

THAT TIME GOOGLE'S ERIC SCHMIDT AND LARRY PAGE TRIED TO WIPE OUT TECH WORKERS

[Silicon Valley's No-poaching Case: The Growing Debate over ...](#)

□ <https://knowledge.wharton.upenn.edu/article/silicon-valleys-poaching-case-growing-debate-employee-mobility/>

"**Silicon Valley's No-poaching** Case: The Growing Debate over Employee Mobility."

Knowledge@Wharton. The Wharton School, University of Pennsylvania, 30 April, 2014.

[Steve Jobs was 'central figure' in Silicon Valley's 'no ...](#)

□ <https://money.cnn.com/2014/08/11/technology/silicon-valley-poaching-case/index.html>

Aug 11, 2014A **lawsuit** by **Silicon Valley** workers claims Steve Jobs was a ringleader in a conspiracy not to poach employees. If **Silicon Valley's** biggest companies want an embarrassing employee **lawsuit** to go ...

The AngelGate Conspiracy (<https://venturecapitalcorruption.weebly.com/the-angelgate-conspiracy.html>); The Job Collusion Case (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/High-Tech_Employee_Antitrust_Litigation) and hundreds of other cases, prove that the perpetrators regularly meet, conspire, collude and racketeer, in full view of law enforcement, without ever getting arrested by the FBI because they bribe public officials in order to avoid prosecution.

Public officials and Silicon Valley oligarchs exchanged felony bribes and manipulated government actions in order to benefit themselves and harm us. these are the facts including the lists of bribes, attacks and covert financing routes! Famous members of congress lie, cheat, steal and manipulate public records in order to protect their trillions of dollars of Google, Facebook, Netflix, Tesla and Amazon insider stock market payola.

Now the public is working together, around the globe, to end this corruption forever by exposing every single one of the corrupt and all of their dirty secrets! Demand the immediate divestiture of all stock market holdings of all politicians and their family members because that is how most bribes are now paid!

The government is responsible to the citizens for the damages to citizens. Many, natural born citizens, suffered injuries caused by the crimes of government staff during, and after, some citizens work for the government.

The NY Times reported: ["Ms. Feinstein and her husband sold \\$1.5 million to \\$6 million worth of stock in Allogene Therapeutics, a California-based biotech company, in transactions that took place on Jan. 31 and Feb. 18."](#) She, as usual, claimed that she has "no involvement in her husband's financial decisions" to avoid criticism. Do you really think that she has no idea about multi-million dollar deals that her husband is involved in? Dianne Feinstein, and her family owned the HR services, the construction company, the leasing services and the stock market accounts in Tesla and Solyndra and got the owners of those companies their government hand-outs. White House Staff and Department of Energy staff were fully aware of this and covered up these conflicts to protect their own stock holdings and revolving door jobs. She, and other Senators, ordered hit-jobs on the competitors to those companies, who were their constituents, in order to protect their stock holding profiteering efforts.

Public integrity at The Department of Energy and The U.S. Congress is in shambles because of this kind of audacious corruption.

Congress failed to eliminate both the appearance and the potential for financial conflicts of interest as Senators, White House staff and Department of Energy executives optimize the support structure to engage in such criminality.

Americans must be confident that actions taken by public officials are intended to serve the public, and not those officials. The actions taken by Administration staff and Department of Energy officials in illicit coordination with U.S. Senators were criminal acts in violation of RICO and other laws.

One set of statements filed with Congress and The FBI include the following assertions:

"We saw illicit individual stock ownership by Members of Congress, Cabinet Secretaries, senior congressional staff, federal judges, White House staff and other senior agency officials while in office. Those government officials acquired, held, 'pump-and-dumped' and traded stock where its value was influenced by their agency, department, or actions in efforts that harmed us.

We saw our government officials engage in organized crime.

We saw conflict of interest laws and ethics violated by the President and Vice President in violation of Conflicts of Interest standards in which the President and the Vice President did not place conflicted assets, including businesses, into a blind trust to be sold off and hid conflicts of interest.

[We saw senior Department of Energy government officials, employees, contractors and White House staff invest in privately-owned assets that did present conflicts and harmed us, including large companies like Tesla, Google, Facebook, Sony, Netflix, etc., and commercial real estate.](#)

We saw an organized crime scheme to not respond to filings by citizens or reporters. Former White House and Energy Department staff use 'stone-walling' to intentionally delay responses for a decade, or more, and that tactic continues to this day.

We saw ethics rules violations by government employees, including unpaid White House staff and advisors.

We saw executive branch employees fail to recuse from all issues that might financially benefit

themselves or a previous employer or client from the preceding 4 years in the "Cleantech" programs.

We saw a 'Revolving Door' between Silicon Valley industry and government and we saw tech companies buying influence in the government or profiting off of the public service of these officials.

We saw lobbying by the President, Vice Presidents Members of Congress, federal judges, and Cabinet Secretaries; and, we saw other federal employees lobbying their former office, department, House of Congress, or agency.

We saw our competitors immediately hiring or paying these senior government officials from agencies, departments, and/or Congressional offices recently lobbied by those companies and staff from our Senator's office go freely back-and-forth at jobs at the companies and the offices of the Senators.

We saw the world's largest companies, banks, and monopolies, especially Goldman Sachs, (measured by annual revenue or market capitalization) hiring or paying former senior government officials mentioned herein. We saw the massive, and unfair, ability of companies to buy influence through current government employees

We saw current lobbyists taking government jobs after lobbying.

We saw corporate outlaws like Google, Tesla, Facebook, LinkedIn, Netflix, Sony, etc., working in government via top corporate leaders whose companies were caught breaking federal law.

We saw contractor corruption where federal contractors and licensee employees worked at the agency awarding the contracts.

We saw "Golden Parachutes" that provide corporate bonuses to executives for federal service as bribes.

We saw massive influence-peddling in Washington DC.

We saw the manipulation of the federal definition of a "lobbyist" to exclude most individuals paid to influence government.

We saw individuals paid to influence government on behalf of for-profit entities and their front-groups who were facades for Silicon Valley oligarchs.

We saw the obfuscation of the disclosure of lobbyist activities and influence campaigns where our competitor's lobbyists did not disclose specific bills, policies, and government actions they attempted to influence; nor many meetings with public officials; and many documents they provided to those

officials

We saw massive influence-peddling by Foreign Actors such as that which occurred in the ENER1, Severstal, Solyndra and related scandals. We saw substantial foreign influence in Washington by foreign lobbying.

We saw American lobbyists accepting money from foreign governments, foreign individuals, and foreign companies to influence United States public policy at the Department of Energy and other agencies.

We saw our competitors current lobbyists taking government jobs after lobbying and using those positions against us where they exploited 'Legalized Lobbyist Bribery' and traded money for government favors for our competitors.

We saw political donations from lobbyists to candidates or Members of Congress in exchange for helping our competitors that the lobbyists worked for and that the Members of Congress owned stock in. We saw those lobbyists operate contingency fees that allowed those lobbyists to be paid for a guaranteed public policy outcome.

We saw our competitor's lobbyist gifts to the executive and legislative branch officials they lobby.

We saw our Congressional representatives use our competitor's lobbyists for "expertise" and information in our industry.

We saw those in our congressional service get paid non competitive salaries that do not track with other federal employees.

We saw the removal of the nonpartisan Congressional Office of Technology Assessment to avoid providing open-source critical scientific and technological support to Members of Congress in order to tunnel-vision info about our competitors.

We saw a non-level playing field between our competitor's corporate lobbyists and government via excessive lobbying over \$500,000 in annual lobbying expenditures by our competitors in a huge number of anti-trust violations.

We saw a COMPLETE failure of individuals and corporations to disclose funding or editorial conflicts of interest in research submitted to agencies that is not publicly available in peer-reviewed publications.

We saw McKinsey-type sham research which undermines the public interest by not requiring that such studies, that present conflicts of interest, undergo independent peer review to be considered in the Congressional rule-making process.

We saw agencies refuse to justify withdrawn public interest rules via public, written explanations.

We saw loopholes exploited by powerful corporations like Google, Facebook, Tesla, Netflix, Sony, etc., to block public interest actions.

We saw loopholes that allow corporations, like Tesla and Google, to tilt the rules in their favor and against the public interest.

We saw Silicon Valley oligarchs and their agency skills delay or dominate the rule-making process by the practice of inviting Google, Tesla or Facebook to negotiate rules they have to follow.

We saw inter-agency review manipulation as a tool for corporate abuse used for the banning of informal review and closed-door industry lobbying at the White House's Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs

We saw abusive injunctions from rogue judges, like Jackson, et al, where individual District Court judges, can temporarily block agencies from implementing final rules.

We saw hostile agencies use sham delays of implementation and enforcement by using the presence of litigation to postpone the implementation of final rules.

We saw obfuscation by agency public advocates to prevent public engagement.

We saw the blockading of private lawsuits by members of the public to hold agencies accountable for failing to complete rules or enforce the law, and to hold corporations accountable for breaking the rules.

We saw a failure to inoculate government agencies against corporate capture such as Google undertook against the White House.

We saw our complaints and whistle-blowing buried in an avalanche of lobbyist activity.

We saw our competitor corporations game the courts by requiring courts to presumptively defer to agency interpretations of laws and prohibiting courts from considering sham McKinsey studies and research excluded by agencies from the rule-making process

We saw blocking of the Congressional Review Act provision banning related rules that prevent agencies from implementing the will of Congress based on Congress' prior disapproval of a different, narrow rule on a similar topic.

We saw a failure in the integrity of the judicial branch by reducing rules that prevent conflicts of interest.

We saw individual stock ownership by federal judges in our competitors.

We saw judges accepting gifts or payments to attend private seminars from private individuals and corporations that were our competitors.

We saw non-ethical behavior by the Supreme Court in which the Court did not follow the Code of Conduct that binds all other federal judges

We saw a lack of public insight into the judicial process by the hiding of information about the process and an increase in the barriers to accessing information.

We saw reduced disclosure of non-judicial activity by federal judges and the hiding of judges' financial reports, recusal decisions, and speeches.

We saw a blockade of public access to court activity by refusing to live-stream, on the web, audio of their proceedings, making case information easily-accessible to the public free of charge, and by federal courts not sharing case assignment data in bulk.

We saw our rights restricted and our access to justice blocked to all but the wealthiest individuals and companies.

We saw barriers that prevented us as individuals from having our case heard in court via harsh pleading standards that make it too hard for individuals and businesses that have been harmed to make their case before a judge.

We saw no independent agency dedicated to enforcing federal ethics and anti-corruption laws.

We saw no support for stronger ethics and public integrity laws via stronger enforcement.

We saw no federal ethics enforcement with effective investigative and disciplinary powers that would help individuals.

We saw minimal enforcement of ethics laws via corrective action, levying civil and administrative penalties, and referring egregious violations to the Justice Department for criminal arrest and enforcement.

We saw no IG anti-corruption and public integrity oversight over federal officials, including oversight of agency Inspectors General, or ethics matters for White House staff and agency heads, or waivers and recusals by senior government officials.

We saw no investigation independent and protected from partisan politics through a single Director operating under strict selection, appointment, and removal criteria.

We saw no easy online access to key government ethics and transparency documents, including financial disclosures; lobbyist registrations; lobbyist disclosures of meetings and materials; and all ethics records, recusals, and waivers.

We saw no independent and empowered ethics office insulated from congressional politics.

We saw few criminal and civil violations in our case referred to the Justice Department, the Office of Public Integrity, or other relevant state or federal law enforcement.

We saw broken Federal Open Records laws, public official and candidate tax disclosures.

We saw Silicon Valley Oligarch special interests using secret donations from corporations and their Cartel of billionaires to influence public policy without disclosure

We saw Google and Facebook provide over a billion dollars of political campaign financing with NO action by the FEC.

We saw fake tech company 'nonprofit organizations' refuse to list donors who bankrolled the production of any specific rule-making comment, congressional testimony, or lobbying material, and refuse to reveal whether the donors reviewed or edited the document at the Silicon Valley insider companies.

We saw the hiding of individuals and corporations disclosures of funding, or editorial conflicts of interest, in research submitted to agencies that is not publicly available in peer-reviewed publications.

We saw McKinsey sham "Cleantech" and "battery research" reports undermine the public interest by using studies that present conflicts of interest to independent peer review to be considered in the rule-making process.

We saw loopholes in our open records laws that allow federal officials to hide tech industry and Silicon Valley oligarch industry influence.

We saw a failure of the presumption of disclosure and a failure to affirmatively disclose records of public interest, including meeting agendas; government contracts; salaries; staff diversity; and reports to Congress.

We saw Tesla Motors get in-person, hand-walked, through the DOE government cash give-away while all of Tesla's competitors were ignored, black-listed, never communicated with and blockaded.

We saw no use of a central FOIA website that is searchable and has downloadable open records databases with all open FOIA requests and all records disclosed through FOIA.

We saw limited FOIA enforcement by not limiting FOIA exemptions and loopholes, and by not giving the National Archives the authority to overrule agency FOIA decisions and to compel disclosure.

We saw Congress become less transparent by not ending the corporate lobbyists leg up in the

legislative process. The public deserves to know what Congress is up to and how Silicon Valley lobbyists influence legislation.

We saw a failure to require all congressional committees to immediately post online more information, including hearings and markup schedules, bill or amendments text, testimonies, documents entered into the hearing record, hearing transcripts, written witness answers, and hearing audio and video recordings.

We saw a refusal of Members of Congress to post a link to their searchable voting record on their official websites

We saw a hiding, by Silicon Valley lobbyists of when they lobby a specific congressional office; specific topics of visit; the official action being requested; and all documents provided to the office during the visit....”

There are many, many news reports, 60 Minutes episodes and Ethics Committee reports and Pacer.gov filings, that anyone can look up, to see stories about many other people who saw all of these same exact things.

The victims want to see: 1.) Their damages paid for, 2.) the FBI 302 reports on this case, 3.) arrests of the government employees who engaged in this corruption and 4.) new laws to make sure this never happens again!

The victims in this case were damaged by their work for, and whistle-blowing about, criminally corrupt government officials

They were assisting federal investigators with a criminal investigation of federal and state officials.

That on-going investigation has resulted in arrests, new laws, federal executive terminations and federal indictments of some of those officials

The history of the issues behind this case, from the past, are fully relevant to the issues of the matter today. It is not ethically possible for government officials to refuse to hear all of the facts. It is not morally right for government officials, who are supposed to solve the problem, to selectively try to piece-meal parts of this in order to avoid political embarrassment.

Silicon Valley law enforcement records prove that the tech oligarchs that finance these political figures, engage in an organized, racketeering-based, massive sex trafficking, tax evasion, anti-trust violating, spousal abuse, money laundering, black-listing, racist, ageist, political bribery, crony racketeering crime Cartel. The Famous U.S. Senators, Governors and their staff knowingly engage in, finance, operate and benefit from these crimes in exchange for search engine manipulation and stock market insider trading.

The Google, Facebook and Twitter components of this Cartel censor and cover-up news coverage of these crimes, and attacked the victims, because they have a financial connection to the perpetrators.

All of the crooks have had their files hacked. The evidence is out there at the NSA, FBI, etc. Even hackers from Russia and China have copies of the incriminating data. The bad guys will eventually lose!

It is unlikely that any whistle-blowers have as productive a domestic resume, as many letters of reference from famous third-parties and as much proof-of-work as these victims have proven in their evidence sets. The victims have been friends with, and shared homes with, multiple White House and Senate staff and family members and some them have even vouched for the victims

The victims are bi-partisan and not affiliated with any political party but they hate political corruption and have the connections to fight it when it affects them and America. Pictures and videos of famous political figures hugging them and meeting with them abound.

In a positive turn of events Whistle-blower Walter Tamosaitis” (easily found on web searches) who was also a Department of Energy Whistle-blower, got a rare victory. Walter got \$4.1 MILLION DOLLARS for his whistle-blower work about the Department of Energy malfeasance.

The rest of the victims have gotten nothing but punishing benefits blockades and benefit reductions that guaranteed they would never be able to afford rent, going to a show or a restaurant, legal services or anything else in their lives! One of the people they helped get arrested sits around and drinks and collects over \$150,000.00 per year in government benefits...and they are an arrested crook. The victims are having a hard time seeing how they have been treated fairly in light of their deeply documented public service!

U.S. Senators, Agency Heads and Congress are bribed with: Billions of dollars of Google, Twitter, Facebook, Tesla, Netflix and Sony Pictures stock and stock warrants which is never reported to the FEC; Billions of dollars of Google, Twitter, Facebook, Tesla, Netflix and Sony Pictures search engine rigging and shadow-banning which is never reported to the FEC; Free rent; Male and female prostitutes; Cars; Dinners; Party Financing; Sports Event Tickets; Political campaign printing and mailing services "Donations"; Secret PAC Financing; Jobs in Corporations in Silicon Valley For The Family Members of Those Who Take Bribes And Those Who Take Bribes; "Consulting" contracts from McKinsey as fronted pay-off gigs; Overpriced "Speaking Engagements" which are really just pay-offs conduited for donors; Private jet rides and use of Government fuel depots (ie: Google handed out NASA jet fuel to staff); Real Estate; Fake mortgages; The use of Cayman, Boca Des Tores, Swiss and related money-laundering accounts; The use of HSBC, Wells Fargo, Goldman Sachs and Deutsche Bank money laundering accounts and covert stock accounts; Free spam and bulk mailing services owned by Silicon Valley corporations; Use of high tech law firms such as Perkins Coie, Wilson Sonsini, MoFo, Covington & Burling, etc. to conduit bribes to officials; and other means now documented by us, The FBI, the FTC, The SEC, The FEC and journalists.

From FBI-class federal investigators and private investigators, records prove that well known California Senate officials and well known White House officials ordered government benefits to be blocked, delayed, obfuscated, denied and otherwise harmed as political reprisal and retribution for the assistance the victims supplied to law enforcement.

SEE HARD EVIDENCE OF THE USE OF STOCKS AND SECURITIES TO PAY BRIBES AND QUID-PRO-QUO PAYOLA TO FAMOUS POLITICIANS AT:

<http://newsplus007.com/STOCKS/>

<http://www.sec.gov>

<https://www.zerohedge.com>

[*Pelosi, Feinstein & Congress Cash in on Insider Trading | RepresentUs*](#)

<https://represent.us/action/insider-trading/>

In 2011, a CBS investigation blew the lid off of one of Washington's most poorly-kept secrets: members of **Congress** were routinely exploiting legal loopholes to engage in **insider trading** and line their own pockets — a criminal offense for regular citizens. In the ensuing public outrage, **Congress** passed a law called the STOCK Act, and took a [...]

[*Congress: California Senators Trading stock on inside information? - CBS News*](#)

<https://www.cbsnews.com/news/congress-trading-stock-on-inside-information/>

Congress: Trading stock on inside information? ... But, congressional lawmakers have no corporate responsibilities and have long been considered exempt from **insider trading** laws, even though they ...

[*Congress Tells Court That Congress Can't Be Investigated ...*](#)

<https://theintercept.com/2015/05/07/congress-argues-cant-investigated-insider-trading/>

But as the Securities and Exchange Commission made news with the first major investigation of political **insider trading**, **Congress** moved to block the inquiry.

[*Reckless stock trading leaves Congress rife with corruption ... - POLITICO*](#)

<https://www.politico.com/story/2017/05/14/congress-stock-trading-conflict-of-interest-rules-238033>

POLITICO Investigation. Reckless stock **trading** leaves **Congress** rife with conflicts . After the furor over Tom Price's investments, four more members quietly bought shares in the same firm.

[*Nancy Pelosi Built Wealth on 'Insider Trading', that's where her covert \\$120M came from...*](#)

<https://thepoliticalinsider.com/nancy-pelosi-insider-trading/>

"Nancy **Pelosi** has engaged in **insider trading**," Hill said, "because she's been the beneficiary of information that other people wouldn't have, so Paul **Pelosi** is able to make active trades on her **insider** knowledge." Listen below:

[**Apple Google Silicon Valley No Cold Calling Anti-Poaching**](#)

<https://www.lieffcabraser.com/antitrust/high-tech-employees/>

Silicon Valley firms and other **high-tech** companies owe their tremendous successes to the sacrifices and hard work of their employees, and must take responsibility for their misconduct. One of the principal means by which **high-tech** companies recruit employees is to solicit them directly from other companies in a process referred to as "cold ...

[**Engineers Allege Hiring Collusion in Silicon Valley - The ...**](#)

<https://www.nytimes.com/2014/03/01/technology/engineers-allege-hiring-collusion-in-silicon-valley.html>

Mar 1, 2014 Alan Hyde, a Rutgers professor who wrote "Working in **Silicon Valley**: Economic and Legal Analysis of a **High-Velocity** Labor Market," said the **no-poaching** accusations go contrary to what has made ...

[**Apple, Google and others to pay \\$415m to settle Silicon ...**](#)

<https://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/news/11843237/Apple-Google-and-others-to-pay-415m-to-settle-Silicon-Valley-no-poaching-lawsuit.html>

Apple, Google and others to pay \$415m to settle **Silicon Valley 'no poaching' lawsuit** US judge agrees settlement that will see thousands of technology workers receive thousands of dollars

[Dirty Secrets of Silicon Valley Poaching | Paysa](#)

 <https://www.paysa.com/blog/dirty-secrets-of-silicon-valley-poaching/>

Silicon Valley is a talent magnet. With prestigious **high-tech** corporations such as Google, Apple, Facebook, Netflix, and Tesla Motors among the Fortune 1000 companies and thousands of startups finding their home in the world-renowned technology hub, this comes as **no** surprise.

[Silicon Valley no-poaching deal appears headed for approval](#)

 <https://phys.org/news/2015-03-silicon-valley-no-poaching.html>

Silicon Valley no-poaching deal appears headed for approval. by Howard Mintz, San Jose Mercury News

[Silicon Valley's \\$415 million poaching settlement finalized](#)

 <https://www.mercurynews.com/2015/09/03/silicon-valleys-415-million-poaching-settlement-finalized/>

Sep 3, 2015**Silicon Valley's \$415 million poaching** settlement finalized ... **valley-tech**-giants-learn-from-**no-poaching**-antitrust-case/ 'When Rules Don't Apply': Did **Silicon Valley tech** giants learn from **no** ...

[Justice Department Requires Six High Tech Companies to ...](#)

 <https://www.justice.gov/opa/pr/justice-department-requires-six-high-tech-companies-stop-entering-anticompetitive-employee>

The complaint arose out of a larger investigation by the Antitrust Division into employment practices by **high tech** firms. The division continues to investigate other similar **no** solicitation agreements. Adobe Systems Inc. is a Delaware corporation with its principal place of business in San Jose, Calif., and 2009 revenues of nearly \$3 billion.

Cold calling is one of the main methods used by companies in the high-technology sector to recruit employees with advanced and specialised skills, such as software and hardware engineers, programmers, animators, digital artists, Web developers and other technical professionals.[1] Cold calling involves communicating directly in any manner with another firm's employee who has not otherwise applied for a job opening. Cold calling may be done in person, by phone, letter, or email.[2] According to the legal brief filed by a plaintiff in one of the class-action cases, cold calling is an effective method of recruiting for the high-technology sector because "employees of other [high-technology] companies are often unresponsive to other recruiting strategies... [and] current satisfied employees tend to be more qualified, harder working, and more stable than those who are actively looking for employment." [3]

Amy Lambert, Google's associate general counsel, noted in a blog post shortly after the DOJ's actions, that Google's definition of cold calling does not necessarily eliminate recruiting by letter or email, but only the process of calling on the telephone. By implication, recruiting through LinkedIn incurs recruiting by "InMail" - LinkedIn's own mail contact system: "In order to maintain a good working

relationship with these companies, in 2005 we decided not to "cold call" employees at a few of our partner companies. Our policy only impacted cold calling, and we continued to recruit from these companies through LinkedIn, job fairs, employee referrals, or when candidates approached Google directly. In fact, we hired hundreds of employees from the companies involved during this time period."

The challenged "no cold call" agreements are alleged bilateral agreements between high technology companies not to cold call each other's employees. The DOJ alleges that senior executives at each company negotiated to have their employees added to 'no call' lists maintained by human resources personnel or in company hiring manuals. The alleged agreements were not limited by geography, job function, product group, or time period. The alleged bilateral agreements were between: (1) Apple and Google, (2) Apple and Adobe, (3) Apple and Pixar, (4) Google and Intel, (5) Google and Intuit,[\[4\]](#) and (6) Lucasfilm and Pixar.[\[5\]](#)

The civil class action further alleges that agreements also existed to (1) "provide notification when making an offer to another [company]'s employee (without the knowledge or consent of the employee)" and (2) "agreements that, when offering a position to another company's employee, neither company would counteroffer above the initial offer."[\[3\]](#)

Department of Justice antitrust action

The [United States Department of Justice Antitrust Division](#) filed a complaint in the [US District Court for the District of Columbia](#) alleging violations of Section 1 of the [Sherman Act](#). In *US v. Adobe Systems Inc., et al.*, the Department of Justice alleged that Adobe, Apple, Google, Intel, Intuit, and Pixar had violated Section 1 of the Sherman Act by entering into a series of bilateral "No Cold Call" Agreements to prevent the recruitment of their employees (a similar but separate suit was filed against Lucasfilm on December 21, 2010[\[6\]](#)). The DOJ alleged in their Complaint that the companies had reached "facially anticompetitive" agreements that "eliminated a significant form of competition...to the detriment of the affected employees who were likely deprived of competitively important information and access to better job opportunities." The DOJ also alleged that the agreements "were not ancillary to any legitimate collaboration," "were much broader than reasonably necessary for the formation or implementation of any collaborative effort," and "disrupted the normal price-setting mechanisms that apply in the labor setting."[\[4\]](#) The same day it filed the suit, the DOJ and the defendants proposed a settlement.[\[7\]](#)



A final judgment enforcing the settlement was entered by the court on March 17, 2011.[8] Although the DOJ Complaint only challenged the alleged "no cold call" agreements, in the settlement, the companies agreed to a more broad prohibition against "attempting to enter into, entering into, maintaining or enforcing any agreement with any other person to in any way refrain from, requesting that any person in any way refrain from, or pressuring any person in any way to refrain from soliciting, cold calling, recruiting, or otherwise competing for employees of the other person", for a period of five years; the court can grant an extension.[8] The settlement agreement does not provide any compensation for company employees affected by the alleged agreements.[9] Lucasfilm entered into a similar settlement agreement in December 2010.[5]

Civil class action

In re: High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litigation ([U.S. District Court, Northern District of California 11-cv-2509 \[10\]](#)) is a [class-action](#) lawsuit on behalf of over 64,000 employees of [Adobe](#), [Apple Inc.](#), [Google](#), [Intel](#), [Intuit](#), [Pixar](#) and [Lucasfilm](#) (the last two are subsidiaries of [Disney](#)) against their employer alleging that their wages were repressed due to alleged agreements between their employers not to hire employees from their competitors.[11][12] The case was filed on May 4, 2011 by a former software engineer at Lucasfilm and alleges violations of California's antitrust statute, Business and Professions Code sections 16720 et seq. (the "Cartwright Act"); Business and Professions Code section 16600; and California's unfair competition law, Business and Professions Code sections 17200, et seq. Focusing on the network of connections around former Apple CEO [Steve Jobs](#), the Complaint alleges "an interconnected web of express agreements, each with the active involvement and participation of a company under the control of Steve Jobs...and/or a company that shared at least one member of [Apple's board of directors](#)." The alleged intent of this conspiracy was "to reduce employee compensation and mobility through eliminating competition for skilled labor."[\[13\]](#)

On October 24, 2013 the [United States District Court for the Northern District of California](#) granted class certification for all employees of Defendant companies from January 1, 2005 through January 1, 2010.[\[9\]](#)

As of October 31, 2013, Intuit, Pixar and Lucasfilm have reached a tentative settlement agreement. Pixar and Lucasfilm agreed to pay \$9 million in damages, and Intuit agreed to pay \$11 million in damages.[\[9\]](#) In May 2014, Judge [Lucy Koh](#) approved the \$20 million settlement between Lucasfilm, Pixar, and Intuit and their employees. Class members in this settlement, which involved fewer than 8% of the 65,000 employees affected, will receive around \$3,840 each.[\[14\]](#)

The trial of the class action for the remaining Defendant companies was scheduled to begin on May 27, 2014. The plaintiffs intended to ask the jury for \$3 billion in compensation, a number which could in turn have tripled to \$9 billion under antitrust law.[\[15\]](#) However, in late April 2014, the four remaining defendants, [Apple Inc](#), [Google](#), [Intel](#) and [Adobe Systems](#), agreed to settle out of court. Any settlement must be approved by Judge [Lucy Koh](#).[\[16\]\[17\]](#)

On May 23, 2014, Apple, Google, Intel, Adobe agreed to settle for \$324.5 million. Lawyers sought 25% in attorneys' fees, plus expenses of as much as \$1.2 million, according to the filing. Additional award payments of \$80,000 would be sought for each named plaintiff who served as a class representative.[\[18\]](#) Payouts will average a few thousand dollars based on the salary of the employee at the time of the complaint.

In June 2014, Judge Lucy Koh expressed concern that the settlement may not be a good one for the plaintiffs. Michael Devine, one of the plaintiffs, said the settlement is unjust. In a letter he wrote to the judge he said the settlement represents only one-tenth of the \$3 billion in compensation the 64,000 workers could have made if the defendants had not colluded.[\[19\]](#)

On August 8, 2014, Judge Koh rejected the settlement as insufficient on the basis of the evidence and exposure. Rejecting a settlement is unusual in such cases. This left the defendants with a choice between raising their settlement offer or facing a trial.[\[20\]](#)

On September 8, 2014, Judge Koh set April 9, 2015 as the actual trial date for the remaining defendants, with a pre-trial conference scheduled for December 19, 2014. Also, as of early September 2014, the defendants had re-entered mediation to determine whether a new settlement could be reached.[\[21\]](#)

A final approval hearing was held on July 9, 2015.[\[22\]](#) On Wednesday September 2, 2015, Judge Lucy H. Koh signed an order granting Motion for Final Approval of Class Action Settlement. The settlement website stated that Adobe, Apple, Google, and Intel has reached a settlement of \$415 million and other companies settled for \$20 million.

According to the settlement website, Gilardi & Co., LLC distributed the settlement to class members the week of December 21, 2015.

See also

- [Corrupt Eric Schmidt And His Role In The Illegal Collusion](#)
- [Antipoaching](#)

The Tectopus: How Silicon Valley's most celebrated CEOs conspired to drive down 100,000 tech engineers' wages



[By Mark Ames](#)

In early 2005, as demand for Silicon Valley engineers began [booming](#), Apple's Steve Jobs sealed a secret and illegal pact with Google's Eric Schmidt to artificially push their workers wages lower by agreeing not to recruit each other's employees, sharing wage scale information, and punishing violators. On February 27, 2005, Bill Campbell, a member of Apple's board of directors and [senior advisor](#) to

Google, emailed Jobs to confirm that Eric Schmidt "got directly involved and firmly stopped all efforts to recruit anyone from Apple."

Later that year, Schmidt instructed his Sr VP for Business Operation Shona Brown to keep the pact a secret and only share information "verbally, since I don't want to create a paper trail over which we can be sued later?"

These secret conversations and agreements between some of the biggest names in Silicon Valley were first exposed in a Department of Justice antitrust [investigation](#) launched by the Obama Administration in 2010. That DOJ suit became the basis of a [class action lawsuit](#) filed on behalf of over 100,000 tech employees whose wages were artificially lowered — an [estimated \\$9 billion](#) effectively stolen by the high-flying companies from their workers to pad company earnings — in the second half of the 2000s. Last week, the 9th Circuit Court of Appeals denied attempts by Apple, Google, Intel, and Adobe to have the lawsuit tossed, and gave final approval for the class action suit to go forward. A jury trial date has been set for May 27 in San Jose, before US District Court judge Lucy Koh, who presided over the Samsung-Apple patent suit.

In a related but separate investigation and ongoing suit, eBay and its former CEO Meg Whitman, now CEO of HP, are being sued by both the [federal government](#) and the [state of California](#) for arranging a similar, secret wage-theft agreement with Intuit (and possibly Google as well) during the same period.

The secret wage-theft agreements between Apple, Google, Intel, Adobe, Intuit, and Pixar (now owned by Disney) are described in court papers obtained by PandoDaily as "an overarching conspiracy" in violation of the Sherman Antitrust Act and the Clayton Antitrust Act, and at times it reads like something lifted straight out of the robber baron era that produced those laws. Today's inequality crisis is America's [worst on record](#) since statistics were first recorded a hundred years ago — the only comparison would be to the era of the railroad tycoons in the late 19th century.

Shortly after sealing the pact with Google, Jobs strong-armed Adobe into joining after he complained to CEO Bruce Chizen that Adobe was recruiting Apple's employees. Chizen sheepishly responded that he thought only a small class of employees were off-limits:

I thought we agreed not to recruit any senior level employees.... I would propose we keep it that way. Open to discuss. It would be good to agree.

Jobs responded by threatening war:

OK, I'll tell our recruiters they are free to approach any Adobe employee who is not a Sr. Director or VP. Am I understanding your position correctly?

Adobe's Chizen immediately backed down:

I'd rather agree NOT to actively solicit any employee from either company.....If you are in agreement, I will let my folks know.

The next day, Chizen let his folks — Adobe's VP of Human Resources — know that "we are not to solicit ANY Apple employees, and visa versa." Chizen was worried that if he didn't agree, Jobs would make Adobe pay:

if I tell Steve [Jobs] it's open season (other than senior managers), he will deliberately poach Adobe just to prove a point. Knowing Steve, he will go after some of our top Mac talent...and he will do it in a way in which they will be enticed to come (extraordinary packages and Steve wooing).

Indeed Jobs even threatened war against Google early 2005 before their "gentlemen's agreement," telling Sergey Brin to back off recruiting Apple's Safari team:

if you [Brin] hire a single one of these people that means war.

Brin immediately advised Google's Executive Management Team to halt all recruiting of Apple employees until an agreement was discussed.

In the geopolitics of [Silicon Valley tech power](#), Adobe was no match for a corporate superpower like Apple. Inequality of the sort we're experiencing today affects everyone in ways we haven't even thought of — whether it's Jobs bullying slightly lesser executives into joining an illegal wage-theft pact, or the tens of thousands of workers whose wages were artificially lowered, transferred into higher corporate earnings, and [higher compensations](#) for those already richest and most powerful to begin with.

Over the next two years, as the tech industry entered another frothing bubble, the secret wage-theft pact which began with Apple, Google and Pixar expanded to include Intuit and Intel. The secret agreements were based on relationships, and those relationships were forged in Silicon Valley's [incestuous boards of directors](#), which in the past has been recognized mostly as a problem for shareholders and corporate governance advocates, rather than for the tens of thousands of employees whose wages and lives are viscerally affected by their clubby backroom deals. Intel CEO Paul Otellini [joined](#) Google's board of directors in 2004, a part-time gig that netted Otellini [\\$23 million in 2007](#), with tens of millions more in Google stock options still in his name — which worked out to \$464,000 per Google board event if you only counted the stock options Otellini cashed out — dwarfing what Otellini made off his Intel stock options, despite spending most of his career with the company.

Meanwhile, Eric Schmidt served on Apple's board of directors until 2009, when a [DoJ antitrust investigation](#) pushed him to resign. Intuit's chairman at the time, Bill Campbell, also served on Apple's board of directors, and as official advisor — ["consigliere"](#) — to Google chief Eric Schmidt, until he [resigned](#) from Google in 2010. Campbell, a celebrated figure ("a quasi-religious force for good in Silicon Valley") played a key behind-the-scenes role connecting the various CEOs into the wage-theft pact. Steve Jobs, who took regular Sunday walks with Campbell near their Palo Alto homes, valued Campbell for his ability "to get A and B work out of people," gushing that the conduit at the center of the \$9 billion wage theft suit, ["loves people, and he loves growing people."](#)

Indeed. Eric Schmidt has been, if anything, even more profuse in his praise of Campbell. Schmidt credits Campbell for structuring Google when Schmidt was brought on board in 2001:

His contribution to Google — it is literally not possible to overstate. He essentially architected the organizational structure.

Court documents show it was Campbell who first brought together Jobs and Schmidt to form the core of the Silicon Valley wage-theft pact. And Campbell's name appears as the early conduit bringing Intel into the pact with Google:

Bill Campbell (Chairman of Intuit Board of Directors, Co-Lead Director of Apple, and advisor to Google) was also involved in the Google-Intel agreement, as reflected in an email exchange from 2006 in which Bill Campbell agreed with Jonathan Rosenberg (Google Advisor to the Office of CEO and former Senior Vice President of Product Management) that Google should call [Intel CEO] Paul Otellini before making an offer to an Intel employee, regardless of whether the Intel employee first approached Google.

Getting Google on board with the wage-theft pact was the key for Apple from the start — [articles](#) in the tech press in 2005 pointed at Google's recruitment drive and incentives were the key reason why tech wages soared that year, at the highest rate in well over a decade.

Campbell helped bring in Google, Intel, and, in 2006, Campbell saw to it that Intuit — the company he [chaired](#) — also joined the pact.

From the peaks of Silicon Valley, Campbell's interpersonal skills were [magical](#) and awe-inspiring, a crucial factor in creating so much unimaginable wealth for their companies and themselves. Jobs [said](#) of Campbell:

There is something deeply human about him.

And Schmidt [swooned](#):

He is my closest confidant...because he is the definition of trust.

Things — and people — look very different when you're down in the Valley. In the nearly 100-page court opinion issued last October by Judge Koh granting class status to the lawsuit, Campbell comes off as anything but mystical and "deeply human." He comes off as a scheming consigliere carrying out some of the drearier tasks that the oligarchs he served were constitutionally not so capable of arranging without him.

But the realities of inequality and capitalism invariably lead to mysticism of this sort, a natural human response to the dreary realities of concentrating so much wealth and power in the hands of a dozen interlocking board members at the expense of 100,000 employees, and so many other negative knock-off effects on the politics and culture of the world they dominate.

One of the more telling elements to this lawsuit is the role played by "Star Wars" creator George Lucas, who emerges as the Obi-Wan Kenobi of the wage-theft scheme. It's almost too perfectly symbolic that Lucas — the symbiosis of Baby Boomer New Age mysticism, Left Coast power, political infantilism, and dreary 19th century labor exploitation — should be responsible for dreaming up the wage theft scheme back in the mid-1980s, when Lucas sold the computer animation division of Lucasfilm, Pixar, to Steve Jobs.

As Pixar went independent in 1986, Lucas explained his philosophy about how competition for computer engineers violated his sense of normalcy — and profit margins. According to court documents:

George Lucas believed that companies should not compete against each other for employees, because '[i]t's not normal industrial competitive situation.' As George Lucas explained, 'I always — the rule we had, or the rule that I put down for everybody,' was that 'we cannot get into a bidding war with other companies because we don't have the margins for that sort of thing.'

Translated, Lucas' wage-reduction agreement meant that Lucasfilm and Pixar agreed to a) never cold call each other's employees; b) notify each other if making an offer to an employee of the other company, even if that employee applied for the job on his or her own without being recruited; c) any offer made would be "final" so as to avoid a costly bidding war that would drive up not just the employee's salary, but also drive up the pay scale of every other employee in the firm.

Jobs held to this agreement, and used it as the basis two decades later to suppress employee costs just as fierce competition was driving up tech engineers' wages.

The companies argued that the non-recruitment agreements had nothing to do with driving down wages. But the court ruled that there was "extensive documentary evidence" that the pacts were designed specifically to push down wages, and that they succeeded in doing so. The evidence includes software tools used by the companies to keep tabs on pay scales to ensure that within job "families" or titles, pay remained equitable within a margin of variation, and that as competition and recruitment boiled over in 2005, emails between executives and human resources departments complained about the pressure on wages caused by recruiters cold calling their employees, and bidding wars for key engineers.

Google, like the others, used a "salary algorithm" to ensure salaries remained within a tight band across like jobs. Although tech companies like to claim that talent and hard work are rewarded, in private, Google's "People Ops" department kept overall compensation essentially equitable by making sure that lower-paid employees who performed well got higher salary increases than higher-paid employees who also performed well.

As Intel's director of Compensation and Benefits bluntly summed up the Silicon Valley culture's official cant versus its actual practices,

While we pay lip service to meritocracy, we really believe more in treating everyone the same within broad bands.

The companies in the pact shared their salary data with each other in order to coordinate and keep down wages — something unimaginable had the firms not agreed to not compete for each other's employees. And they fired their own recruiters on just a phone call from a pact member CEO.

In 2007, when Jobs learned that Google tried recruiting one of Apple's employees, he forwarded the message to Eric Schmidt with a personal comment attached: "I would be very pleased if your recruiting department would stop doing this."

Within an hour, Google made a "public example" by "terminating" the recruiter in such a manner as to "(hopefully) prevent future occurrences."

Likewise, when Intel CEO Paul Otellini heard that Google was recruiting their tech staff, he sent a message to Eric Schmidt: "Eric, can you pls help here???"

The next day, Schmidt wrote back to Otellini: "If we find that a recruiter called into Intel, we will terminate the recruiter."

One of the reasons why non-recruitment works so well in artificially lowering workers' wages is that it deprives employees of information about the job market, particularly one as competitive and overheating as Silicon Valley's in the mid-2000s. As the companies' own internal documents and statements showed, they generally considered cold-calling recruitment of "passive" talent — workers not necessarily looking for a job until enticed by a recruiter — to be the most important means of hiring the best employees.

Just before joining the wage-theft pact with Apple, Google's human resources executives are quoted sounding the alarm that they needed to "dramatically increase the engineering hiring rate" and that would require "drain[ing] competitors to accomplish this rate of hiring." One CEO who noticed Google's hiring spree was eBay CEO Meg Whitman, who in early 2005 called Eric Schmidt to complain, "Google is the talk of the Valley because [you] are driving up salaries across the board." Around this time, eBay entered an illegal wage-theft non-solicitation scheme of its own with Bill Campbell's Intuit, which is still being tried in ongoing federal and California state suits.

Google placed the highest premium on "passive" talent that they cold-called because "passively sourced candidates offer[ed] the highest yield," according to court documents. The reason is like the old Groucho Marx joke about not wanting to belong to a club that would let you join it — workers actively seeking a new employer were assumed to have something wrong with them; workers who weren't looking were assumed to be the kind of good happy talented workers that company poachers would want on their team.

For all of the high-minded talk of post-industrial technotopia and Silicon Valley as worker's paradise, what we see here in stark ugly detail is how the same old world scams and rules are still operative.

Follow all of the Tectopus coverage [here](#).

References

1.

- *Singer, Bill. ["After Apple, Google, Adobe, Intel, Pixar, And Intuit, Antitrust Employment Charges Hit eBay"](#). Forbes. Retrieved 2013-12-02.*
-
- *DOJ. ["Complaint, US v. Adobe Systems Inc., et al"](#) (PDF). DOJ. Retrieved 2013-12-02.*
-
- *["Complaint, Hariharan v. Adobe Systems Inc., et al"](#) (PDF). Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein. Retrieved 2013-12-02.*

-
- ["Complaint, US v. Adobe Systems Inc., et al"](#) (PDF). Department of Justice. Retrieved 2013-12-02.
-
- Richey, Warren. ["Lucasfilm settles antitrust case over wage suppression of top animators"](#). The Christian Science Monitor. Retrieved 2013-12-02.
-
- ["Complaint, US v. Lucasfilm Ltd"](#). Department of Justice. Retrieved 2013-12-02.
-
- ["Justice Department Requires Six High Tech Companies to Stop Entering into Anticompetitive Employee Solicitation Agreements"](#) (Press release). United States Department of Justice. September 24, 2010. Retrieved 2016-01-14.
-
- ["U.S. v. Adobe Systems, Inc., et al.: Final Judgment"](#). United States Department of Justice. March 17, 2011. Retrieved 14 January 2016.
-
- ["Judge OKs class-action suit against Apple, Intel, Google, Adobe"](#). San Jose Mercury News. Retrieved 2013-12-02.
-
- Dan Levine (2014-04-24). ["Apple, Google agree to settle lawsuit alleging hiring conspiracy"](#). Chicago Tribune. Reuters. Retrieved 2016-01-17.
-
- Rosenblatt, Joel. ["Apple, Google Must Face Group Antitrust Hiring Lawsuit"](#). Bloomberg. Retrieved 2013-10-27.
-
- ["Judge Grants Class-Action Status in Silicon Valley Hiring Suit"](#). The Wall Street Journal. 2002-10-03. Retrieved 2013-10-27.
-
- ["Complaint, Hariharan v. Adobe Systems Inc., et al"](#) (PDF). Lieff, Cabraser, Heimann & Bernstein. Retrieved 2013-12-02.
-
- Cooley, Brian (2014-05-16). ["Judge approves first payout in antitrust wage-fixing lawsuit"](#). CNET. Retrieved 2016-01-17.
-
- ["Dockets & Filings: In re: High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litigation"](#). Justia. Retrieved 2013-12-02.
-
- Levine, Dan (2014-04-24). ["Apple, Google agree to settle lawsuit alleging hiring, salary conspiracy"](#). The Washington Post. Retrieved 2016-01-17.
-
- Levine, Dan (2014-04-24). ["Apple, Google agree to settle lawsuit alleging hiring conspiracy"](#). Reuters. Retrieved 2016-01-17.

- - ["Apple, Google, Intel, Adobe Settle for \\$324.5 Million"](#). Bloomberg News. Retrieved 2014-05-26.
 -
 - ["Judge questions settlement in Silicon Valley no-poaching case"](#). San Jose Mercury News. 2014-06-19. Retrieved 2016-01-17.
 -
 - ["Court Rejects Deal on Hiring in Silicon Valley"](#). The New York Times. 9 August 2014.
 -
 - ["Judge Koh Sets April 2015 Trial In Tech Anti-Poach Row"](#). Retrieved 2015-01-13.
 -
22. ["Court preliminarily approves \\$415m settlement of high-tech no-poaching lawsuit"](#). Retrieved 2015-06-30.

External links

- [Docket for US v. Adobe Systems Inc., et al.](#)
- [Docket for US v. Lucasfilm Ltd.](#)
- [The Silicon Valley Anti-Poaching Conspiracy](#)
- [Docket for In re: High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litigation](#)
- [Order Granting Plaintiffs' Supplemental Motion for Class Certification, In re High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litigation](#), no 11-CV-02509 (N.D. Cal. Oct. 24, 2013)
- [High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litigation Settlement Administration Website](#)
- <http://pando.com/tag/techtopus/>
- [*http://pando.com/2014/03/30/court-docs-google-hiked-wages-to-combat-hot-young-facebook-after-sheryl-sandberg-refused-to-join-hiring-cartel/](http://pando.com/2014/03/30/court-docs-google-hiked-wages-to-combat-hot-young-facebook-after-sheryl-sandberg-refused-to-join-hiring-cartel/)

Catch and Kill By Ronan Farrow -

[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catch and Kill: Lies, Spies, and a Conspiracy to Protect Predators](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Catch_and_Kill:_Lies,_Spies,_and_a_Conspiracy_to_Protect_Predators)

Permanent Record By Edward Snowden- <https://www.amazon.com/Permanent-Record-Edward-Snowden/dp/1250237238>

Brotopia By Emily Chang - <http://brotopiabook.com/>

Throw Them All Out By Peter Schweizer - <http://peterschweizer.com/books/throw-them-all-out/>

The Circle (Based on Google and Facebook) By David Eggers -

<https://archive.org/details/circle00dave>

World Without Mind By Franklin Foer - <https://www.amazon.com/World-Without-Mind-Existential-Threat/dp/1101981113>

A Journey into the Savage Heart of Silicon Valley By Corey Pein -

<https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/35684687-live-work-work-work-die>

Disrupted By Dan Lyons - <https://www.goodreads.com/book/show/26030703-disrupted>

Chaos Monkeys By Antonio García Martínez - <https://www.antonio-garciamartinez.com/chaos-monkeys/>

The Creepy Line By Matthew Taylor - <https://www.thecreepyline.com/>

[The Cleantech Crash By Leslie Stahl](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/cleantech-crash-60-minutes/Congress: Trading Stock) - <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/cleantech-crash-60-minutes/Congress: Trading Stock> [By Steve Kroft](https://www.cbsnews.com/news/congress-trading-stock-on-inside-information/) - <https://www.cbsnews.com/news/congress-trading-stock-on-inside-information/>

[Online Human Interaction - Challenges And Dynamics By Wikipedia Users](http://www.skybase.us/ONLINE_HUMAN_INTERACTION.pdf) - http://www.skybase.us/ONLINE_HUMAN_INTERACTION.pdf

THE INVESTIGATIONS OF THE CORRUPTION AT GOOGLE:

From INSIDE Google, our team saw Google manipulate the entire internet to hype up Larry Page's "boyfriend": Elon Musk and Tesla, which Google execs owned a portion of, while sabotaging Tesla's competitors. Google illicitly and illegally timed these manipulations with stock market pump-and-dump efforts to exploit insider trading. That is a felony violation of RICO, Antitrust and other laws.

Google must show its "crown jewels" software to FBI, SEC, FTC and our search engine optimisation experts to prove that they did not engage in these crimes. The fact is: We can prove they did the crimes and FBI experts can help us prove it!

In a similar case unfolding in Britain over whether Google wrongly demoted price comparison rival Foundem from its search results in favour of paid-for adverts, Google must now decide which it values more: the algorithms that rank its search results, or its stance that manually fiddling with those results to promote its own paid-for products over rivals' sites doesn't break competition laws.

High Court judge Mr Justice Roth [posed the stark question](#) to Google's lawyers in mid-March, just as the global coronavirus situation began triggering governmental responses in the West.

Foundem had asked for legal permission to bring in independent expert Philipp Klöckner to read confidential documents disclosed by Google in court.

Those documents were court exhibits filed by Google engineers Cody Kwok and Michael Pohl. They sought, as the judge put it, "to explain the operation and aims of Google's ranking algorithms, and how they have been applied to shopping comparison sites generally and Foundem in particular".

Foundem has been pursuing Google since 2006, when [a flip of the switch at Mountain View](#) caused the price-comparison site to vanish down Google's search rankings. Foundem argues that Google's demotion of it was a deliberate act to penalise a commercial rival and an abuse of Google's dominant market position.

Google denies this and is defending a High Court claim from Foundem as well as an EU competition investigation triggered by the website. The High Court case is stuck at a very early stage, despite having been filed in 2012, [thanks to the EU investigation](#).

Foundem's lawyers, the company argued in the High Court, wouldn't be able to understand the technical algorithm evidence without having an SEO expert on hand. While not disputing this, Google

strongly objected to Klöckner because he is a working SEO consultant: the Chocolate Factory is terrified of the SEO industry getting a proper glimpse under the bonnet and seeing how the search engine really operates. It told Mr Justice Roth:

The integrity of Google's ranking processes relies upon all webmasters or website owners having the same degree of access to information about Google's ranking... This will no longer be the case if information of this kind is made available to some individuals offering commercial services to assist companies to improve their Search ranking.

It also claimed Klöckner was potentially biased against it because he had done work for Trivago and Visual Meta, two firms that previously complained to the EU Commission about Google's anti-competitive practices.

Foundem suggested Google could simply withdraw the evidence so nobody would need to read it, while Google dug in and insisted the evidence was vital to help prove its case that nothing bad was done here. Thus Mr Justice Roth gave the adtech monolith a choice. Either it could withdraw the evidence as Foundem suggested, or it could agree to let Klöckner read the algorithm papers. The SEO expert would be given legal permission to enter two so-called confidentiality rings where he could read unredacted copies of the documents and talk to lawyers about them.

"If Google maintains its present course, then for the reasons I have explained I will grant the application that Mr Klöckner be admitted to those two rings until further order," said the judge! We are strongly advocating for full Court review of Google's manipulations in every possible Court.

Google is a criminal operation. Its executives have been publicly exposed as participants in horrific sex scandals, money laundering, political bribery and racism. It is time for the bought and paid shill politicians to stop protecting them!

[Google Deletes Videos Accusing It of Election Manipulation from YouTube... Which It Owns \(thefreethoughtproject.com\)](#)

[With All These Big Tech Revelations.](#)

[GOOGLE EXECs PANIC! Go Into Hiding - Delete Social Media Accounts After James O'Keefe's Latest Exposé](#)

[White House Slams Google As Veritas Censorship Controversy Escalates \(bitchute.com\)](#)

[Google's NSA Again Exposed For Unauthorized Collection Of Americans' Phone Records \(zerohedge.com\)](#)

[What exactly is google's business model besides selling ads no one clicks on and selling people's data to the NSA? \(AskVoat\)](#)

[So the "russian hackers" meddling in the election was Google all along. Why isn't this the biggest story in America right now? None of the "trusted" news sources have commented on this at all. \(politics\)](#)

[Google stealthily infuses political agenda into products](#)

[Google Chrome is Tracking Your Every Move and Storing It. This is How to Stop It](#)

[Google Chrome Has Become Surveillance Software, It's Time to Switch | \(archive.fo\)](#)

[2020 Election; Subliminal Google Messages to Alter Outcome ...](#)

 <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=LBmByyFkRlo>

Google, Facebook, Amazon, Microsoft, and Apple: these companies, the big 5, know almost everything about your life. They know what websites you go to, what y...

[MSNBC segment on Hidden and Subliminal Messages Found In ...](#)

 <https://www.videonet111.com/video/msnbc-segment-on-hidden-and-subliminal-messages-found-in-google-1>

The **Google** empire has paid more **political** bribes to politicians around the globe than any other company on Earth. ... MSNBC segment on Hidden and **Subliminal Messages** ...

[2020 Election; Subliminal Google Messages to Alter Outcome?](#)

 <https://www.zachdrewshow.com/episodes/2020-election-subliminal-google-messages-to-alter-outcome/>

Google manipulates your searches for you to be subconsciously swayed — let that sink in. We are dealing with that today. 2020 Election: Who Decides? **Google** meddling with the 2020 election? We will cover it, but also go back in history and explain that this is NOT a new development.

Manipulation, deception: It starts often as **subliminal**.

[Subliminal Messaging Used By Google To Manipulate Hapless Citizens | Owlcation](#)

 <https://owlcation.com/social-sciences/Subliminal-Messaging>

Subliminal messages are perceived by the unconscious brain. There is not as much **subliminal** messaging happening in the US now as previously reported, but there could be subtle **messages** that are received unconsciously. Messaging has probably been used by or **political** operatives, yet it may not work.

[Sneaky Subliminal Messages Hidden in Google Ads | Mental Floss](#)

 mentalfloss.com/article/67223/7-sneaky-subliminal-messages-hidden-ads

The FCC fielded the incident, and subsequently condemned such tactics as being "contrary to the public interest"; it's believed to be the first example of **subliminal** advertising on television.

[Google's Dirty Subliminal Messages You'd Never Notice in Everyday Life ...](#)

 https://www.cracked.com/photoplasty_386_17-subliminal-messages-youd-never-notice-in-everyday-life/

17 **Subliminal Messages** You'd Never Notice in Everyday Life ... Twitter. **Google** Plus. Stumble Upon. ... We asked you to show us your inner-Banksy by adding **subliminal** ...

[What Are Google's Subliminal Political Manipulation Messages And How Do They Work?](#)

 <https://allthatsinteresting.com/what-are-subliminal-messages>

Subliminal messages, on the other hand, are likewise real and similar to supraliminal **messages** except that the signal or stimulus is below our threshold of conscious awareness. In other words, you cannot consciously perceive a **subliminal message**, even if you search for it.