40 percent of American adults get news from the site.

Google [accounts](#) for 64 percent of all U.S. desktop search queries. In Europe, the figure is a [whopping](#) 90 percent. The company also owns YouTube, the world's most popular video-sharing website.

How is this power used? Earlier this year, ex-Facebook employees [admitted](#) they routinely suppressed conservative news and were ordered to place relatively unpopular but company-favored (read: liberal) stories in their "trending" news section. And trending means mind-bending because people are influenced by what's "popular." Make an article appear more or less so and you can cause some readers to embrace it as "consensus" or dismiss it as a fringe view. It snowballs, too: prominent placement makes a piece more popular, which makes it more prominent, which makes it yet more popular, which makes...well, you get the idea.

Now the social-media site — [dubbed](#) "Fakebook" by many — [states](#) it will label and essentially bury "fake news," using as fact-checkers liberal outlets such as Snopes.com, Politifact and ABC, which themselves have peddled falsehoods (see [here](#), [here](#) and [here](#)).

And Google? In its June piece "The New Censorship," U.S. News and World Report lists nine blacklists Google maintains. The site asks, "How did Google become the internet's censor and master manipulator, blocking access to millions of websites?" Moreover, the search giant [announced](#) last year that it was considering ranking sites not just based on popularity (which reflects the market), but on "truthfulness" — as determined, of course, by Google's [Democrat-donating](#) techies.

Blacklisting can be devastating, too, as what befell two normal businesses illustrates. As U.S. News also reported, "Heading into the holiday season in late 2013, [an online handbag business](#) suffered a 50 percent drop in business because of blacklisting. In 2009, it took [an eco-friendly pest control company](#) 60 days to leap the hurdles required to remove Google's warnings, long enough to nearly go broke."

Likewise, stigmatize a media website with blacklisting or, more deviously, by burying its result on the eighth search page (Web users generally examine only the first few pages), and you could dry up its revenue — and readership. Thus, this tactic sends politically incorrect views to Internet Siberia, where few will hear the dissenters except their fellow Google-gulag inmates.

One victim was combative PC Magazine columnist John Dvorak, whose website and podcast site were [blacklisted](#) in 2013. This prompted him to ask, “When Did Google Become the Internet Police?” Answer: a long time before. In 2006, the company [terminated](#) its news relationship with some conservative news sites critical of Islam.

So is it time to break up Facebook and Google? In principle, I may object to such things. But here’s the issue: if antitrust laws are unjust, eliminate them. But if we’re going to have them, they should be applied where most needed. As for Google, most people admits it’s “a de facto monopoly.” Libertarian tech investor Peter Thiel and ex-Microsoft CEO Steve Ballmer both think so, and even “Google chairman Eric Schmidt has admitted “we’re in that area.”

The breakup of AT&T’s Bell System was mandated in 1982. That came even without Bell denying service to people, blocking their calls or hiding their phone numbers based on the content of their conversations. The Internet and social media may be more like a [party line](#), but that doesn’t mean they should reflect only the Democrat Party line.