

FaceBook was and is the greatest CIA (and Police) Asset ever Invented.

by watson Wednesday, Feb 1 2012, 9:38pm

international / mass media / other press

Few people are aware that a CIA company, similar to the one in partnership with GOOGLE, was one of the original LARGE investors in the fledgling Facebook project. Well, it was money well spent as Facebook is now the most utilised data mining and surveillance resource that Police/CIA and other regulatory agencies have at THEIR disposal -- and YOU desperate morons fell for it.



How desperate are you pathetic no-accounts to VOLUNTARILY divulge highly personal information about yourselves to the WORLD -- which you also legally surrender to nefarious third parties -- and then allow yourselves to be tracked and traced in real time, unbelievable?

The following piece leans toward the conspiratorial though it contains much valuable data on the origins, designs and original financial backers for this CIA 'social networking, data-mining project.' I always give credit where it's due and this exercise is a blinding success for the CIA and Police, who have affectionately named it, "Tracebook." As for the moron, desperados that use it, YOU deserve it!

DailyBell report follows:

Facebook IPO is US Intel Operation

Media reports suggest that Facebook will file for an IPO this week that could value the company at \$100 billion — and leave the company sitting on \$10 billion in cash. I'm not a financial analyst, so I'll leave it to Wall Street to discuss and debate that valuation. But the fact is this newfound wealth could not only allow Facebook to solve its biggest business challenges, it could also help Facebook finally achieve its longstanding goal to change how marketing works. So how should Facebook use its IPO windfall? – Nate Elliott's Blog

Dominant Social Theme: This Facebook IPO is very exciting and shows that young people can create incredible value in a short period of time. Mark Zuckerberg is a genius.

Free-Market Analysis: No, we don't believe the hype. It's directed history, perhaps, not reality. Zuckerberg is in his later twenties. Did you ever meet anyone who'd built a US\$100 billion company in a single decade, much less at a time when most young men and women are still deciding on career choices?

It strikes us as a dominant social theme of sorts, despite all the excitement that the IPO has caused (see excerpt above). The media is full of breathless adulation regarding Facebook and Zuckerberg.

We're supposed to accept this narrative unquestioningly. We don't.

There is a group of impossibly wealthy families, in our view – a power elite initially based in the City of London – that controls central banking around the world. This handful of families uses trillions in cash flow to aid in the construction of what is popularly known as the New World Order.

This NWO is not erected without a good deal of effort, and what we call the Internet Reformation has proven to be a stumbling block. The information revealed on the Internet has generated extreme opposition to what the NWO families are trying to do, along with their enablers and associates.

In order to overcome this opposition, the power elite has launched a series of false flags that are intended to make the Internet more confusing to the opposition and more supportive of its efforts.

Facebook, from what we can tell, is a kind of false flag intended to gather huge numbers of users in an environment that will be – at least gently – pro-globalist. Or at least useful to the globalist agenda.

Why do we believe that Facebook is a kind of false flag? The biggest tip-off in our view is Facebook's astonishing popularity. It's simply another social networking site but it's one that's attracted nearly a billion users. Is it really so much better than other such facilities?

No ... the barriers-to-entry seem fairly modest to us. What probably differentiates Facebook from other such facilities is not its technology or brilliance but its backers.

When a company gets this big this fast it seems to us that there are always the powers-that-be lurking close by. In this case, Zuckerberg seems to us to have the requisite pedigree for someone that would be subject to elite cultivation.

We note a "big" movie has been made about his life. This, too, is a kind of red flag. When the elites are involved in a sizable promotion, one tool seems to be a Hollywood movie. Supposedly, Julian Assange – who also may function as a kind of false flag, in our view – is also getting a movie. He already has a book.

What's even less debatable than the evident hype surrounding Zuckerberg and Facebook is the reality of the facility's initial funding. There is almost no doubt – so far as we can tell, anyway – that the initial funding Facebook received was in part organized by US Intel.

An article posted at Advent of Deception, entitled "Behind Facebook—A New World Order Agenda?", seems to show us clearly the kind of capital that Facebook was able to amass ...

Facebook's first round of venture capital funding (\$US500,000) came from former Paypal CEO Peter Thiel. Author of anti-multicultural tome 'The Diversity Myth', he is also on the board of radical conservative group VanguardPAC.

The second round of funding into Facebook (\$US12.7 million) came from venture capital firm Accel Partners. Its manager James Breyer was formerly chairman of the National Venture Capital Association, and served on the board with Gilman Louie, CEO of In-Q-Tel, a venture capital firm established by the Central Intelligence Agency in 1999. One of the company's key areas of expertise are in "data mining technologies".

Breyer also served on the board of R&D firm BBN Technologies, which was one of those companies

responsible for the rise of the internet. Dr Anita Jones joined the firm, which included Gilman Louie. She had also served on the In-Q-Tel's board, and had been director of Defence Research and Engineering for the US Department of Defence.

She was also an adviser to the Secretary of Defence and overseeing the Defence Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), which is responsible for high-tech, high-end development.

This makes plenty of sense, of course. The way to control and promote promising technologies is to fund them. By funding some technologies lavishly - and ensuring they are able to avoid inconvenient run-ins with the US legal and regulatory community - one can likely build a successful company fairly easily.

Of course, it's perhaps the luck of the draw as to whether a company grows to the size of, say, MySpace or gets as big as Facebook. But in either case, one is struck by the paucity involved in the actual business model. Facebook's content is furnished by its users - and user information is then resold to advertisers.

The model is simplicity itself and involves little creative content. This is probably one reason why Facebook is constantly getting into trouble over its privacy policy. The company really has nothing to offer but user-driven data.

The more of it that the company can extract, the more valuable the company becomes. It is perhaps, therefore, the first company in history where the business model is based almost entirely on spying.

Google does much the same thing, but at least Google provides a search algorithm. Facebook's business posture is almost irredeemably hostile to its users. It's a strategy based on a kind of deception.

The data Facebook gathers is valuable to more than just advertisers. Anyone who investigates Facebook in an unbiased way will find clear evidence that the website is being used for "Intel" purposes, much in the same manner as Google.

There is plenty of admitted precedent for this sort of thing. Project Mockingbird comes to mind. Such gambits show clearly that top companies and their leaders work very closely with Anglosphere spying operations.

The agencies themselves are supposedly hard at work supporting the safety of their respective nations. But in fact, the over-riding focus of Western intelligence has little to do with national security and much to do with building global government. At the very top, they probably work for the "families." That's where the real agenda is set.

In his blog on Facebook, Elliot points out that the cash that Facebook will supposedly generate from its IPO will come in handy in building a "real" company out of one that is playing "small ball."

He makes the point that "marketing doesn't work very well on Facebook," and that Facebook's revenue model is "pretty simplistic" ...

He writes: "For Facebook to become the company it wants to be (and the company investors want it to be), they need to swing for the fences ... Building or buying an ad exchange or a sell-side platform is one obvious way to do this; and they need to work hard on other creative and profitable (and legal) uses of their data as well."

Boil this down and what Elliot is saying is that he is puzzled by Facebook's business model and doesn't believe it's sustainable. And this is the company that Wall Street is valuing at US\$100 billion!

Elliot also points out that Facebook isn't especially popular overseas, certainly not as popular as it is in North America and Europe. In countries where there is a lot of "social media," Facebook is doing poorly: Russia, Japan and Korea. Facebook apparently isn't even offered in China.

We're not surprised, of course. Facebook is most popular where Western Intel agencies have the most sway and can exercise the most influence. China doesn't want Facebook gaining a foothold for obvious reasons.

The idea that Zuckerberg is some sort of rogue genius whose implacable vision has swept the world is unrealistic, in our view, and that's putting it mildly. In fact, we're grateful to the Internet for revealing the larger promotional patterns of the Anglosphere power elite when it comes to "global brands" and their marketing.

We used to believe the normative narrative, but no more. We "get it" now. In the 20th and 21st centuries anyway, business and large-scale technology applications are a kind of directed history. Those who are about to try to invest in the Facebook mythology ought to bear this in mind.

If Facebook is not what it seems, then what it is? And if it is something other than what it purports to be, then is it built to last? Or will it be thrown over as soon as it has served its purpose - or when something more useful comes along?

Conclusion: These are not, of course, the normal investing questions that one might ask. But then, these are not normal times.

© 2012 The Daily Bell

Follow link below for additional information and other embedded links.

<http://www.thedailybell.com/3565/Facebook-IPO-Is-US-Intel-Operation>

Cleaves Alternative News. <http://cleaves.lingama.net/news/story-2974.html>