

Exposing the Deception and Fraud Committed by Google: A Special Interview With Dr. Robert Epstein

By: Dr. Joseph Mercola

JM: Dr. Joseph Mercola

RE: Dr. Robert Epstein

JM: Welcome everyone. This is Dr. Joseph Mercola helping you take control of your health. Today we are honored to be joined by Dr. Robert Epstein who received his PhD on Psychology from Harvard in 1981 and was the former editor in chief at Psychology Today and he now serves as a senior research psychologist for the American Institute of Behavioral Research and Technology. From our perspective, he's really exposing the fraud, deception and manipulation that Google has been doing for at least the last decade. We're going to have a really engaging discussion. It's going to open your eyes.

JM: I really wasn't quite aware of Dr. Epstein's work prior to our interview, but I'm just really impressed with the knowledge he's uncovered about the surreptitious behavior of Google. Welcome and thank you for joining us today.

RE: Sure. It's my pleasure.

JM: We're about the same age and we've both written about the same number of books and we've both been targeted and censored by Google. I'm wondering if, and I hope to have a really long engaging discussion on this and I wanted just to give people an idea of where you're coming from, what your personal experience was with Google and I believe it started from you writing how they were manipulating an election in 2012 and then the blow back started to happen. If my details are incorrect, certainly update them and tell us how this whole journey started. It was about eight years ago, I believe.

RE: Sure. Well, in 2012 actually January 1st, it was New Year's Day, I received some emails from Google saying that my website contained malware and that they were somehow blocking access. This means I had gotten onto one of Google's blacklists. My website did contain some malware. It was pretty easy to get rid of, but it turns out it's hard to get off of a Google blacklist. That's a big problem. I started looking at Google just a little bit differently. I wondered first of all, number one, why were they notifying me about this rather than some government agency or some nonprofit organization? Why was a private company notifying me?

RE: In other words, who made Google sheriff of the internet? Second, I learned that they had no customer service department, which seemed very, very strange so if you have a problem with Google, then you have a problem because they don't help you solve the problem. I learned also that although you can get onto a blacklist in a split second, it can take weeks to get off a blacklist. There have been businesses that have gotten onto their blacklists and have gone out of business while they're trying to straighten out the problem.

RE: The thing that really caught my eye was because I've been a programmer my whole life, I couldn't figure out how they were blocking access to my website, not just through their own products, for example, not just through google.com the search engine or through Chrome, which is their browser, but through Safari, which is an Apple product, through Firefox, which is a browser run by Mozilla, which is a nonprofit organization. How was Google somehow blocking access through so many different means? The point is I just started to get more curious about the company and later in 2012, I happened to be looking at a growing literature, which was about the power of search rankings to impact sales.

RE: This was in the marketing field and it just was astonishing. In other words, if you could push yourself up one more notch in their search results, that could make the difference between success or failure for your company or it could mean a lot more income. It turns out that this initial research was saying that people really trust those higher ranked search results. I simply asked a question. I wondered whether if people trust those higher rank search results, if I could use search results to influence people's opinions, maybe even their votes.

RE: That's where everything got started because early 2013 I started doing experiments, randomized controlled experiments to see whether I could use search results that are biased somehow rather to shift people's thinking, opinions, and even their votes. I was completely, completely, completely shocked by what I found.

JM: Wow. It sounds like your experience with the malware notification from Google and them blocking you from these other platforms really was independent of your investigation of them. They just serendipitously or coincidentally targeted you for some reason or even mistakenly. Did you ever determine how they were able to do that from a...?

RE: Yes, I did. In fact, in 2016 I published a lengthy investigative article for U.S. News & World Report, which is called The New Censorship, and it was about nine of Google's blacklists. I explained exactly how this works and exactly how they block access to websites and exactly how they're able to block access even on other people's browsers such as Safari and Firefox. Yeah, I did eventually work all that out and it's genius on their part. It's genius what they do, but it's also very, very frightening because basically, well, as you know, they have the power and not just to remove you from search results or demote you in search results or to block access to YouTube videos because YouTube is part of Google, of course.

RE: I'm studying YouTube videos right now. They can block access to websites, millions of websites. In fact, they do block access to millions of websites every day. That's their biggest blacklist called their Quarantine list. On January 31st, 2009 for 40 minutes, Google blocked access to the entire internet. I'm not making that up by the way. That was reported by the guardian and Google did not deny it and just recently for I think 11 minutes, they blocked access to every website in Japan. They have power, which it boggles the mind and they actually use the power that they have to serve their purposes, which are sometimes monetary, sometimes political.

JM: Yeah. I think if we can just summarize and then I'm going to let you go really deep in each one of these is they have three powers. One is that they are a surveillance agency, second is that they censor as you just alluded to, and then thirdly and perhaps most importantly they manipulate, which the implications of that are just profound. You've got some shocking information to share and you, I think aptly called Google, the GSA, the Google Surveillance and Ad agency. Why don't you take it from there? Because I think it's just a brilliant analysis.

RE: Well, sure. We call Google Google, and it's a cool word. It's a misspelling of a word invented by a mathematician that was meant to indicate one with a hundred zeros after it. Very large number. So Google means very large number. Again, they spelled it a little differently, but that's the way they chose to name the company. Google itself, that name doesn't tell you what they actually do. Now, Kentucky Fried Chicken, that tells you what the company does, right? Apple Computers tells you what the company does, but Google doesn't. If you really wanted to have the full name of the company, it would have to be GSA because surveillance is actually what they do.

RE: All of the tools that you use that are Google's tools you may think they serve this purpose or that purpose, but from Google's perspective, they're just surveillance tools. That's all they are. They dress them up in various ways. The search engine itself, we think of as users as a search engine that's free. If from their

perspective, it's just another surveillance tool, Google Wallet, Google Docs, Google Drive, YouTube, these are surveillance platforms. In other words, from their perspective, the value that these tools have is it gives them more information about you. Surveillance is what they do. Now where do they get their money from? Almost all of their money comes from advertising.

RE: Because they take the information that they've obtained about you and your family and your children and they monetize it more or less, you could say they sell it, they put the vendors in touch with you based on what they know about you, and as a result, now make more than \$130 billion a year doing so. Really the company, if we wanted to name it like Kentucky Fried Chicken, it would be called GSA or Google Surveillance and Advertising. Surveillance is what they do, advertising is how they make their money. Now there are three big areas of threat, however, to us as individuals to us as citizens of a country, and you mentioned them.

RE: The first of course is that there's surveillance, which I've just talked about a little bit and second is the censorship because they decide what people are going to see or not see. That's not just people in the US, that's two and a half billion people around the world. That number will soon be over four billion. They decide what you're going to see or not see. I can tell you more about that. Then the third area is the one I study in my experimental research, and that's manipulation.

RE: To me, that's the scariest area because as it turns out that Google is shaping the opinions and the thinking and the beliefs and the attitudes and the purchases and the votes of billions of people around the world without anyone knowing that they're doing so except a handful of people like me and perhaps even more shocking without leaving a paper trail for authorities to trace. They're using new techniques of manipulation that have never existed before in human history and they are for the most part, subliminal. Now, that was a scary term that the few people used to talk about a lot.

RE: They used to talk about a movie theater in New Jersey that put in subtle signals into the movie suggesting that people buy more Coke and buy more popcorn and supposedly people did some. That kind of subliminal manipulation turns out doesn't really work very well. The point is, what I've stumbled onto are a whole set of techniques that Google has developed that work extremely well. I can give you some numbers when we start to talk about specifics here, but these are invisible effects, so they're subliminal in that sense, but they don't produce tiny shifts. They produce enormous shifts in people's thinking, very rapidly.

RE: Literally, some of the techniques that I've discovered are among the largest behavioral effects ever discovered in the behavioral sciences. In other words, they're very, very powerful new forms of influence. First one I discovered was early 2013 but at this point I've discovered about a dozen of these and I'm just currently setting, I think seven or eight of them simultaneously. Trying to understand them, quantify them. It's a long process and I'm always just first playing catch up because I'm sure that what I've discovered is the tip of the iceberg. I'm sure the capabilities that Google has really go beyond what I've been able to discover so far.

JM: Yeah, and the world deeply appreciates that or if not, currently they will because you've uncovered some really amazing information and largely because you have the training to do it. You're really well trained. You got your PhD in Harvard in psychology, so you've got the tools and the disciplines to analyze this. Why don't you describe some of the experiments you performed and elaborate on the amazing power that this tool has to manipulate and shift people's perceptions?

RE: Sure. Well, the first effect I discovered, it's called SEME, S-E-M-E, which stands for search engine manipulation effect. I discovered this in early 2013. The basic experiment is pretty straight forward and I should point out that all of these experiments meet the very highest standards of scientific integrity. They're

randomized, they're double-blind, they're counterbalanced, they're controlled, etc. I know how to do good research and I've used the highest standards in conducting these experiments. In the simplest experiment, basic one, people are randomly assigned to one of three groups. Now, who are the people, first of all?

RE: Well, in the first experiments that I ran, I had small groups in Southern California, but they were very diverse. They weren't college sophomores. In other words, I had tried to match demographic characteristics of the US voting population because this was a study about voting. I had people of all ages and all ethnicities and balanced for gender, and so on and so forth. I really did try to make them representative of this voting population, although they were all from the San Diego area initially in the early experiments, and they're randomly assigned to one of three groups. One group, they're going to end up seeing search results that are biased in favor of one political candidate.

RE: The second group, they're going to see the search results that are biased in favor of that candidate's opponents or the other political candidate. The third group, they're going to be seeing search results that are not biased, they're all mixed up. That's the control group. Where it works is we ask our participant a bunch of questions. We give them some very, very basic information, a short paragraph about each candidate. We then ask, who do you trust? Who do you like? Who would you vote for if you had to vote today? Questions like that.

RE: Then we let them do a search and they're using our search engine, which is called Kadoodle. Kadoodle looks and works exactly like Google does and we're using, it turns out real search results that we got from Google and real webpages. This is very important. We're using real search results, real webpages. The only difference between the three groups is the order in which they see the search results. Everything else is the same. It's just the order that's changing in the three groups. After they search for up to 15 minutes and again, they're clicking on search results, they're reading articles, they can move back and forth between the different pages in search results.

RE: Again, it works exactly like Google. After up to 15 minutes of searching, we ask them those questions again. In other words, we say, "Okay, who do you like? Who do you trust? Who would you vote for?" Questions like that to see if there's any shift in their thinking and in their voting preferences. Now I had predicted when we first did this that we would get a shift because I thought people do trust higher ranked search results, and of course we had biased the search results so that if in that first group, if someone was clicking on a high ranking search result, that would connect them to a webpage which made one candidate look much better than the other.

RE: We'd rated all the webpages before we ran the experiment. I thought, well maybe people would trust that because it's near the top of the list, and maybe that would produce a shift in their opinion, their thinking and maybe their voting preference. I predicted we could get a shift in voting preferences of two to 3%, that was my prediction. I was way off. We got in that first experiment, a shift of 48% which I thought must be an error because that's crazy. One search and we get a shift of 48%? Let's put this another way, before they've done the search, we look at how they answer the questions and they're basically split 50-50 and then after the search we look again at the answers to those questions and then we get this enormous shift.

JM: This was for both candidates, either way?

RE: Yeah, we can push them either way. Exactly. They're randomly assigned to the three groups. We're pushing them any way we want. Exactly. That's what makes us so important. I should note here that in almost all of our experiments, especially those early ones, we deliberately used undecided voters. That's the key. You can't easily push the opinions or voting preferences of people who are partisan, who are strongly committed to one party or another, but people who are undecided, those are the people who are very vulnerable. In our experiments, we always find a way to use undecided voters.

RE: In these early experiments, the way we guaranteed that our voters were undecided was we used people from the US as our participants, but the election that we chose was the 2010 election for the prime minister of Australia. They're real candidates, a real election, real search results, real webpages, and of course, because our participants were from the US they were not familiar with the candidates. In fact, that's why before they do the search, we get this almost perfect 50-50 split regarding who they're going to vote for because they don't know these candidates, they don't know them at all. The information that they're getting from the search, that's presumably is why we're going to get a shift.

RE: It can only be happening because of the information they're getting from the search, and of course if there's a difference between the groups, which there was, then that's only happening because of the difference in the way we order search results. That first experiment was astonishing in producing such a big shift, but there was another thing that I noticed and that is that very few people seemed to realize that they were seeing biased search results. This is where it starts to get a little scary because think about it, if I can produce big shifts and people don't even realize they're seeing bias search results, then this is an invisible manipulation.

RE: Second experiment, we got a 63% shift, third experiment, also another very large shift. What we were doing as we move from experiment to experiment is we were trying to see whether we could fool more and more people into thinking that these are just average search results that are unbiased. What we did was a little bit of masking. Let's say it's, I don't know, Clinton and Trump, which it wasn't of course in those early experiments, but let's say it's Clinton and Trump. What that means is that in group one you might see pro-Clinton, pro-Clinton, pro-Clinton, pro-Clinton, right? But we did some masking.

RE: Just to confuse people a little bit, we did pro-Clinton, Clinton, Clinton, Trump, Clinton, Clinton, Clinton, Clinton, and so on in group one. Then again in the other group, the other bias group, we would have Trump, Trump, Trump, Clinton, Trump, Trump, Trump. Just mix it up a little bit. We call this masking and it turns out by just doing a little bit of masking, we could fool everybody. In other words, we could get enormous shifts in opinions and voting preferences, enormous shifts with no one, no one able to detect the bias in the search results we were showing them. This is where, again, it starts to get scary. Scariest still is when we moved on to do a national study, our first national study of more than 2000 people in all 50 states.

RE: Now we're out of San Diego at this point so we're done with that. Again, very large shift, almost no one aware of the bias in the search results, but because at this point we have thousands of people, we can now look at demographic effects, we can now look at subgroups. When you have that many people, you are going to find a few people who can see the bias, and to me this is the scariest thing of all. The very small number of people who can see the bias in the search results, they shift even farther in the direction of the bias, even farther. In other words, merely being able to detect the bias doesn't protect you from its effects.

JM: Fascinating. I have some questions on how the design of the study, just for clarification. You had a list of webpages, I would assume it was somewhere around 10 or so pages with the typical Google strategy and the only thing you shifted was the order of those, so they were the same pages, is that correct?

RE: Same search results, same pages. The only thing that's changing is the order of the search results. That's right.

JM: Okay. I just wanted to confirm that before my next question, which is your best guess as to the mechanism of what happened? I believe that design of the study allowed for only 15 minutes to review, so it would seem since there's a load of information on there, if it's a candidates' webpage, they can read just

one page for 15 minutes. Do you think it was because they trusted the objectivity of the search and only clicked on the first few and didn't have an opportunity to review the rest? Did that cause a distortion?

RE: Well, we looked at that very carefully. That's a very important issue, and what we found is that there's a pattern of clicks which matches the pattern of clicks, which had been found previously in very large studies, not our team, but other people have looked at. The pattern of clicks in millions of searches, literally millions of searches. The pattern of clicks is basically this, that 50% of all clicks go to the top two items and 95% of all clicks go to the first page of search results. The point is the pattern of clicks that we got in our experiments matched perfectly the pattern of clicks that had been found in studies that just look at patterns of clicks involving millions of searches.

RE: It's that pattern of clicks that's key. In other words, you're right, people are just spending most of their time clicking on and reading content that comes from high ranking search results. If those high ranking search results favor one candidate, that's pretty much all they see and that impacts their opinions and their voting preferences. Yeah, you're right. It just has to do with what people click on. Now we also later, much later did experiments trying to figure out why people click mainly on those high items and why they trust them so much. All right. Here, I won't bore you with the details because it would take too long, but the point is that it turns out that this is a conditioning phenomenon.

RE: We are basically rats in a skinner box. My doctorate from Harvard by the way, was with B. F. Skinner. I was his last doctoral student there. I know, very ironic.

JM: [inaudible 00:26:40].

RE: Yeah, and basically we're all rats in a skinner box because this is the way it works. Almost all the searches that we conduct are for pretty simple things, for example I recently flew to Boston and I don't use Google, no one should ever use Google, but using another search engine I typed in "Boston weather" and what comes up right at the top of the search is just all the numbers describing Boston weather or a website to AccuWeather, Boston weather. The point is most of the searches we conduct are routine searches for simple things. What is the capital of Iowa? I don't even know, but whatever it is, it's going to turn up right at the top of the list.

RE: Over and over again we are conditioned to learn that what's at the top is better, what's at the top is truer. As a result, when the day comes, when we type in something a little more vague, like "What's the best restaurant in Las Vegas?" Or, "Where should I go on vacation?" Or, "Who should I vote for?" Or, "Who's the best candidate?" You see what I'm saying? When the day comes, when you type in something a little more open ended, that doesn't have a clear answer, the fact is we still trust what's at the top of the list. That's why the opinions shift so dramatically because that trust has been conditioned every single day. It never stops.

RE: That conditioning never stops. SEME, the search engine manipulation effect is a list effect and scientists have been studying list effects for over a hundred years, but it's a list effect with a difference because it's supported by a daily regimen of operant conditioning and that regimen never stops. The training never stops.

JM: Reinforced continuously.

RE: Correct.

JM: Yeah. That is absolutely fascinating, but some people could be, the immediate response was, so what? Well, tell us the implications of this because they are beyond profound and frightening as to the impact that this behavior shifting can have.

RE: Well, so-

JM: Behavior shifting can have.

RE: Well, "So what?" is in fact a good response because you could say, all right, well, okay, so Google has this power presumably, in other words, especially in an election, if they actually presented people with search results that were biased in favor of one candidate or for that matter, day by day, if they were presenting search results that were biased in favor of one dog food or one restaurant chain or whatever it may be. I mean, think of all the tens of thousands of things we search for, if they were presenting us with search results that were systematically biased, Wow, that would be a problem, right? But are they? See that's a separate question. They have the power, do they use the power? That's the question.

RE: So in 2015 a couple of things happen. One is I published the findings from my early experiments, first five experiments in the proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. Now that's a pretty prestigious place to publish something. I mean it's hard to publish in there. And that particular paper, by the way, last time I checked, had been downloaded or accessed from the website of the National Academy of Sciences more than 250,000 times. Now I've never in my whole career seen anything like that. I mean, if you get a few hundred downloads or a few thousand, that's good. But 250,000, that's a lot. So there's definitely an interest here.

RE: So I published that in 2015 and also got a phone call from the Attorney General of Mississippi. who recently ran for governor there and lost by the way. He had sued Google and Google had sued him back, literally had sued him as an individual. So he was in this big battle with Google and he was up for re-election as attorney general and he was very concerned. He was wondering whether Google could somehow mess with the votes in Mississippi. And I said, "Oh yeah, quite easily." And he wanted to know how and I explain it to him and so on. And then he said, "but how would we know if they're doing it?"

RE: Okay. That just lit my head on fire because I mean from that moment on, I just became obsessed. And then he said that in law enforcement, he said what they would do is they would use a bot or sock puppet, they're called, fake people and we would collect data coming into fake people and we would analyze the data. And I said, well, I said to him, "General Hood," you address an attorney general as general, which is kind of funny. "General Hood, I said, that won't work." "Why not?", he said. I said, "Because Google has a profile on all of us. The profiles are immensely large." We can talk about that if you want when we talk about surveillance some more, I mean people will be shocked, just shocked to know how big these profiles are.

RE: I said, "so the point is if you set up a bot or a sock puppet, they know it's not real, it's not a real person. So they won't and they personalize results, so they'll be sending non-biased search results to your fake people." I said, "and you won't learn anything." He said, "Well, I don't know." He said, "well then what would we do? How could we find out what they're doing?" And so the point is, I started to obsess about that. And then early 2016, I set up the first ever monitoring system, which allowed me to look over the shoulders of people as they were conducting election related searches on Google, Bing, and Yahoo, so three search engines in the months leading up to the 2016 presidential election, so I had a 95 field agents we call them, in 24 states.

RE: We kept their identities secret, which took a lot of work. And this is exactly by the way what the Nielsen company does to generate ratings for television shows. They have several thousand families. Their

identities, they're secret. They equip the families with special boxes, which allow Nielsen to tabulate what programs they're watching. And Nielsen does that now, by the way, in 47 countries. So the point is, inspired by the Nielsen model, we recruited our field agents, we equip them with custom software that we designed, which is passive software. In other words, no one can detect the fact that they have the software in their computers. But that software allowed us basically to look over their shoulders as they conducted election related searches. And so we got our first trickle of data coming in May of 2016, the closer we got to the election, the more field agents we had, the more data we were collecting.

RE: And we ended up preserving a 13,207 election related searches and there're nearly 100,000 webpages to which the search results linked. And after the election now that we'd preserve this information, because remember we know what search results these people were actually seeing so we know where these links were occurring. And so after the election we rated the webpages for bias, either pro-Clinton or pro-Trump. I personally supported Hillary Clinton in that election. And then we just did an analysis to see whether there was any bias in the search results people were seeing. The results we got were crystal clear, highly significant statistically, this is something I tried to explain to a reporter and she just, I mean I've taught statistics at the doctoral level. I'm using statistics in my work for almost 40 years, but I just couldn't quite get this reporter to understand what I was saying.

RE: But the point is we, the results we got were just significant at the 0.001 level. And what that's that says is we can pretty confident that the bias we were seeing was real, and it didn't occur just because of some random forces. The point is what we found was a pro-Clinton bias in all 10 search positions on the first page of Google search results, but not on Bing or Yahoo. That's very important. So there it was, I mean there was a significant pro-Clinton bias on Google. Now because of the experiments at this point that I had been doing now since 2013, I also was also able to calculate with that level of bias how many votes could have been shifted. And it depends on a number of things, but the bare minimum would have been, about 2.6 million votes would have shifted to Hillary Clinton, in other words, those are undecided people who are going online, getting information about anything that's election related, anything, and being brought to webpages that are basically pro-Clinton.

RE: And that shifts opinions and it shifts both that we know for sure. So basically I calculated that with that level of bias, over a period of months, that would have shifted among undecided voters, somewhere between 2.6 and 10.4 million votes, with no one knowing that they've been influenced, number one. Number two, without leaving a paper trail for authority to trace. The paper trail issue, that's a very interesting issue. Last year in 2018, last year in one of the leaks of material from Google to the media, one of the email conversations within Google was about Google's, rather Trump's travel ban and one of the employees says to other employees there, how can we use ephemeral experiences, okay? Ephemeral experiences. I'm actually writing an article now about ephemeral experiences, to change people's opinions about Trump's travel ban. In other words, too, to get people to be opposed to it, to his travel ban.

RE: And that's the key to everything here. The point is, people within Google themselves, they know how powerful ephemeral experiences are and search results are ephemeral experiences. What are femoral experiences? They're experiences that you have it with your computer in which you're shown content that is fleeting, it's generated on the fly just for you. It impacts you and it disappears and it's gone forever. It's not stored anywhere. That's the key to all this. If you are influencing people using ephemeral experiences as that Google employee said, then that's gold. Because you can shift opinions and thinking and attitudes and beliefs, and no one knows it's happening, number one. Number two, there's no paper trail. Authorities can't go back in time and recreate that experience. I mean it's brilliant and it's frightening and it's diabolical.

JM: Absolutely. Great summary. So that I think it's important to emphasize that as you previously stated, that you were a Clinton supporter, so the bias you uncovered does not suggest you are biased because you were her supporter and you covered a bias in favor of her, which would be not beneficial to her in any way.

In fact, she later, when Trump, I believe, tweeted or acknowledged your testimony to Congress, she responded adversely and denounced you.

RE: Yes, this was horrible. This actually set in motion, what has so far been one of the most horrible periods of my life. But yes, I testified before Congress about the same research and other research, because that was just the beginning and that I did indicate that in 2016, according to the 13,000 searches that we preserved, yes again, the bias in Google search could have shifted somewhere between 2.6 and 10.4 million votes to Hillary Clinton. Yes. I was a Hillary Clinton supporter. So I did report that. It's part of my congressional testimony. Now, a few weeks later, president Trump tweeted about my testimony. He didn't get the numbers quite right, he makes lots of mistakes and he didn't get the numbers quite right, but he did no harm in his tweet for, as far as I was concerned.

RE: But then Hillary Clinton responded his tweets saying that my work had been debunked and was based on data from 21 undecided voters. I don't know where either of those things came from, because my work has never been debunked. I'm not even sure what debunked means, but the point is 21 undecided voters? This was a massive amount of data that we had preserved and we spent months analyzing it. Then there was a deluge of a mainstream newspaper articles, including in the New York Times, just dismissing me and my work and calling me a fraud and saying my work was garbage and so on. I've had a spotless reputation as a scholar and scientist for almost 40 years. And so this was brutal for me. This was horrible, it still is. It still is. I don't understand it. I can't understand it. I can't understand how you can just destroy someone's reputation-

JM: Well, don't take it personally. This is a classic strategy that they use to discredit anyone who opposes their agenda. Tobacco industry did it. Wireless industry is doing it. The GMO industry in Monsanto did it. I mean that is the absolute standard playbook strategy. Discredit the people who are speaking out in the most reputable, in the loudest. Why did they do it? Because it's effective and it works and it requires very little investment on their end.

RE: Well, I'm a researcher. I'm not a politician. I'm a researcher. I report what I find, if I had found pro-Trump search results, I would have reported that. I reported what I found and I mean it was, politically speaking, I thought it was great that they were helping Hillary Clinton to get votes. She actually won the popular vote in 2016 by over 2.8 million votes and I had predicted at a minimum they could shift 2.6 million. So what that means is if you take Google out of the equation in 2016, it means that the popular vote might have been very, very close. Because again, I know that they had the ability to shift at least 2.6 million votes. So the point is, I report what I find. So the fact that I'm excoriated, I'm trashed by mainstream news and by Hillary Clinton herself.

RE: I can't understand it, I've been a supporter of the Clinton for decades. I have a signed letter from Bill Clinton from when he was president, up on the wall over my desk. I still haven't taken it down, although maybe I should.

JM: Well, I guess nothing personal there. They're just opposing anyone that's getting in their way. And you certainly were an obstacle. So I still don't think the average viewer or listeners are aware of the full implications of what you just said. So let's extend it to a worldwide view. And you've made some pretty amazing projections of what Google has and is doing to this day, how they're influencing elections around the entire planet.

RE: I was just thinking that, so I'm glad you're shifting things in that direction because, I find a lot of people when they look at my work, they just keep thinking about the U.S. and the U.S. elections. And the problem is much bigger than that. As I explained when I testify before Congress, the reason why I'm speaking out

about these issues is because first of all, I believe in democracy. I believe in the free and fair election. And I think it's important that we preserve democracy and preserve the free and fair election.

RE: And I think that's more important than my support for any particular candidate or party. To me, it's pretty straight forward. But the problem is much bigger than elections or democracy or the United States. Because I calculated back in 2015 that even at that point in time, Google's search engine, because more than 90% of search worldwide is conducted on Google.

JM: That's an astounding number. It is an astounding number.

RE: Yes. It's actually 92% currently, and it has been for about a decade now. But because basically for most people in the world, Google is the gateway to knowledge. It's the gateway to all knowledge of any source.

JM: It has to be refined, is the gateway to the suppression of knowledge.

RE: Well that's kind of a separate issue, which I happy to talk about.

JM: We'll go to that layer but finished-

RE: Yeah. But because people around the world rely on Google to find information. I had calculated as of 2015, Google was determining the outcomes of upwards of 25% of the national elections in the world. Now how can that be? Well, it's because a lot of elections are very close. And that's the key to this, to understanding this. So in other words, we actually looked at the margins, the win margins in elections around the world, national elections, which tend to be very close. Local elections tend not to be so close, but national elections tend to be very close. That 2010 Australian election for example, the win margin was something like 0.2% ,it was less than 1% so if an election is very, very close and people are just searching for various topics related to an election over a period of weeks or months.

RE: And if Google is biased, no, if the results they're getting on Google are biased toward one candidate, well that shifts a lot of votes among undecided people. And it's very, very simple for them to flip an election or as an article I published in political, put it to rig an election. I didn't put that title on my article. The folks at Political did. But it's very, very simple for Google to do that. Now they can do it deliberately, which is kind of scary. In other words, some top executives at Google could decide who they want to win an election in South Africa or the UK or anywhere. It could be just a rogue employee at Google who does it, and you're thinking that's impossible, how could a single employee at Google rig an election? Actually, it's incredibly simple.

RE: Your viewers may have heard of the famous Google Street View scandal. A few years ago, a professor just like me figured out that the Google Street View vehicles, which drive up and down our streets photographing our homes and our businesses, which at that point have been driving around the streets of 30 countries for more than four years. That the Google Street View vehicles weren't just taking photographs of our houses and they were also vacuuming up all of our Wi-Fi data in more than 30 countries for four years.

RE: Literally just capturing our Wi-Fi data, capturing our passwords, capturing our whatever activity we're engaged in, capturing which websites we're visiting, which allow them to figure out sexual orientation, political leanings, et cetera, et cetera. And so Google got caught, again just because of someone just like me, a researcher figured it out and Google got investigated and they got sued and this and that. Google blamed the entire Street View project on one employee, Marius Milner, one employee, they blamed it on just one employee. Because Google employees themselves have a lot of power. They can change a

parameter here and there, and they have a lot of power. And Marius Milner, again, he got, he got blamed for this entire project.

RE: So naturally then they fired him. No, no, they didn't fire him. Marius Milner is still at Google and he's a hero at the company. And if you look on his LinkedIn page, you'll see he identifies himself as working for Google. And he says his profession is hacker, so they don't fire people like that at Google. So an individual employee, a rogue employee could flip an election.

RE: And then there's the third possibility. The third possibility is, they've got the algorithm running. They don't care about, Cameroon, which is in Africa. They don't care about that, they don't pay any attention. They don't care, let's say, or Nigeria or something. They don't care. And so the algorithm favors one candidate over one another and you're thinking, wait a minute, why would the algorithm fail? Because the algorithm is built that way. It's built always to favor one dog food over another. One, I don't know, flavor of ice cream over another, and one candidate over another. It has no equal time rule built into it. It always is going to favor one candidate over another, and that can flip a close election. And that's the scariest possibility because now you've got an algorithm, a computer program which is an idiot. It's an idiot deciding who rules us. It's crazy.

JM: The implications are quite profound. And what you described actually is illegal behavior, but because these are ephemeral experiences and they leave no paper trail, they are very difficult to prove. But if you've set up some pre-emptive capturing strategies to do this, you can document this. Because there are rules, regulations and penalties for contributing to campaigns that have to be acknowledged. And if you exceed those, you are going to be fined and maybe even put the jail. So why don't you expand on that because I think that the implications that are really quite profound.

RE: Yes. Well I think we should be clear here. There's not only are there no laws or regulations which restrict the way the Google ranks its search results. There are no laws or regulations regarding that. In fact, the courts have said over and over again in case after case that Google can order its search results any old way it pleases. They're just exercising, I'm not kidding you, their right to free speech. That's Google's first amendment right. And by the way, the courts have also said that if they want to eliminate you from their search results or demote you and I know you have some experience with these types of things.

JM: Sure, of course.

RE: Yeah, I know. It's terrible. The courts have said they can do it because they're just exercising their right to free speech. In other words, they can take your business and destroy it. A rogue employee can do it, an executive can do it. The algorithm itself could do it and the courts have said, no problem, no problem. Now whether the legal issue arises is in the context of an election, as you pointed out, there are laws that say that if you donate to a campaign and you donate above a certain amount you have to declare that. And of course there are also limits on how much you can donate unless you're donating to these new super packs.

RE: So you could say that if Google's search results or search suggestions or YouTube videos and on and on and on are favoring one candidate that could be considered an in kind donation, which they're not declaring. And one could put a value on it and so one could go after them in that way. Now, has anyone done that yet? No. One reason is because the monitoring system I set up in 2016 was a unique project. I set up a similar system in 2018 captured even more data. Should be happy to talk about it. That was another unique project. And to my knowledge, no one else has done this anywhere in the world. In other words, no one is setting up systems to preserve, to capture ephemeral content and you have to do this right.

RE: You have to do it on a large scale. You have to be looking over the shoulders, you must look over the shoulders of real people. In other words, you can't do it with bots. It's very, very, very expensive and labor

intensive to run a project like this. My opinion though, these monitoring systems must be set up and not just in the U.S. They must be set up around the world. Because it's the only protection we could possibly have. I mean as a species, it's the only way we can protect ourselves from new types of online technologies that can be used to influence us.

RE: Now what one of the leaks from Google was an eight-minute video, which you can find online. You can actually find it. The video is called the Selfish Ledger and this is an internal video of Google prepared by one of their advanced kind of rocket science divisions, their X division, in which they explain that they have the ability to re-engineer humankind and they specifically mentioned in this video, "According to company values". Now I made a transcript of this. I'm sure I'd be happy to share with your viewers, I can get you a link to it if people want to you know really dig into this. But this is serious stuff, it's not just me discovering some manipulative techniques and trying to quantify them. I'm saying there's an awareness in the company of the power of a ephemeral experiences. And this awareness of the company, of the power the company has to reshape humankind. So this is a kind of threat, in my opinion, that humanity has never faced. No dictator, no miscellany, no Hitler, no dictator-

RE: No dictator, no Mussolini, no Hitler, no dictator anywhere has ever had even a tiny fraction of the power that this company has.

JM: Yeah, it really is brilliant. If you look at it objectively, I mean-

RE: Yes. I agree with that.

JM: How could you design a more sophisticated and effective strategy to control the population? Virtually it's hidden. Virtually no one understands or knows this.

RE: Well in 20... Let's see now if I can figure out what year it is. 2016 I made my second discovery. Since then, they've been coming faster and faster, but 2016 I discovered another type of manipulation that Google is capable of and also got incredible numbers. When you start to type a search term, so you're typing letters into a search box, or a search bar, Google flashes suggestions at you. So this is sometimes called their auto-complete tool. I'm just going to call them search suggestions. They're flashing search suggestions at you. When they first develop this they would flash 10 they would flash 10 at you. I think Yahoo still does 10, and Bing maybe does eight, or vice versa. So, they still show you those long lists.

RE: Initially the idea was they were going to save you some time. That's the way they presented this new feature of the search suggestions. They were going to save you some time. They're going to anticipate based on your history, or based on what other people are searching for, they are going to anticipate what it is you're looking for so you don't have to type the whole thing. Just click on one of the suggestions. I think it really started out that way but then it changed into something else. It changed into a tool for manipulation.

RE: In June, I believe of 2016 a small news organization posted a video on YouTube, which is kind of funny because YouTube is part of Google. It was a seven minute video in which they had a very cool guy, just ultra cool guy, explaining that their news outfit had discovered that it was virtually impossible to get negative search suggestions related to Hillary Clinton, but easy to get them for other people including Donald Trump. They were very concerned about this because I don't know, maybe that could influence people somehow. So I tried this myself and I have a wonderful image that I preserved showing this. I typed in Hillary Clinton is, I did it on Bing and on Yahoo, and I got those long lists eight and 10 items saying, "Hillary Clinton is the devil. Hillary Clinton is sick. Hillary Clinton is..."

RE: All negative things and all things that people were actually searching for. How do you know that? Because we checked on Google trends. Google trends shows you what people are actually searching for.

Sure enough people were actually searching for all these negative things related to Hillary Clinton. Those are the most popular search terms. So, we tried it on Google Hillary Clinton is, and we got, "Hillary Clinton is winning, Hillary Clinton is awesome." And that's it. Now you check those phrases on Google trends and you find no one searching for those who's typing in Hillary Clinton is awesome? Nobody. No one. But that's what they're showing you in their search suggestions. So that again got my research gears running again. I started doing experiments because I said, "Wait a minute why would they do this? What is the point?" Here's what I found in a series of experiments. Just by manipulating search suggestions I could turn a 50/50 split among undecided voters into a 90/10 split.

JM: Wow.

RE: With no one having the slightest idea that they've been manipulated. So search suggestions, this became a second effect, the SSE or the Search Suggestion Effect. It's an incredibly powerful tool which you can't... It's not billboards. Okay? In other words, you put up a billboard supporting your run for governor. Right? I put up my own billboard across the street. Right? I can counteract your billboard. Same with your television commercial, same with your radio ad. Whatever it is you're doing I can counteract it, I can fight it. But Google search suggestions, how would you fight those? How would you counteract them?.

RE: Of course, they're ephemeral. Wow ephemeral again. They're ephemeral. So there's no record kept of them, and you can't go back in time and reconstruct what they were showing people. So now we have a second effect. I mean I could go on and on with more effects. But I'm just trying to give you a glimpse here of the way the process has worked for me, the way I've stumbled onto things, and what I have found. I report what I find, I don't care which candidate or which political party-

JM: You're neutral.

RE: Yeah. Well I'm [crosstalk 01:04:28] not neutral. Well, I'm not neutral. I'm not neutral as a human being.

JM: You are neutral with respect to the outcomes of your research.

RE: Correct Yes.

JM: Yeah, that's what I meant to say. Obviously, we all have biases. So I think you've really highlighted and illustrated an enormous pieces of information that most everyone watching this was absolutely clueless as is most of the population. So I'd like to go on to eventually... Let me come back to some of the... Well, let's go into the censorship and the blacklisting. Then I want to really focus on what can we effectively do because this can get very discouraging and hopeless. I mean you've got 92% of the world using Google. I mean you just give up now. I mean if these were going to control everything!

JM: But I want to present some hope here because there are very clear specific strategies that we can use that can actually make a difference. But let's talk a little bit about censorship and blacklisting, which we've been focusing on the manipulation, and I want to talk about those a little bit because I think that those are other tools that they're using that is going to encourage more of us to engage in these recommendations that you're going to go over shortly.

RE: Sure. Well, censorship is in my opinion, is the second big threat that companies like Google, to a lesser extent Facebook, to a much lesser extent Twitter, these are threats that these companies pose to humankind. There could be a company after Google, which could do the same thing. So the point is that Google is determining what billions of people right now, two and a half billion people around the world, see or don't see. That's the problem. Because in other words, let's say it's a health issue, whether certain kinds of vitamins

are helpful or not, or certain kinds of foods are helpful or not. If they eliminate from search results, a certain perspective, let's say, or a certain website, or a certain set of websites, how would anyone know that?

RE: See that's the problem with censorship is you don't know what you don't know. Is there evidence that Google at times just demotes or removes material from its search results? Absolutely. I mean this has been known for a long time, and again, Google now and then gets sued by someone who says, "You've demoted me or you've removed me." So a lot of the stuff is kind of out in the open. I mean at one point Google demoted JCPenney for example. Yeah. Because JCPenney, they said they were violating Google's policies because they were using what are called SEO techniques. SEO is a big industry search engine optimization, it's called. To try to boost their rankings in Google search results, which every company does. Every company does that. But somehow or other they focus on JCPenney and they demoted them.

RE: I mean this was a big demotion because they didn't just knock them off the first page. They knocked them into the 50th position, which no one ever sees. So there are many, many cases now in which we know Google does this quite deliberately. There was a company called Eventures, based in Florida, where Google decided they didn't like the quality of their web pages. There's so much subjectivity going into this. It's horrible. They literally a block access to, I think about almost all of the URLs that this Eventures company had, which I'm thinking was about a hundred. No explanation. They never explained.

RE: See, that's the other problem. That's why Tulsi Gabbard, one of the presidential candidates now, has sued Google because after the first presidential debate, they shut down her ability to place ads. She was the most searched for candidate at the time, and she needed to place those ads to be running on Google in order to raise funds. They literally blocked access. They shut her down for, I think about six hours, immediately following the debate. Well, again, think of it from the perspective of the public, not the candidate. The public just doesn't even see, they don't see the ads. You're not seeing the search results, or the ads, or the search suggestions, whatever it may be. You don't know what you don't know.

RE: So you don't even know that you're being manipulated. You don't understand. So it turns out that Google sensors, all kinds of content in all kinds of ways. As I mentioned earlier, I wrote a big article about this for U.S. News And World Report called the New Censorship. I talked about Google's blacklist. I focused on nine of them, later in a little addendum we added a 10th one. But point is, I said, "These blacklists exists in the company." Now, had I ever seen one? No. But I'm a programmer. I know how this works. I know Google suppresses content. So I wrote about the blacklist, I wrote about... And I explained exactly how they worked, and I talked about the... Because every aspect of Google has a blacklist.

RE: So there are YouTube blacklists, for example. Whatever Google does there are blacklist, always. Now, just a few months ago, this was after I testified before Congress, a new whistleblower turned up. His name is Zachary Vorhies and he left Google after serving there eight and a half years as a senior software engineer. Unlike the other whistle blowers, he walked out of there more than 950 pages of documents and a video. Among those documents or two blacklists. They were actually called blacklists within the company. He actually walked out with two of their blacklist. So meanwhile, I should point out that when I testified before Congress, just before I did, Google's representative testified in the same hearing. He was asked point blank, I think it was by Senator Josh Holly. "Does Google have blacklist?" He said under oath, "No, we have no blacklist."

JM: Well I think testifying under oath before Congress isn't illegal, right?

RE: Well, you mean lying though? People do lie.

JM: That's what I meant to say, lie.

RE: Yeah. Yeah. [crosstalk 01:11:45] No, people do lie. Back a long time ago, Congress used to exercise its authority to punish people for lying before Congress. Of course a Michael Cohen, Trump's attorney is in prison now, in part for lying before Congress. So it can happen, but generally speaking, now you can lie to Congress and no one cares, and congress doesn't do anything. The last time Congress actually just used its muscle, literally it's police. It has a kind of police to arrest someone for lying, I think that was 1930 if I'm not mistaken. So they don't really do that anymore. Yeah, you can just lie all you want.

JM: I'm reminded of the presidents of the four or five U.S. tobacco companies in the late 90s-

RE: Yes, yes, yes.

JM: Every single one of them said smoking was not addictive-

RE: Right.

JM: ... And it doesn't cause cancer. In the late 90s! [crosstalk 01:12:50] There was no repercussion for those testimonies.

RE: Right.

JM: All right, so this discouraging-

RE: Can I just talk a little bit more about censorship because-

JM: Sure, absolutely.

RE: Because right now, what's happening in the U.S. is there's a lot of hullabaloo about Google's censorship. It's coming mainly from conservatives, conservative candidates, conservative organizations, and there is evidence that Google is aggressively censoring conservative content. So there is some evidence to support this. I think conservatives have reason to be concerned. However, they don't just censor conservative content. So this issue is much bigger than that, because I've received communications from people in socialist organizations, progressive organizations, whose content has been censored by Google. You could be anybody, and be censored by Google. Remember that even individual employees at Google sometimes have the power to make changes like that, to demote or remove.

RE: Another senior software engineer at Google, His name is Shumeet Baluja, who's been at Google almost since the very beginning, he published a novel that no one's ever heard of and it's called The Silicon Jungle. Of course that title comes from a very old book from the early 1900s called The Jungle, which is a remarkable book about the meat packing industry in the United States. The Silicon Jungle is about Google. It's fictional, but it's about Google, and it's about the power that individual employees at Google have to make or break any company or any individual mean. It's a fantastic novel. I asked Baluja, how Google let him get away with publishing it and he said, "Well, they made me promise I would never promote it." That's why no one's ever heard of this book.

RE: There's no question that they do suppress content and it's not just conservative content, it's any content they want to. Another article I'm working on looks at how Google operates in different countries. It turns out yes, in the U.S. Google leans heavily to the left, but in Cuba they lean heavily to the right. Of course, it came to light just not long ago that Google was about to go back into China to help the Chinese government control its population. The politics that we think they have in the U.S., which are pretty clear, they don't have those politics everywhere. They do what they want to do that serves their company, serves the bottom line, presumably. Or serves other agendas that they may have.

RE: But a lot of this is just about money, and they can sensor any content anywhere. That's the problem. So the question I keep raising is, who gave this private company, which is not accountable to any of us, who gave this private company the ability to determine what billions of people around the world will see or will not see? That's the bigger issue here.

JM: Yes. You go into that, as do others, in the video documentary that is just outstanding it's called The Crooked Line.

RE: The Creepy Line.

JM: Oh, sorry. The Creepy Line. Yes.

RE: Yeah.

JM: A direct quote from Eric Schmidt.

RE: Right.

JM: I mean the reason I mentioned that is that traditional media have very serious constraints placed on them, but Google, which is far more penetrating, and far more effective at influencing people, has none of these constraints.

RE: That's right, and as a result there... By the way Creepy Line, I want to say, I highly recommend to people. It does focus quite a bit in my research, but there are lots of people in there, besides me-

JM: Jordan Peterson.

RE: Jordan Peterson is in there, Peter Schweizer, who has become actually a good friend over the years. There are lots of good people in there, lots of good data, and it explains my research very clearly which is nice, which is wonderful. It explains my research better than I explained my research. The Creepy Line is available, it premiered about a year ago first in New York than D.C., and so on. But it's available now on iTunes and on Amazon. I think it costs \$3 or \$4 to watch, unless you're an Amazon Prime Member. If you're an Amazon Prime Member it's free-

JM: Free.

RE: It's free to watch. You can get information about it at thecreepylines.com or you can just search for it on Amazon. It's an excellent, excellent film-

JM: [crosstalk 01:18:23] Recommended. It's an absolute outstanding followup to this interview. It really is well done. So in that video documentary, you explained some different strategies, and maybe we can jump to that. Unless you want-

RE: Sure.

JM: ... There's anything else you want to comment on with respect to blacklisting and censorship.

RE: Well, I just want to say that censorship is... I just want to say that at the moment I'm concerned that the censorship issue is being framed as a conservative issue. So I'm repeating myself a little bit but this is

worth repeating because this is not a conservative issue. So my conservative friends insist that it is. It's not. This is a much, much bigger issue.

RE: Remember you don't know what you don't know. So when content is suppressed, you don't know it's been suppressed because you can't see it. So seriously, when I'm online now, I'm so conscious of this that I'm being shown something and I'm always asking "What am I not being shown?" Generally speaking, I don't have a way of answering that question. So that's one reason I stopped using Google's search engine years ago because I'm very nervous about what it is they're not showing me. Of course I'm nervous too about the order in which they're showing me whatever it is they're showing me. So censorship, I'm just saying is a serious issue, and it's not just a conservative issue. I just want to emphasize that.

JM: Yeah. There are many videos that you've done over the years, and many of them are sponsored by conservative agencies and groups. You begin your... Not an interview, but your presentation by saying, "I'm not one of you, I'm a liberal." But they all love you because you're telling the truth about a very important issue.

RE: Well, they love me because it serves their purpose right now, because of the fact that their content is being suppressed. More than that, there are manipulations being used to defeat conservative candidates and conservative causes. So, right now, yes, conservatives like me, but I'm not a conservative no. I've been pretty much more of a independent, a centrist, I would say. I lean left, but no, I'm definitely not a conservative. But this is not a conservative issue. It's really been a problem for me that the people who pay most attention to my work, and who want to interview me, and invite me to give talks, they virtually always, all of them are conservatives. That's a problem. That's a problem because there are people who now, who associate me with conservatives, which is absurd. I don't have a conservative bone in my body.

JM: All right, well thank you for letting us know that it places it in proper context, but you've written a... Is it a website? Certainly an article which is mysevensimplesteps.com I believe, that outlined some of the recommendations, which in my view you'd have to be irrational not to implement into your life immediately, and share them with your families and friends. Because it's not going to cost you virtually anything. There's a few suggestions that have a small cost to it, but it's more than worth it. So maybe you can review those now.

RE: Sure. If you go to mysevensimplesteps.com you can either spell out the word seven or just use the numeral seven. It doesn't matter, mysevensimplesteps.com, that will take you to an article which I wrote, which is about seven simple steps that I've used to try to increase my privacy online. Now my first sentence is more or less, "I have not received a targeted ad on my cell phone or my laptop computer since 2014." Most people are shocked by that because they're just bombarded with targeted ads constantly. More and more people are telling me that they're just having a conversation with someone, so they're not even doing anything online per se, they're just having a conversation, but their phone is nearby. Or they're having a conversation in their home and they have Amazon Alexa in their home, or they have Google Home, these personal assistants, and the next thing they know they start getting targeted ads related to what they were talking about.

JM: This is relatively recent because my girlfriend, I was talking to her, Erin, and we are talking about going to the office that I have in South Florida, and staying at a specific hotel and it was just our dialogue and literally after hung up she had a targeted ad at her Facebook page for that hotel.

RE: That's what I'm saying. That's what I'm saying. I'm going to divert here slightly, but this is the surveillance problem, which we really didn't talk about very much. But the point is that there are ways to use the internet, and to use the tablets, and mobile phones, and so on to preserve or protect your privacy, but almost no one does that. So the fact is that we're now being surveilled 24/7, generally speaking with no

awareness that there were even being surveilled. So, maybe some people are aware that when they do searches on Google the searches are preserved, and the search history is preserved forever. So that over time, tens of thousands of searches their patterns that Google can detect based on your searches which websites you're visiting.

RE: But it goes so far beyond that now because now we're being surveilled through personal assistance, so that when we speak, we're being observed. But again, it goes beyond that because a few years ago Google bought the Nest company, which makes a smart thermostat. Surely after they bought the company, they put microphones into the smart thermostats, and the latest versions of the smart thermostats have microphones and cameras. Google has been issued patents in recent years, which give them basically, ownership rights over ways of analyzing sounds that are picked up by microphones in people's homes.

RE: So that they've developed ways, for example, of listening in to determine whether your kids are brushing their teeth enough, to determine the nature of your sex life, to determine whether there's a lot of arguing going on in the house. That's easy obviously because they can monetize all that. See, they can hook you up with dentists, they can hook you up with sex therapist, they can hook you up with mental health services, relationship coaches, et cetera, et cetera. So there's that. Now there's also location tracking has gotten completely out of hand. We've learned even in recent months that even when you disable location tracking, at least you think you've disabled it on your mobile phone, you're still being tracked.

JM: Yeah. Could you expand on that too? Because New York Times did a recent investigation report, just a few weeks ago I believe, that expanded on this and how they sell it to the data warehouses. So if you could summarize it, I think you could do it brilliantly.

RE: Well, first of all, you have to understand that if someone is able to track your location, that tells them a lot about you. So again, we don't, we tend not to... We're so naive about such things. But think about it, if someone's tracking your location, they're probably going to know whether you're cheating on your spouse because they know where you're parking and-

RE: ...because they know where you are parking and where you're spending your nights. They know where you're shopping just by your location. They know where you're relaxing, they know everything. Your location is important. If you attend a political rally, your location tells them you attended a political rally and they know which rally you attended and so on and so forth. So location is extremely valuable. We don't think much about it. But what these new investigations have found, the New York Times and others is that the aggressiveness of location tracking is far beyond what anyone imagined. For example, let's say that you have an Android phone. Android is owned by Google. So that's their mobile operating system and they developed that mobile operating system because they weren't getting enough information when you're online. So they developed a mobile operating system so they could track you when you're offline, because in other words, Android runs your phone and it doesn't matter whether you're connected to the internet or not or using the internet or not.

RE: You're still doing stuff. You're still dialing phone numbers, maybe you're reading books on your phone, maybe you're listening to music on your phone. Android tracks all of that, and it also tracks your location. Now if you're paranoid about such things and you disconnect location tracking on your phone, it doesn't matter. They're still tracking your location, and it just gets creepier and creepier because let's say that you pull out your SIM card. Let's say that you disconnect from your mobile service provider, so you're absolutely isolated. You're not connected to the internet. Guess what? Your phone is still tracking everything you do on that phone and it's still tracking your location as you move around during the day and at the end of the day.

JM: That seems so hard to believe. Can you just briefly describe how they're able to do that? It just doesn't make sense. If it's not connected to the internet or to a wireless communication carrier.

RE: I would refer your viewers to an episode that was on Tucker Carlson in which he had an expert explain exactly how they do it and he drove around with his Android phone all day long and it was disconnected from the internet. And then he, at the end of the day, he hooks up a device, which by the way, anyone can buy these devices now. They used to cost a fortune. Now they're very cheap. He hooks up a device to his phone just before he reconnects to his mobile service provider. In other words, just before he reconnects to the the world, to the internet. And the device shows what information is being sent to Google the moment he reconnects to the internet. And it just sends volumes and volumes and volumes of housing information, including his location all day long. It's all uploaded the moment he reconnects.

RE: I'm just trying to tell you that people have no idea how aggressive and pervasive the surveillance is and it's going to become very quickly, very rapidly, more aggressive, more pervasive because of what's called the internet of things, because right now if you buy a refrigerator or washer or dry or anything, toaster, those items more and more are connected to the internet. And of course cars. Automobiles too. This is why Google has spent a lot of money trying to develop self driving cars. It's not because they want to become a car maker, it's because they want more information ,and to the extent that they can get car companies to use there technology for self-driving, that gives them more information about your location. That's why they bought YouTube. It gives them more information about you because they can tell which videos you're watching.

RE: Totally off track, but I have to throw this in since I just mentioned YouTube. This is a new area that we're just starting to research and I'm very excited about it. I can't wait to get some numbers. But the fact is, did you know now that 70% of the videos that people view on YouTube are suggested by Google's top secret Up Next algorithm? It's called the Up Next algorithm. So you search for a video, you watch a video, but then Google immediately is trying to get you to watch another one.

JM: An EMT, an ephemeral manipulation tool.

RE: That is ephemeral. That's right. It's another, ephemeral experience, because there's no record of it. But this is incredible. I think this is going to prove to be more powerful than Seam, because of the sequencing, because they can take you to one video then to another, to another, to another and down into a rabbit hole. And there are documented cases now in which people have been converted to extreme Islam or to white supremacy, literally because they'd been pulled down a rabbit hole by a sequence of videos on YouTube. So 70% of the videos now that people are watching are suggested by Google's algorithm.

JM: Wow.

RE: Think of the power. Think of that power. Again, it's not powerful for people who already have strong opinions. It's powerful for the people who don't, the people who are vulnerable, the people who are undecided or committed. And that's a lot of people. That's why I've calculated that in 2020 ,that the tech companies, Google being the main one, can shift 15 million votes leading up to the 2020 election. Again, with no one knowing that they've done it, without leaving a paper trail, 15 million votes, which means they will pick the next president of United States. Of course, then people will be saying, "Well, what happened in 2016? How did they fail?" Well, they were overconfident, but they're not, overconfident anymore. And they're going to use every single tool available to them.

JM: Yeah. And you've got a strategy to defeat that. We can discuss that in a little bit.

RE: I do.

JM: But I want to ...

RE: Well, we didn't really finish the seven simple steps. You want me to go back to that?

JM: Yeah, but before you go back to that, maybe just elaborate on the amount of data with respect to surveillance that they've acquired.

RE: Oh yeah, yeah.

JM: The average 35 year olds in the US. You won't guess how much information they now store on you because I doubt if anyone out there, maybe one or two people, have implemented the strategies you have suggested on these years ago.

RE: Yes. The average 35 year old in the US has been using the internet probably since the beginning, and Google's been around for 20 years. Google has probably collected the equivalent of ... Wait, let me put this in context. Let me put this context. Remember Cambridge Analytica? Cambridge Analytica was accused of-

JM: Yes.

RE: Yep, shifting boats in 2016, and there's actually a scary documentary that came out just a few months ago, all about Cambridge Analytica and it's complete nonsense, in my opinion. Cambridge Analytica claimed that they had "5,000 data points on every voter in America," and not through surveillance, by the way, they just purchased it. They just purchased it from other companies. So Cambridge Analytica was never a surveillance company. 5,000 data points. Okay. 5000 pieces of information about every voter in America. You know how much information Google has on the average 35 year old in the United States? The equivalent of 3 million pages of information, 3 million pages of information.

JM: But we've all agreed to that in their terms of service.

RE: Well, except I'm one of two people that I know of who has actually read their terms of service. So I don't think people understand what it is they're agreeing to, but it's true that their terms of service first of all, according to the terms of service, you agree to their terms of service if you use any Google product, even if you don't know that you're using a Google product. So millions of websites incorporate Google analytics to track traffic to their websites. You can't see Google Analytics. You don't know what's there when you're on a website, any website. But if you're using a website that uses Google analytics, and almost all websites do, Google has the right to track everything you do on that website. So they're not just tracking you when you're using a Google product. This is insane stuff.

RE: All I can say is that when I first got interested in these things, I was concerned. I was at times shocked. But my concern has simply grown and grown and grown. The more I have learned, the more concerned I have become. And I think anyone who sees the numbers that I see on a regular basis anyone who follows the court cases, follows the various investigations, especially the investigations of Google in the EU, which had been very aggressive, anyone would be horrified. I'm horrified by this. I just can't imagine-

JM: Every one of us should be. So why don't we get back to those seven simple steps, and at least give us the ammo that we can implement to start protecting ourselves. Everyone needs to embrace these widely and adopt them as soon as you can because this is a big issue as **RE** has carefully described.

RE: Sure. Well again, if you go to mysevensimplesteps.com, you'll come to this article. I probably need to update it again already. But I did update it just a few months ago. But I think it needs to be updated again. But basically some of the stuff is very straightforward. For example, you should not use Gmail. No, because everything you write on Gmail is recorded permanently by Google. It becomes part of your profile and it's used to help to build digital models of you and to make predictions about everything that you desire and want and do and think. So there's a lot of content in emails and you should not be using Gmail. Now there are alternatives to Gmail which preserve your privacy. So the one I like the most right now called Proton Mail. Proton Mail is based in Switzerland, it's subject to very strict Swiss privacy laws. Basic. Proton Mail of the simplest form of it is free. The paid version of it is relatively inexpensive. I think it's six or seven dollars a month, and my gosh worth every penny.

RE: Proton Mail uses end to end encryption, which means among other things, that the company itself, the people at Proton Mail cannot read your emails.

JM: Unlike Google.

RE: Unlike Google. And it also means that if you're writing to someone who uses Proton Mail, it means that no one in between you and that person can read your emails because it's all encrypted. It gets decrypted when it arrives at the other person's computer. It's just like the old days, **JM**, because as you say, we're probably roughly the same age, like the old days that we can remember when you'd write a letter to someone, you put it in a mailbox and no one would see that mail until it was in the hands of the recipients, and then that person would open it. So the point is that Proton Mail, basically the set up has recreated that type of a communication system. So I recommend that highly. There are alternatives as well, but I think that's the best right now. Okay. Gmail.

RE: How about Chrome? Chrome is Google's browser. Problem with Chrome is everything you do when you're using Chrome is surveilled. Everything. So they know everything you type, everything you look at. If someone is using your computer to go to porn sites, I don't mean you personally, but if someone is using your computer, that's part of your profile. So you must not use Chrome. Again, there are alternatives to Chrome which preserve your privacy. The one I like right now is called Brave. You go to brave.com. Brave was developed by the man who developed Firefox, which is the browser that's run by a nonprofit organization. But Brave is even better than Firefox, first of all. It's very fast. In fact, the people at Brave call it the anti Chrome because the idea is that it's faster than Chrome, and they keep improving it very, very rapidly.

RE: So Brave right now I think is the best browser. And it not only preserves your privacy, it suppresses ads. So I could go on my screen right now and find out how ads it's been suppressing in the last few months too.

JM: [crosstalk 01:41:54] too, and I've suppressed over a million ads. A million.

RE: Yeah. Yeah. So Brave is quite good now. Then of course ... Yeah?

JM: It's based on Chromium, which is the same software that Google is based on, the infrastructure, the code.

RE: That's right.

JM: It means that you can easily transfer your extensions, your favorites, your bookmarks, and there's no pain. It's simple. You got to be crazy not to use Brave.

RE: Yeah, Brave is fantastic. I really like it. You must never use Google.com as your search engine. And again, there are alternatives, although the next most popular search engine in the United States is Bing which is Microsoft's search engine. That only draws around two and a half percent of search. So they can't influence an election. The point is that I don't recommend Bing, for various reasons. One is that Microsoft and Google signed a secret pact in I think early 2016, dropping all lawsuits against each other and so on. Some people think that since that time Bing has gradually started drawing its own search results from Google to save money, Yahoo started doing that years ago. Yahoo hasn't searched the internet in years. Yahoo just draws its search results mainly from Google.

RE: So you don't want to be using Google or any kind of extension of Google. You see, that's just an invisible form of Google. For example, Siri, which is the personal assistant on iPhones, Siri draws all of its answers from Google. It's just an extension of Google. And then again, that's where you have that censorship problem, because if Google is suppressing content or promoting certain content, that's going to be reflected in the answers that Siri gives you or that Yahoo gives you. So you want to stay away from that world as much as possible. So at the moment, the search engine that I use which preserves privacy, it has a terrible name. It's called SwissCows.com. Now there's another I have been recommending and it's in my article, it's called Start Page. Start Page. Start [inaudible 00:17:25].

JM: Aren't they using Google results as a search engine, though? It has privacy, but I think they're still integrating [inaudible 00:17:35].

RE: Start Page draws all of its results from Google, which is a good thing because it gives you very good quality.

JM: [crosstalk 01:44:41] .

RE: But it doesn't track you. That's the key. It doesn't track you. So Start Page since 2009 has had full access to Google's database. But at the moment, I'm no longer recommending Start Page and there are several privacy organizations that in fact have dropped Start Page from their list of recommended tools, because Start Page got bought about a year ago by an American company, which is a very aggressive online marketing company that depends on just as Google does, it depends on surveillance to do its marketing. So it's troubling that Start Page now has been bought by another company.

JM: What about Qwant? I thought you were ...

RE: Well Qwant is a very innovative search engine based in France. I met with their president in France a couple of years ago. It's very, very innovative for sure. It's a different style of search, which is really fascinating. And by the way, if you try Qwant Q-W-A-N-T, I believe is how they spell it, Qwant.com, you should look at it just to see just how different it is because Google's monopoly on search for almost 20 years now has stifled innovation in search. There's been no innovation. People think of Google as the big innovator and it's quite the opposite. They've stifled, because they buy up companies that might compete with them and so they've just stifled innovation.

RE: Qwant takes a different approach to search. They do preserve privacy, but they don't have access to Google's index. They don't have ... The point is they-

JM: They're not censoring, and you can select it as a search engine on Brave.

RE: Oh yes, yes, yes. I think Qwant is quite interesting. Now Qwant itself just got sold.

JM: Ah, [inaudible 00:20:04].

RE: Yeah, because they've been struggling. Most of these search engines that people have tried to build to compete with Google, they've all just disappeared. And even the ones that still exist, except for Bing, they all are attracting less than one percent of search. So it's very, very hard. It's a real struggle. It's virtually impossible to compete with Google. There is a solution to Google's monopoly on search. I published that in Bloomberg Business Week just a few months ago and I did talk about it in my testimony before Congress. And that is to make Google's index, which is the database they use to generate search results, to turn that into a public commons. And in other words, give everyone access to the database and let them create their own search engines on top of it, their own search platforms, I should say, on top of it. And if you made Google's index into a public commons, then search would become competitive again and Google would lose its monopoly on search worldwide because you'd end up with thousands of search engines all giving you very good search results because they're all drawing from Google's big database.

RE: But there'd be innovations. They'd be catering to different markets, they'd be ordering things in different ways. They'd be presenting the data in different ways on the screen. They'd be all kinds of innovations. And if we didn't like one we would move to another. So it's a pretty light touch kind of regulation and it would quickly and permanently end Google's worldwide monopoly on search. There's no other way to do it, by the way.

JM: Yeah, I couldn't agree more. It's rational, but which federal agency would impose that sanction? Would it be the Department of Justice?

RE: DOJ has that power. They did that with AT&T in the famous, I think it's called the 1956 consent decree. And DOJ basically forced that. They force AT&T to share all of its patents for free with everyone in the world. That led to a dramatic explosion of innovation in electronics and communications, and this is the same type of thing. It's just making this resource that Google guards zealously and making it available to ...

JM: That makes sense, though. But AT&T didn't have the insight and the sophistication to essentially pay an individual like [Makim Delrem 01:49:44] about \$100,000 in 2007 to lobby, Google paid him that, for their acquisition of DoubleClick, another surveillance tool, for \$3 billion. Who now, who is this guy? He is the attorney general and head of the Justice Department's antitrust division. So with that piece of information, they have a paid lobbyist is the head of the DOJ, how likely is it they're going to implement this incredible effective solution?

RE: Well, the FTC also has the authority to do it. Congress has the authority, although, Chris, they'll never, Congress is dysfunctional. But my hope lies with the European Union because the European Union could also implement this, because-

JM: Interesting.

RE: Google has 13 data centers worldwide. Five of them are in the EU. So the EU could implement this. And if they implemented it, it would apply to everyone in the world if they made this happen.

JM: They've been aggressive at prosecuting you. I think, what is it? It's well over 5 billion, might be 13 billion fines already.

RE: Well they're up to 10. 10 billion. But yeah, there've been, since 2017 there been at this point, four very large fines levied against Google by the EU. Yeah. [Bess Tiersia 01:51:06], the woman who's in charge of these investigations, she was supposed to step down a few months ago. In fact, she didn't. And in fact she's been given more power than she ever had before. The usual solution people offer is let's break up

Google. That's Elizabeth Warren's big thing. Let's break up Google. That means getting Google to divest itself of some of the companies that they've purchased, like YouTube. That doesn't diminish their power very much at all because their power comes from the search engine and you can't break up the search engine.

RE: So the way you solve the search engine problem is with my plan, which is simply making their index into a public commons. Lots of precedent for that in law and lots of precedent in Google's own business practices. After all, they've given Start Page access to their index since 2009. Apple pays Google about \$9 billion a year to access Google's database for Siri. So there's lots of precedent here for doing that. Let me get back, because we're probably running short on time.

JM: No, that's okay. We can extend it [crosstalk 01:52:18] .

RE: Seven simple steps.

JM: Still important.

RE: Sure.

JM: I want you to talk about [Nord 01:54:03] , too.

RE: Oh yeah. So yeah. So I mentioned Gmail, get rid of Gmail, get rid of Chrome, get rid of Google.com, get rid of Android. Perhaps that was obvious from some of the remarks I made earlier. Get rid of Android. Android is an extremely aggressive surveillance tool. And again, it's just a surveillance tool. You might think it's something else, but from a business perspective and from Google's perspective, it's just another very powerful surveillance tool. I don't even mention YouTube in that article, but more and more when I'm looking for movie trailers, I just type into another search engine. Again, at the moment I'm using Swiss Cows. I just type in the name of the movie, whatever movie I'm interested in at the moment and I put in trailer. And of course I'll get a list, and sure enough, a lot of the items listed will be YouTube videos, but there are others too, that are always ... if you're a different search engine, something besides Google, you're going to find even for movie trailers that you can get movie trailers on other websites.

RE: And more and more now, I'm clicking on those other websites so that I'm not giving information to Google through YouTube. Now you mentioned Nord. Let me explain. Another item in my article. It has to do with VPNs. That stands for virtual private networks. When you just use your mobile phone or your laptop, your desktop in the usual way, your identity is very easy for Google and other companies to see. They can see your identity. They can see it via what's called your IP address, but more and more, there are much more sophisticated ways now that they know it's you.

RE: So one is called browser fingerprinting. I don't know if you're familiar with that, but this is something that it's so disturbing. But basically the kind of browser you have and the way you use your browser, that's like a fingerprint. It's just like a finger. You use your browser in a unique way. And just by the way you type, these companies now can instantly identify you. Oh dear. Now Brave actually has some protection against a browser fingerprinting, which is kind of cool. But you really need to be using a VPN. What a VPN does is it routes whatever you're doing through some other computer somewhere else. It can be anywhere in the world, and there are hundreds of companies offering VPN services. Some of them even offer what appear to be free services. By the way, whenever you see free ...

JM: You're the [inaudible 01:55:48] .

RE: Yeah, you're the product.

JM: [inaudible 01:55:52].

RE: It's not really free, but there's a lot of VPNs out there. The one I like the best right now is called Nord VPN, N-O-R-D VPN. There are all kinds of specials usually for signing up with-

RE: There are all kinds of specials usually for signing up with Nord, and what it does is you download some software, you install it, just like you install any software. It's incredibly easy to use. You do not have to be a techie to use an Nord and it shows you a map of the world and you basically can just click on what country you want to be in.

JM: Is there any advantage to selecting a specific country, I mean should you select the US versus Mexico or South America?

RE: Well, yes, what you select is makes a big difference, which is why during the day I actually move around sometimes from country to country, because depending on what country you're in, that's going to determine, for example, what you see, what kind of content you see? Even results you'll get on a search engine or what news stories you'll see that depends on-

JM: Even not using Google.

RE: That's correct. That's correct, yeah. So the VPN basically makes it appear that that your computer is not your computer. It basically creates a kind of fake identity for you. And that's good, that's a good thing. Now, very often I will go through using Nord, I will go through their computers in the United States. Sometimes you kind of have to do that or you can't get certain things done, you know, PayPal doesn't like you to be in a foreign country for example.

JM: Yeah, sure.

RE: But if you pick a United States location using a VPN, PayPal's fine with that. So you know, if you want to watch the premiere of Doctor Who in the UK, then you just pick a UK location, now you're in the UK, so you have access to all the UK resources and you can watch Doctor Who the moment it's posted, you can't do that if you're not in the UK. You have to be in the UK to do that because BBC and you know, it's supported by taxes from taxpayers in the United Kingdom. But the point is if you have a VPN, you can easily just...

JM: Spoof it.

RE: Well yeah, you put yourself in the UK. So yeah, generally speaking when you're using a VPN, you might just want to stick with one country and stay there of course. But generally speaking, if you're an English speaker, you want to pick an English speaking country because otherwise, well first of all, you might be getting a lot of things in a foreign language, which is not helpful. So we're talking about, South Africa, New Zealand, Australia, et cetera.

JM: So just to get a little bit more details on that, if you buy the three year package, it's about \$3, a little over \$3 a month, which is almost free. And you get six devices, including one of those devices can be your mobile phone, which I think may be one of the most important. And a question I [inaudible 01:59:20] with Nord, if your mobile phone's using Nord and you're using Google Maps, as many of us do, which happens to be the best, absolute best strategy to go to find locations and when you're driving, if you're using Nord, does it mask your data?

RE: Yes, yes it does. And see, I use a very fancy Blackberry and the next model the have coming out is going to be one of the most secure phones ever produced in the world.

JM: Is that a smartphone too?

RE: This, yeah. Yeah. Yeah. And this has real keys, but the keys are themselves touch sensitive. In other words. In other words, if you're online, okay... It means that, well, see, here's something from Mercola. Isn't that funny? Right here. But the point is that I can be moving my screen around of course in the usual way, but also even while I'm typing, the keys themselves are touch sensitive.

JM: Oh, so the keys are a touchpad?

RE: Yeah.

JM: Wow, that's really innovative.

RE: Yeah. And the point is this phone is encrypted. This phone uses a VPN, in fact it uses Nord.

JM: Is that for the presidents too? Don't they give the presidents blackberries?

RE: Yeah, normally. But president Trump has refused to use one. Yeah. He's still using his regular phone. So he's absolutely refused. But yeah, so that's what they normally give the president is a Blackberry.

JM: Okay. So that's good. Or RIM as they used to be called. I don't know what it stands for.

RE: Research in motion.

JM: Yeah, I thought they went out of business.

RE: Nope, nope, they're not out of business. It's complicated, but they're not out of business, no.

JM: That's good to know.

RE: And they serve a very important niche. They serve a certain niche in the business community and people like me, and there's a niche there. There are people who are more aware of the kinds of issues you and I have been discussing today and who want some protection. And so Blackberry, there are a couple other companies too, but Blackberry is I think one of the best companies helping people like me to use the new technologies in a different way, in a way that preserves privacy, suppresses ads, you know, it can be done.

RE: Google invented this model now that's being used by thousands of companies, it's called the surveillance business model, and they invented the model, but now everyone's using it. Verizon is using it, the smart television makers are using it, the smart TVs now are surveillance tools. Verizon now owns AOL and is it Yahoo? What's the other... I'm just trying to think which is the other email service that they own. I know AOL email is owned by Verizon. And so the point is that some of these kind of legacy email systems people have been using for a long time, they're now being used just like Gmail is, they're being used as surveillance platforms because Verizon has adopted the surveillance business model.

JM: Yes, indeed. So the summary of your steps, or mysevensimplesteps.com, spell it or put the number seven and you can go over those. But it's really important because most of those recommendations are not expensive. I don't think you had in there the recommendations, because it hadn't been done yet with the

Google recently acquired Fitbit for a number of billions of dollars, which is another way they're going to surveil you. I mean it's just extraordinary how much data they're compiling, that 3 million pages you referred to is going to be exponentially higher in the not too distant future.

RE: That's right. And this is true partly because Fitbit gives them all kinds of physiological information, activity level and so on. But they've gone beyond that because Google has been investing in DNA repositories now for quite a long time. So they're adding DNA information to our profiles. At one point Google took over the national DNA repository, and by the way, the online articles about that, which I have cited in some of my articles, have been taken down. That's very creepy. And again, that's a kind of censorship, I mean, literally articles about Google running the government run national DNA repository, and the articles about that are gone.

RE: And then we're talking about now of course the development, as I'm sure you're very aware of, of all kinds of monitoring tools for monitoring all kinds of bodily functions, and all of those new tools that are being developed, all of those new tools are, are uploading information into the cloud, into the internet, which means again, they're fair game for surveillance.

JM: Yeah. So it's easy to see that the sophistication and the stealth that Google has applied to capturing so much information about us is really a dystopian future, almost Orwellian, that would be the goal of many governments. And there is some information on the internet that suspects that some of the initial funding for the starting of Google was done through, I believe, DARPA and another federal agency. And clearly there's a connection with government, I mean, there's clearly a collusion. Most of the governmental agencies use Gmail as their primary email, which means Google can look at anything on there. But I'm wondering if you think there's a more direct connection and a collusion and maybe even either this initial funding or this cooperation between the government and Google to really establish complete tyrannical control of the population.

RE: Well, I'm sure everyone has heard of, or most people have heard of President Eisenhower's last speech that he gave just before President Kennedy took office. This is a speech in which he warned about the so-called military industrial complex that he was very concerned about. Now, what people somehow have ignored is that in that same speech, he warned about the rise of what he called the technological elite. He said that could control public policy without anyone knowing that they're doing so. And he said, we need to be vigilant to make sure this doesn't happen. We've not been vigilant. And the fact is, you know, there are now some big companies, Google is the main culprit, that are affecting public policy in part because of partnerships they have with government agencies. So it has been now well-documented that some of the initial funding for even the development of the Google search engine came from the NSA and the CIA, not DARPA as far as I know. The point is, this has been well documented at this point, and Google has had a very close relationship with intelligence agencies, not just in the US but in other countries as well for a very long time.

RE: Now let's not get too conspiracy theory oriented here because some of this is legitimate, because the intelligence agencies, 20 years ago they saw, you know, the internet beginning to grow, and they realized that if they had a way of tracking what people were searching for, they could find people who were searching for, how to build a bomb. They could track white supremacists or religious extremists, or people who were a threat to national security. So they encouraged the founders of Google to come up with ways of tracking, of preserving search histories. And that's legitimate. That's a legitimate concern. That's a good way for intelligence agencies to preserve our security.

RE: Now, obviously it has gotten out of hand, and Edward Snowden's revelations showed that clearly, because what he showed was that in our intelligence agencies, we're literally just vacuuming up massive amounts of information, not just from Google, but from a lot of the tech companies, sometimes with the

cooperation of the tech companies, sometimes not. But they basically had at various times or maybe still have free access to these massive databases that a number of tech companies have been accumulating.

RE: Now that that gets to be problematic because again, there's no court order there. You know, this is government surveillance now, this is government surveilling in a kind of backhanded way because for them to surveil directly, they would need that court order. They would need probable cause, let's say. But if they can just vacuum up information from companies, and companies don't need any permission to do this because maybe they get permission from their terms of service without us knowing, then the government has a bunch of... You think of them as Santa's elves, they have a bunch of elves that are just doing all the surveillance for them, and doing surveillance in fact that they're not even allowed to do.

RE: That's where we stand right now. And of course, Google's project, it's called the Dragonfly Project, to go back into China and work directly with the Chinese government in controlling their population, that's pretty blatant. Supposedly that's been tabled, and that's because a lot of employees within Google protested, and a few members of Congress too, but it's mainly because of internal protests at Google, and that has led Google now to suppress speech at Google. Google now is officially suppressing political speech by its employees.k

JM: So let's think about the future. Do you feel that there is hope that we can change the course trajectory that Google has implemented? That we can educate a sufficient number of individuals to recognize this threat and implement strategies to take a different course of action? Or do you think they've reached a critical threshold, at which point it's just impossible to turn around?

RE: I think we as individuals, as parents for example, I have five children myself, we can take steps to protect our privacy to some extent, it's foolish not to. Now, what percentage of the people in the world will take such steps? I'm sure it's far less than 1%. But the point is, someone watching this right now, if you're interested in doing this, please know you can do this. You can protect yourself and you can protect your family-

JM: Easily, easily.

RE: Yeah, it's very easy, and yeah, some of it costs money, but it's very, very little money, I mean really, even if you did very aggressive protection, you might be talking about \$15 a month. I mean, it's a very tiny amount of money.

JM: Less than you're paying for Netflix.

RE: That's right. Regarding the larger issues, there I'm not so sure, I'm not so optimistic, because right now, for example, again, the tech companies can shift 15 million votes in 2020. So you know, I know lots of over-confident Trump supporters who think he's got a lock on this even with the impeachment and think that the impeachment, in fact, will just mobilize his supporters and he'll get even more votes. The fact is, again, I know about the power that these companies have, I know that they will use all of their power in 2020, that's what several whistleblowers have said coming out of Google just in recent months that they're going to make sure that Trump doesn't win. I know how many votes they can shift. Trump doesn't have a chance.

RE: So here's the problem. The problem is if the next president is, is a Democrat, and I love Democrats, you know, but if the next president is Democrat, and then let's say the Senate is shifted over too to Democrats and the house is already... The point is this is what's going to happen. What's going to happen is all the investigations that are currently underway against Google and Facebook as well, they're all going to stop, they'll all stop, and Google will take over Washington D.C. as they did during president Obama's

second term. Six federal agencies were being run by former Google executives; Obama's chief technology, former Google executive; Hillary Clinton's chief technology officer, Stephanie Hannon, former Google executive. 250 people running through this revolving door between high positions in the Obama administration, high positions at Google, 250 people. 450 visits to the White House by Google representatives. That's about 10 times more than any comparable company.

RE: That's what will happen. So I lean left, it's true, and I love Democrats, and everyone in my family is a proud Democrat. But I'm very worried because I think the Democrats will sweep and I think all of these investigations will shut down. And then if you think about it, we might never be able to hold these companies back, Google being the worst culprit, we might never be able to get them under control.

JM: Yeah. Well it seems like the effect of strategy and that one I wasn't aware of until this discussion is to really support the European Union's efforts to impose this restriction on Google, to make it a utility for the public comments. I mean, that is a solution [inaudible 00:19:10]. I mean, that's the solution, because they haven't captured the European Union.

RE: Correct. And European Union has been very aggressive. They do have the authority to implement this. I can tell you at the moment, I'm having trouble, I've dealt with some of those people in Brussels, and I'm having trouble getting their attention at this particular moment. But yes, the European Union in a way could rescue humankind. There's more that's needed. And we need monitoring systems. Those need to be set up worldwide, not just in the US. I did a second monitoring project in 2018, I discovered once again pro liberal bias in all 10 search positions on the first page of Google search results, not on Bing or Yahoo. Enough to have shifted upwards of 78.2 million votes in the 2018 elections. Of course, those would have been distributed over hundreds of races. But still that's a lot of votes. That's a lot of influence.

RE: You know, in 2018, Google's homepage, they replaced the word Google with the words "go vote" in the Google colors and everyone said, "Wow, what a great public service. They're trying to get people to vote." That's not what they were doing. That was a vote manipulation. And I published an article a few months ago with all the facts and figures, all the calculations explaining exactly how it worked, that if indeed Google displayed the go vote reminder to all Americans, that would have been seen 500 million times that day. And it would have given 800,000 more votes to Democrats than to Republicans simply because of the demographics of who uses Google. And they did the same calculations I did before they decided to display that go vote prompt. That was not a public service. It was a vote manipulation.

JM: Well, hopefully, I mean, in other interviews, I've seen your proposals for a monitoring system for the 2020 elections, but it's going to be pricey, it's upwards of \$50 million. And you know, that's a difficult barrier to reach. But there are some wealthy individuals out there, they could easily finance this thing, and I think, good strategies to get you more exposure. So these one or two individuals who could easily support this, could get this done and really hold Google accountable.

RE: Yes. And in fact, what we're hoping to come up with in coming weeks would be a pledge. It might come from multiple individuals, maybe just one individual of just half that amount, of 25 million. Because Glenn Beck, who I admire very greatly, even though he's a conservative, Glenn Beck has actually offered, if we can get a big pledge to do a nationwide... And by the way, he said this on the radio, this isn't just some private thing. He said this on air publicly. He's offered to do a kind of nationwide fundraiser to match the 25 million. And you know, he thinks he and his other radio colleagues around the country could very easily raise the additional money that we would need. And I like that concept because I like the idea of having monitoring funded by tens of thousands of people, not just by one wealthy donor.

JM: Yeah. Well you've got to be pragmatic too. I mean, it needs to be done, so you have to get it up and running. And sometimes it might be more of a challenge, but I think that is ideal from multiple donors. So

you know, I'd like to commit to helping support you in this effort and [crosstalk 02:18:55]in some of those strategies.

RE: Thank you.

JM: This has been a long interview, but I think it's really, really important information that people need to know. They could at least take action to be part of the remnant, the part of the population that isn't controlled by this massive surveillance agency, Google, and is seeking to have totalitarian control. So we can effectively isolate ourselves from them, as you have done for the last six years. So you know these strategies... And we can commit to having this decade, 2020, being one where we're not surveilled; easy to do and relatively inexpensive. So are there any websites you would recommend or additional resources other than to let me reinforce the strong encouragement to watch The Creepy Line free on Amazon prime.

RE: Well, start with The Creepy Line, then go to mysevensimplesteps.com. If people want to support my research or they want to learn more about it, they can go to mygooglresearch.com, mygooglresearch.com, very easy to remember. You know, there's a lot out there, there's a lot of resources. But if you go to mygooglresearch.com then from there you can link to all kinds of resources and all kinds of work that I've been doing now since 2012.

JM: All right, well that's terrific. I so deeply appreciate the courageous, and I think that's a serious understatement, the courageous work that you're doing to really free us from this tyrannical future, this dystopian future that seems inevitable. But you know, with people like you, we can hopefully determine strategies to circumvent that inevitability.

RE: Well, my middle name is David.

JM: There you go.

RE: But this Goliath is-

JM: It's huge.

RE: Pretty tall. I think it's going to take more than...

JM: I meant to ask you this earlier, would it be fair to describe them as the biggest monopoly in the history of the world?

RE: Yes, no question about it. And the most powerful company that's ever existed in human history.

JM: Wow. We might even have that as the headline for this article. The most powerful company in the history of the world. I mean, that is frightening. Well, it's an interesting note to close on, but thank you for everything and really appreciate all your work, and hopefully people will engage and participate in the process of freeing themselves from Google.

RE: Well, Dr. Mercola, thank you for this opportunity, and I admire your work, and I feel for you because I know that you yourself have been victimized by Google that's terrible because you do a lot of good things for people's health.

JM: Yeah. It's terrible from the perspective, not personally, but from the perspective of what they're doing more broadly, which is restricting access to this information. I mean, you literally will not be able to find in Google any natural strategies for any disease, it's only going to be pharmacological approaches, so that

that is desperately evil, there's no question. So that's what really saddens me that at the deepest levels. It's not personal. We're doing fine. My company existed two years before Google was invented. So, you know, we've got a reputation and people support us and we're doing just fine. It's just the people who don't know yet, which has been my mission, to change this whole system, and I'm confident we'll do it, because I'm going to be living for a long time. So they'll have to look out for me.

RE: Go for it.

JM: All right then, nice to talk.

RE: Okay. Thank you.

[END]