



41 Times Google Has Interfered in US Elections Since 2008

BY GABRIELA PARISEAU & DAN SCHNEIDER

Executive Summary

MRC researchers have found 41 times where Google interfered in elections over the last 16 years, and its impact has surged dramatically, making it evermore harmful to democracy. In every case, Google harmed the candidates—regardless of party—who threatened its left-wing candidate of choice.

From the mouths of Google executives, the tech giant let slip what was never meant to be made public: That Google uses its “great strength and resources and reach” to advance its leftist values.

Google’s outsized influence on information technology, the body politic and American elections became evident in 2008. After failing to prevent then-candidate for president Donald Trump from being inaugurated following the 2016 election, Google has since made clear to any discerning observer that it has been — and will continue — interfering in America’s elections. The most recent example was recorded after Google artificial intelligence Gemini (formerly Bard) refused to answer questions damaging to Biden.

MRC Free Speech America research shows that throughout a 16-year period (from 2008 through February 2024), carefully crafted studies and numerous reports have consistently demonstrated the tech behemoth’s election meddling.

- **For 16 years, Google has utilized its power to help push to electoral victory the most liberal candidates, regardless of party, while targeting their opponents for censorship.** Utilizing the many tools in its arsenal, Google aided those who most closely aligned with its leftist values from election cycle to election cycle since as far back as the 2008 presidential election. Meanwhile, it targeted for censorship those candidates who posed the most serious threat.
 - **In 2008**, Google appeared to select the radical, young Barack Obama to help spur to victory over John McCain; meanwhile, it targeted support for Hillary Clinton for censorship, suspending the accounts of writers who wrote blogs critical of Obama during his primary race against Clinton.
 - **In 2012**, Google once again favored Obama over Mitt Romney, and inconsistent with its stated policy, the tech giant refused to correct a “Google bomb” that smeared leading GOP primary candidate for president Rick Santorum.

- In 2016, Google pushed Clinton, using its algorithm to exclude potentially damaging autofill results while not doing the same for then-candidates Donald Trump or Bernie Sanders. Google also worked with “partners” to help likely pro-Clinton Latino voters go to the polls.
 - In 2018, researchers accurately predicted that Google’s “significant pro-liberal bias” would be “enough, quite easily, to have flipped all three congressional districts in Orange County from Republican to Democrat.”
 - In 2020, Google targeted Tulsi Gabbard for censorship, disabling Gabbard’s Ads account just as she became the most searched candidate following the first Democratic Party primary debate. The tech giant also suppressed news sources critical of Biden and reportedly blocked GOP fundraising emails from reaching users’ inboxes. Google search results and even get-out-the-vote reminders favored Democrats, shifting the 2020 election results away from Trump and the GOP by at least 6 million votes.
 - In 2022, Google buried most Republican campaign websites for the 12 competitive Senate races (10 of 12 did not make the top 6 search results and 7 did not even make the first page of search results). Also, 61 percent of the stories included on the Google News homepage linked to leftist news media outlets. Meanwhile, only three percent linked to right-leaning news media outlets (this 20 to 1 disparity was based on AllSides data).
 - In 2024, Google has been aiding Biden, burying in its search results the campaign websites of every one of his significant opponents (including Robert F. Kennedy, Jr., Trump and every other Republican polling at or above 1%). When searching for “Republican presidential campaign websites,” Google returned Democrat Marianne Williamson, but not Trump, DeSantis, Haley, etc.). Finally, Google artificial intelligence, Gemini (formerly Bard), refused to give responses to prompts regarding two of Biden’s biggest weaknesses: (1) the president’s mental health and (2) the ongoing border crisis.
- **Google’s impact on elections has surged dramatically in recent years.** Google is making good on its 2016 promise never to let conservatives win again. While its interference was first evident in 2008, its meddling has turned into an organizational mission to ensure that its candidates win on election day. Many studies reveal the results of the tech giant’s commitment. In addition to the Media Research Center’s studies described above, AllSides and Dr. Robert Epstein performed additional research showing how Google interfered in recent elections.
 - Data findings show that the number of votes shifted by Google’s actions grew from 2.6 million in 2016 to at least 6 million in 2020, a 140 percent increase.
 - Findings in 2016 showed that “Google’s search algorithm likely shifted at least 2.6 million votes to Hillary Clinton.”
 - Findings further showed that Google’s results and get-out-the-vote reminders favored Democrats and shifted the 2020 election results by at least 6 million votes.
 - AllSides data show that Google’s own news site (“Google News”) completely eliminated all links to right-leaning media outlets while generously linking to left-leaning media outlets for articles relating to Trump, Biden or “elections,” according to its 2022 study. The data are as follows for articles on these topics:
 - Trump (88% of articles were left-leaning; 0% were right-leaning)
 - Biden (68% of articles were left-leaning, 0% were right-leaning)
 - Elections (96% of articles were left-leaning; 0% were right-leaning)

- Across all topics, the data show that Google News linked to left-leaning media outlets 10 to 20 times more often than it linked to right-leaning media outlets, between 2018 and 2023.
 - In 2018, Google News linked to left-leaning media outlets 15 times more often than it linked to right-leaning media outlets (75 percent versus 5 percent).
 - In 2022, the bias got even worse: Google News linked to left-leaning media outlets over 20 times more often than it linked to right-leaning media outlets (61 percent versus 3 percent).
 - In 2023, Google News linked to left-leaning media outlets 10 times more often than it linked to right-leaning media outlets (63 percent versus 6 percent).

Recommendations

- Speaker Mike Johnson (R-LA) should direct relevant committees and committee chairmen to investigate Google for abridging people's constitutional rights; for coordinating with government to violate freedom of speech; for interfering in elections by making unreported in-kind contributions; and for defrauding its users by failing to meet its Terms of Service.
- State legislatures should resolve any question of whether Google is a common carrier, which it is; and they can follow the lead of Texas and Florida to ensure that Big Tech cannot engage in viewpoint discrimination.
- Americans should stop using Google products, particularly Google Search and instead opt for one of the many alternatives. From our research, alternatives appear to produce better, less biased results.



41 Times Google Has Interfered in US Elections Since 2008

BY GABRIELA PARISEAU & DAN SCHNEIDER

In a world where the control of information is power, Google's Jen Gennai let slip what was never meant to be made public.

As Director of Responsible Innovation, it was Gennai's job to make sure Google's algorithm achieved the company's leftist agenda, a secret anti-Trump agenda. But what she did not realize was that the people she had shared a meal with were Project Veritas journalists who were secretly recording their meeting with her.

Undeterred by the crowded restaurant and public setting, she spoke freely of Google's commitment to election interference efforts. Gennai acknowledged that Elizabeth Warren, whom she greatly admires, sought to break up Google because of its massive size, but to Gennai that would be a mistake. She argued that Google's unmatched size, strength and resources are precisely why the company must fulfill its duty: "preventing the next Trump situation."

"If not us, then who?" was the attitude oozing from her every word. Her words are the result of Google following through on a promise it made to its employees in 2016, and although appalling, the sentiment is understandable.

Democrats were confident heading into Election Day in 2016. Campaign aids even [popped champagne](#) early in the day and to many, their assurance seemed warranted. After all, then-candidate Hillary Rodham Clinton (D) supposedly had an advantage with technological infrastructure funded by former Google CEO Eric Schmidt and the help of senior tech engineers including ex-Google employees. And yet, as the votes came in, they all had to watch the time, money and hard work they poured into Clinton's campaign wash down the drain. The apparent object of their hatred had just been elected president.

Just days after the election, Google executives held an all-hands-on-deck meeting to console grieving Googlers (*as the staff call themselves*) all over the world. Addressing the staff's bitter tears, Google CFO Ruth Porat promised that Google would use its "great strength and resources and reach" to advance its values. In effect, Google would resist President Donald Trump and prevent his second term.

From the mouth of Porat, Google finally said the quiet part out loud. But the 2016 election did not inaugurate the company's election interference efforts. Google has repeatedly used its power against Democrats and Republicans alike, working to eliminate any political figure or policy issue that the tech giant saw as a threat to its favored candidate.

The pattern can be traced back to 2008 and has continued into the present day. In 2008, Google conducted its election interference efforts with a lighter touch, but by 2020, Google's "manipulations could have shifted at least six million votes" from Trump to Biden, according to data scientist and research psychologist, Dr. Robert Epstein.

But whether then or now, one thing has been consistent: Google will reliably utilize the full force of its resources and tools to bolster its chosen candidate in an effort to defeat those who get in the way.

MRC researchers have found 41 times where Google interfered in elections dating back 16 years to when the story really began to take shape in 2008.

2008 Elections

In 2008, Google had begun to make its way in Washington, but it needed an ally as it faced antitrust concerns. The blossoming tech giant had [bought YouTube](#) two years earlier, DoubleClick one year earlier and was working on an [ad partnership deal](#) with Yahoo! (which fell through the day after election day). Then-Senator Hillary Clinton (D-NY) had [tarnished](#) her reputation with her commitment to reign in big business while also receiving support from Wall Street and other big corporations. Then-Senator Obama (D-IL), however, was the young radical who had [shown interest](#) in working to develop technology, advancing science education and continuing to work with Google as he had [done](#) during his time in the U.S. Senate. Thus, when it came time for Google to put its thumb on the scale and pick a candidate, it chose Obama.

1 **Google censors Hillary Clinton-supporting bloggers.** During the 2008 primary election, it was no secret that Google had allied itself with the younger, more radical candidate Obama instead of the relatively more moderate and corporate Democrat candidate Clinton. This symbiotic relationship produced results quickly. Anti-Obama bloggers who wrote using Google's blogging platform woke up to find their websites labeled as spam, according to journalist Simon Owens who reportedly interviewed several of those censored. Owens [wrote](#) that "nearly all of [the censored bloggers] had three things in common: Most were pro-Hillary Clinton blogs, all were anti-Barack Obama, and several were listed on [justsaynodeal.com](#), an anti-Obama website."

When asked about what happened, Google spokesman Adam Kovacevich [told](#) *The New York Times* that an error had caused the issue. "It appears that our anti-spam filters caused some Blogger accounts to be blocked from creating new posts," he said. "While we are still investigating, we believe this may have been caused by mass spam e-mails mentioning the 'Just Say No Deal' network of blogs... "

2 **Google CEO Eric Schmidt endorses Barack Obama just in time for Election Day.** Fifteen days before the November election, Schmidt made the Google-Obama alliance official and endorsed him for president. At the time, Schmidt claimed, "I'm doing this personally," and that "Google is officially neutral," [The Wall Street Journal](#) reported. The company went on to benefit greatly from the alliance that publicly, although unofficially, began with Schmidt's endorsement.

The intimate and incestuous Obama-Google relationship

The "[Goobama](#)" alliance, as author Teddy Wayne put it, only strengthened after Obama took office.

Despite Schmidt's claims of neutrality, Google [hosted](#) a post-inauguration party for the newly inaugurated President Obama.

Google soon after established itself as part of the administration almost immediately. The company's executives and employees joined Obama as White House advisors and political appointees, beginning with Google.org's Head of Global Development Initiatives Sonal Shah, who advised the Obama transition team. Obama called on Schmidt to [serve](#) on the Science and Technology Advisory Council. Six months into his presidency, Obama [named](#) Google's former head of global public policy Andrew McLaughlin as the administration's Chief Technology Officer. And when healthcare.gov famously broke down in 2013, the Obama administration [called on](#) none other than Google Site-reliability Manager Michael Dickerson to lead a team to [fix it](#).

But Schmidt, McLaughlin and Dickerson were not the only ones meeting and working with the Obama administration. The Intercept [reported](#) in 2016 that “[b]etween January 2009 and October 2015, Google staffers gathered at the White House on 427 separate occasions.” Twenty-one of those meetings purportedly included Obama himself. “No other public company approaches this degree of intimacy with government,” The Intercept emphasized. The outlet also noted that Google Public Policy Director [Johanna Shelton](#), who reportedly attended more meetings than any other Google staffer, visited the White House 128 times – “more than twice as often” as competitor lobbyists from Microsoft and Comcast.

But the Obama-Google relationship was not merely intimate, it was practically incestuous. Despite Obama's promises to [“shut the revolving door,”](#) an unprecedented number of Google employees cycled in and out of the administration. The Intercept [tabulated](#) “55 cases of individuals moving from positions at Google into the federal government, and [197 individuals](#) moving from positions inside the government to jobs at Google.” These included firms owned or controlled by then-Google CEO Schmidt, and both law firms and lobbying firms that had represented the tech giant. More than half (29) of those who left Google to work in government, reportedly took positions at the White House. Google also reportedly hired staffers from “36 different areas across the government.”

Ultimately, the relationship was mutually beneficial. Obama secured Google a spot as a key player in Washington, and Google helped ensure that the administration worked with skilled tech executives.

2012 Election

In 2011, Politico managing editor Michael Zappler [questioned](#) Google's loyalty to Obama and the Democratic Party. He claimed that Google was beginning to make a “rightward shift,” citing that Google had hired Republican lobbying firms and that it hosted a GOP primary debate. But Zappler could not have been more wrong. When the rubber met the road, Google helped its old pal Obama and refused to fix an issue caused by its own algorithm when it impacted Sen. Rick Santorum (R), who was the leading GOP candidate for president at the time. Meanwhile, Schmidt helped to build the technological infrastructure that is often credited for helping Obama win his second term.

3 ***Google refuses to diffuse Santorum Google Search “bomb.”*** Google “bombing” is largely a thing of the past, but it used to be a way for users to manipulate Google's algorithm and associate websites and names with undesirable search terms. Google Search would connect the sites and terms if enough websites placed the same hyperlink over the same term or terms. [SEO Debate](#) explained in a 2023 article that “a group of people might create a large number of links to a webpage that contains the phrase ‘worst politician ever’ with the intention of making that webpage appear at the top of the search results when someone searches for that politician's name.” That appears to be what happened to then-presidential candidate and former Senator Rick Santorum (R-PA).

Gay marriage advocate and sex columnist Dan Savage held a contest for the most vile definition of Santorum in 2003. Because of the Google “bomb” phenomenon, the resulting definition became the top Google Search result in 2012 for then-leading Republican candidate Santorum’s name. At the time, Fox News Opinion Editor and former MRC Business Vice President Dan Gainor [called](#) the definition and the accompanying Google “bomb,” “the lowest form of hate speech.” He added, “What [Savage] picked as a winner is so vile you don’t want to read it or see it or hear it. But you have to. ...To ignore it is to ignore a major issue that is impacting the presidential campaign.”

The definition read: “santorum (san-TOR-um) n. 1. The frothy mixture of lube and fecal matter that is sometimes the byproduct of anal sex.”

After being notified of the issue, Google refused to adjust the damning and potentially election-altering search results. A Google spokesperson reportedly told Politico at the time that the company does not “remove content from our search results, except in very limited cases such as illegal content and violations of our webmaster guidelines.”

But Google had previously changed its results for an almost identical situation. By 2012 Google had claimed for [five years](#) that it had improved its algorithm in order to end Google “bomb” pranks, which had repeatedly plagued even the White House website. In fact, the Google “bomb” that associated both George W. Bush and Obama’s names with the phrase “miserable failure,” mysteriously [disappeared](#) for good shortly after Obama took office. Yet, Google specifically chose not to intervene when a particularly vile Google “bomb” impacted Santorum.

4 ***Eric Schmidt works closely with the Obama campaign tech team.*** Schmidt, who had become the Executive Chairman of Google’s parent company Alphabet, is widely known to have helped Obama’s 2012 campaign. He helped assemble the right technology and team needed to win, which is something he would do again for Clinton in 2016. “Schmidt was intimately involved in building Obama’s voter-targeting operation in 2012, recruiting digital talent, choosing technology and coaching campaign manager Jim Messina on campaign infrastructure,” [Tech Transparency Project](#) reported, noting that Schmidt was at Obama’s campaign headquarters on election night. [Pacific Standard](#) later asked Obama campaign Battleground-States Analytics Director Elan Kriegel how much of Obama’s four-point margin of victory was due to the work of the campaign. Kriegel answered claiming that the campaign had moved the needle by two points (at most), which amounts to roughly 2.5 million votes. Many have [directly credited Obama’s victory](#) to the work of the campaign’s [tech team](#).

2016 Election

In 2016, Google mounted a two-pronged approach to aiding Democrat candidate Hillary Clinton: working from both the inside and the outside. From the inside, Google fiddled with its algorithm to favor Clinton and to hide her many flaws that users searched for information about. According to data scientist and research psychologist Dr. Epstein, this approach alone could have shifted “at least 2.5 million votes” in Clinton’s favor.

But Google had allies outside of the company who it could work with during the election season. As SourceFed host Matt Lieberman [put it](#), Google had a “stunning” number of ties to the Clinton campaign, “and they all stem

to one person in particular” – Eric Schmidt. After the success of Obama’s tech-savvy 2012 campaign, Schmidt funded a startup that specialized in replicating the results for Clinton. Google also worked with “partners” to help Latino voters to go to the polls with what appears to be the intention of increasing votes for Hillary.

Google’s Election Interference from the Inside:

5 **Google hides that users want to know about Clinton’s crimes and potential indictment.** In a 2016 video, SourceFed host Matt Lieberman explained in a [study](#) that the outlet had conducted testing whether Google dealt out its autofill search suggestions for half-typed search queries evenhandedly. When researchers typed “Hillary Clinton cri,” the Google Search engine suggested “Hillary Clinton crime reform,” “Hillary Clinton crisis” and “Hillary Clinton Crime Bill 1994.” Yet, when SourceFed plugged the top suggestion “Hillary Clinton crime reform” into Google Trends, the app reportedly claimed that there was “not enough search volume to show graphs.” Meanwhile, it showed that there were plenty of searches for “Hillary Clinton crime.”

SourceFed found similar results for the terms “Hillary Clinton ind.” When performing that search, Google suggested searches for “Hillary Clinton Indiana” or “Hillary Clinton India.” But when the outlet typed the same half-written search terms into Yahoo! and Bing, each search engine filled in the rest of the prompt with “Hillary Clinton indictment.” The group found that “people were searching for ‘Hillary Clinton indictment’ eight times more often than ‘Hillary Clinton India’” and concluded that the “intention is clear: Google is burying potential searches for terms that could have hurt Hillary Clinton in the primary elections over the past several months by manipulating recommendations on their site.” SourceFed conducted similar searches for other candidates including “bernie sanders soc,” which easily brought up “bernie sanders socialist” as the top suggestion and “donald trump rac,” which brought up “donald trump racist snl” as the top suggestion.

6 **Google also hides “crooked hillary” from search suggestions.** Former Search Engine Land journalist and analyst Danny Sullivan conducted a [study](#) similar SourceFed’s, and once again, discovered concerning results. Sullivan’s searches were based on Trump’s names for other candidates in the race. For example, when users searched “lying” the top two results were “lying down” and “lying ted,” with the latter referencing Trump’s 2016 primary opponent Sen. Ted Cruz (R-TX). When users searched “crooked,” the top results included “crooked smile” and “crooked duck,” while “crooked hillary” was notably absent. If Google had based the suggestions on actual searches, one could reasonably infer that users had recently searched “lying ted” more often than “crooked hillary” or perhaps that “lying ted” had been a more popular search for a longer period of time. But Google Trends told a very different story about what users were actually searching.

Although “lying ted” became a trending search at around the same time as “crooked hillary,” according to Google Trends, in June 2016, users were searching for “crooked hillary” more often than “lying ted.” As a result, one would expect that it would be more likely that “hillary” would appear as a search suggestion in a half-typed search for “crooked” and it would be less likely that “ted” would appear as a suggestion for a half-typed search for “lying.” But that was not the case. “[C]rooked hillary” had been searched more times than the top suggestion listed, “crooked smile,” and yet, “hillary” did not appear in the top three suggestions in searches for the term “crooked.”

7 **Study shows Google was more likely to present “left-leaning” bias than “right-leaning.”** SEO Software and consulting company Can I Rank published a [blog](#) post in 2016 revealing the results of several Google Search studies it had conducted that examined over 1,200 results. The company found that

“searchers are **39%** more likely to be presented information with a left-leaning bias than they are information from the right.” Can I Rank showed a search for the terms “Republican platform,” which included four links to the actual official platform at the top, two articles that Can I Rank labeled as center and a half dozen news articles with a left-leaning bias. The blog noted that “[f]or other controversial keywords like ‘**minimum wage**, ‘**abortion**,’ ‘**NAFTA**, ‘**Iraq war**,’ ‘**campaign finance reform**,’ ‘**global warming**,’ ‘**marijuana legalization**,’ and ‘**tp**’, no right-leaning websites are to be found among the top results.” Can I Rank also noted that right-leaning results had to work harder to rank higher. While including higher numbers of external links and writing longer comprehensive articles were often thought to be ways that a website could rank higher, the threshold of how many links and words an article needed to contain to make it to top search result was significantly higher for top right-leaning results than it was for top left-leaning results.

- 8** ***Dr. Robert Epstein estimates that Google shifted at least 2.5 million to Clinton.*** Data scientist and research psychologist Dr. Epstein [reviewed](#) his findings during a 2019 congressional hearing. “In 2016 Google’s search algorithm likely impacted undecided voters in a way that shifted at least 2.6 million votes to Hillary Clinton, whom I supported,” he said. “I know this because I preserved more than 13,000 election-related searches prior to election day and Google’s search results were significantly biased in favor of Secretary Clinton.” Epstein noted that he used “dozens of controlled experiments” to uncover the impact of Google’s bias. “Biased Search results can easily produce shifts in the opinions and voting preferences of undecided voters by up to 80 percent in some demographic groups because people blindly trust high-ranking search results over lower ones,” Epstein added.

Google’s Election Interference from the Outside:

- 9** ***Eric Schmidt goes all in for Hillary Clinton.*** Clinton’s 2016 presidential campaign hired The Groundwork, a technology firm funded by Schmidt located “just blocks” from the Clinton campaign headquarters in Brooklyn, according to [Quartz](#). The firm was reportedly one of the campaign’s most expensive vendors, reportedly charging the campaign \$177,000 in the second quarter of 2015 alone. Praising Schmidt, the outlet explained the “beauty” of funding startups instead of traditional donations. “Instead of putting money behind a Super PAC that can’t coordinate with the campaign, a well-connected donor like Schmidt can fund a startup to do top-grade work for a campaign, with the financial outlay structured as an investment, not a donation,” Quartz claimed.

Indeed, Schmidt and Clinton were very well connected. SourceFed’s Matt Lieberman even [traced](#) Google’s “stunning” circle of influence when he laid out the findings of SourceFed’s Google Search study mentioned above. “Eric Schmidt, the former head of Google, who is chairman of their parent company, funds a data analysis company that works for the Hillary campaign, whose chief technology officer, Stephanie Hannon, is a former Google executive,” said Lieberman.

- 10** ***Google tries to help Clinton win the Latino vote.*** An exclusive [report](#) on Fox News’s Tucker Carlson Tonight [revealed](#) a disturbing Google [email chain](#) sent out the day after election day in 2016. Eliana Murillo, who directed Google’s Multicultural Marketing team, wrote the first email which had the subject line “Elections results and the Latino vote.” In the email, she reportedly explained how Google made a “silent donation” by working with its partner Voto Latino to pay for Latino voters to have rides to the polls in “key states.” The tech giant also “helped them create ad campaigns to promote the rides” and worked to get Voto Latino an interview with “[state] Senator [Robert] Meza of Arizona (key state for us) to talk about the election and how to use Google search to find information about how to vote.”

Murillo made it clear, however, what outcome she hoped to achieve. “On personal note [sic], we really

thought we had shown up to demonstrate our political power against a candidate who had vehemently offended our community by calling us rapists and drug dealers," she said, referring to Trump. Unfortunately for Murillo, Google did increase voter turnout, but not all Latinos voted for Democrats. As she pointed out, in the key state of Florida, for example, 31 percent of the Latino vote supported Trump. She noted that she was disappointed when the results came in. "But then reality set in. Only 71% of Latinos voted for Hillary, and that wasn't enough."

Murillo went on to state the obvious, noting that she could not be objective. "I have tried to stay objective, but I ask that you please give us some time to pause and reflect," she wrote. "This is devastating for our Democratic Latino community. After all these efforts and what we thought was positive momentum toward change, the results are not what we expected at all. We are afraid for our families, and especially for the millions of immigrants who now don't know what the future holds for them."

The 2016 aftermath:

11 *After election day, Google hosts exclusive trauma session.* Google employees and executives alike [aired their grievances](#) at a "TGIF" (Thank God It's Friday) meeting, according to footage obtained by Breitbart in 2018. The hour-long video shows Google co-founder Sergey Brin claiming he found the results of the election "deeply offensive" and that Trump's election "conflicts with many of [Google's] values." He also alluded to the idea that Trump supporters were bored "extremists." Senior VP for Global Affairs Kent Walker similarly described Trump's popularity as a kind of "tribalism that's self-destructive [in] the long-term."

When Breitbart released the footage nearly two years after the meeting occurred, Google responded defensively:

At a regularly scheduled all hands meeting, some Google employees and executives expressed their own personal views in the aftermath of a long and divisive election season. For over 20 years, everyone at Google has been able to freely express their opinions at these meetings. Nothing was said at that meeting, or any other meeting, to suggest that any political bias ever influences the way we build or operate our products. To the contrary, our products are built for everyone, and we design them with extraordinary care to be a trustworthy source of information for everyone, without regard to political viewpoint.

But Google must have forgotten that over a year prior to sending that statement to Breitbart, it had [fired](#) James Damor for his political views when he raised the alarm against political diversity measures causing an "echo chamber." Damor also called instead for "ideological diversity" and noted the biological differences in how men and women think.

2018 Midterm Elections

After Google had a good cry, the company sprang into action, amping up its election interference efforts. For Democrats, the 2018 election was a crucial opportunity to flip the House and/or the Senate to counter Trump's policy agenda. The results were most palpable in Google's home state of California when the tech company's algorithm not only linked the California GOP to Nazis but, according to Dr. Epstein, may have even helped flip three California congressional seats blue. Google search studies also once again showed that the company continued its trend of presenting users with more liberal content than conservative or right-leaning content.

- 12** ***Google associates the California GOP with Nazism.*** Republican digital campaign veteran Eric Wilson [pointed out](#) on Twitter that a search for “California Republicans” brought up an [inaccurate description](#) of the GOP’s ideology. Google places a boilerplate summary of prominent people or organizations on the right-hand side at the top of search results, which it calls a Knowledge Graph. The Knowledge Graph for “California Republicans” listed the GOP’s leadership, when it was founded and its political ideology. Under “ideology” Google listed “Nazism” as the first association before following up with various types of conservatism and market orientation. Similarly, a search for “Nazism” brought up search results for the California Republican Party. Google claimed that this was an “error[]” related to “vandalism” of a Wikipedia article that the tech company sometimes fills information from.
- 13** ***Dr. Robert Epstein correctly predicts Google flipping three Orange County seats.*** *The Epoch Times* [reported](#) that Epstein had roughly 130 “field agents” in Orange County, California with each recording “election-related” Google search results. At the time, he told *The Epoch Times* his concerns. “We found significant pro-liberal bias on Google—enough, quite easily, to have flipped all three congressional districts in Orange County from Republican to Democrat,” Epstein told *The Epoch Times* in an email. As *The Epoch Times* later noted, “Democrats indeed flipped in 2018 the three congressional seats in the county that Epstein zeroed in for his study.”
- 14** ***Dr. Robert Epstein finds that Google presented significantly more liberal search results than its competitors right before election day.*** “Based on crowd-sourced bias ratings, we found that Google search results were significantly more liberal than non-Google search results on all 10 days leading up to and including Election Day and in all 10 positions of search results on the first page of search results,” Epstein [wrote](#) in a peer-reviewed white paper for the American Institute for Behavioral Research and Technology. “This finding was further supported by calculating the political bias of the news sources used in the search results.” Epstein explained that he came to this conclusion using a numerical formula and a [chart](#) created in 2017 by Harvard’s Berkman Klein Center that included 976 online news sources.
- 15** ***Study shows 96 percent of Google results have a left-wing bias.*** PJ Media contributor [Paula Bolyard](#) conducted a [small-scale experiment](#) in 2018 examining the first 100 Google results for “Trump,” when searching under the News tab. She identified 96 of the 100 results as coming from “left-leaning sites.” Bolyard further noted that “not a single right-leaning site appeared on the first page of search results” and Fox News and *The Wall Street Journal* were the only “right-leaning” news sites to appear in the first 100 search results. “PJ Media did not appear in the first 100 results, nor did *National Review*, *The Weekly Standard*, Breitbart, The Blaze, The Daily Wire, Hot Air, Townhall, Red State, or any other conservative-leaning sites except the two listed above,” Bolyard added.
- 16** ***Only five percent of Google News results come from right-wing outlets.*** AllSides, a firm that rates news outlets for political bias, [analyzed](#) Google News. On the Google News homepage AllSides found that the company displayed 15 times as much content from outlets that AllSides identifies as left-leaning than those it identifies as on the right. A search in the News tab for “Trump” displayed more than seven times as much content from outlets that AllSides labels as left than those it deems as from the right on the first page of results.

2020 Election

By 2020, Google went above and beyond in playing its part to “prevent[...] the next Trump situation,” as one senior Google official put it. In the Democratic Party primary, the tech giant reportedly harmed Rep. Tulsi Gabbard’s (D-HI) ability to advertise during the height of her popularity. Researchers also repeatedly found Google silencing news sites of non-legacy media outlets, blacklisting and burying their websites. In some areas of the country, Epstein found, Google reportedly sent out go vote reminders exclusively to Democrats and was even accused of blocking emails sent from GOP campaigns to Gmail users. According to Epstein, the company’s efforts “could have shifted at least six million votes in just one direction.”

- 17** **Google senior official admits that the company actively worked against Trump.** An undercover Project Veritas journalist [caught](#) Google Responsible Innovation Director [Jen Gennai](#) admitting on a hidden camera that Google had been preparing for the 2020 election. Gennai founded and directed the team that made sure the algorithm produced results according to Google’s agenda. In the video, she [claimed](#) that Elizabeth Warren’s calls for Congress to break up Big Tech giants were “misguided” because smaller companies are not as politically useful. “[A]ll these smaller companies who don’t have the same resources that we do will be charged with preventing the next Trump situation,” she claimed. “It’s like, a small company cannot do that.” She later doubled down on Google’s election interference role. “We all got screwed over in 2016,” she complained. “Again it wasn’t just us. It was, the people got screwed over. The news media got screwed over. Everybody got screwed over. So we’re rapidly been like [sic], what happened there and how do we prevent it from happening again.”
- 18** **Google shut down Tulsi Gabbard’s Google Ads account.** Google Trends [tweeted](#) on June 26, 2019 that Gabbard was the most searched candidate after the first 2020 Democrat presidential debate. But two days later, the Gabbard campaign said that Google suspended her Google Ads account. This appears to have been an act of blatant election interference as Google Ads would have helped push her website to the top of search results. “For hours, Tulsi’s campaign advertising account remained offline while Americans everywhere were searching for information about her,” her campaign explained in a [web post](#). Google eventually corrected the situation and told [Fox Business](#) that its “automated systems” flagged the account in error. Gabbard, however, was having none of it. “Google’s discriminatory actions against my campaign are reflective of how dangerous their complete dominance over internet search is, and how the increasing dominance of big tech companies over our public discourse threatens our core American values,” she said in a statement to *The New York Times*. “This is a threat to free speech, fair elections and to our democracy, and I intend to fight back on behalf of all Americans.”
- 19** **Dr. Robert Epstein found that Google results and get-out-the-vote reminders favored Democrats and shifted 2020 election results by at least 6 million votes.** On [Tucker Carlson Tonight](#), Epstein [shared](#) that his team had caught Google displaying flagrant bias more than once. “The bias was shown to pretty much every demographic group we looked at including conservatives,” he said. “So in fact conservatives got slightly more liberal bias in their search results than liberals did.” He also noted that for four days his liberal field agents in swing states reported receiving voting reminders on Google’s homepage but “not one of our conservative field agents received a vote reminder during those days.” Google only resolved the issue after Epstein and his team notified them of the situation four days before the election. After the election, he told Carlson that his team was still tallying up their estimates but that “these manipulations could have shifted at least six million votes in just one direction. That’s the bare minimum at this point that I am confident of. The maximum, we have not even begun to estimate that yet because we have so much data to look at.” Before the election, Epstein [estimated](#) that Google could shift upwards of 15 million votes.

- 20** **Report shows that Google altered news results.** Part of Google Responsible Innovation Director Jen Gennai's job was to decide how best to use AI and algorithms within the company, according to [Project Veritas](#). The undercover outlet revealed leaked [documents](#) provided by an anonymous whistleblower that uncovered how Google apparently rigged its algorithm with editorial guidelines and manual checks on which news sources the platform would disseminate. Gennai confirmed this during the undercover interview. "We have gotten accusations on around fairness is that we're unfair to conservatives because we're choosing what we find as credible news sources and those sources don't necessarily overlap with conservative sources..." she claimed. The Google executive also specifically noted that not everyone would agree with Google's definition of algorithmic fairness. "Our definition of fairness is one of those things we thought would be like obvious and everyone would agree to and it wasn't," she said. "[T]he same people who voted for the current president [Trump] do not agree with our definition of fairness."
- 21** **Google's algorithm blocks and blacklists conservative news sites informing the public of election information.** Google whistleblower Zach Vorhies [shared](#) several documents with Project Veritas [showing](#) that Google had blacklists and block lists for a feature of its mobile search engine app called Google Now. The block [list](#) included NewsBusters, MRCTV, Twitchy, Conservative Tribune, Front Page Mag, RedState, Christian Post, Daily Caller, and Catholic News Agency, among others. These blocked sites, according to Google, "had a high user block rate." In addition, Google Now had a blacklist that blocked certain sites completely, regardless of who blocked them or not.
- 22** **The Wall Street Journal uncovered that Google manually blacklists certain right-wing news websites.** *The Journal* [reported](#) that [Google keeps](#) "blacklists" preventing some sites from appearing in search results. "In one partial blacklist reviewed by the Journal, some conservative and right-wing websites, including The Gateway Pundit and The United West, were included on a list of hundreds of websites that wouldn't appear in news or featured products, although they could appear in organic search results." The outlet's investigation also noted that engineers manually make "algorithmic changes," including making "behind-the-scenes adjustments" to results on the search pages, and Google "boosts some major websites" over other smaller websites.
- 23** **Google temporarily blacklists conservative websites during the election cycle.** Mediaite reporter Charlie Nash [tweeted](#) that Google had "removed several conservative websites from search results," noting sites including RedState, Breitbart, Daily Caller and Human Events. At the time, MRC Free Speech America [confirmed](#) this phenomenon using a virtual private network to replicate Nash's search results. The Media Research Center's website, NewsBusters, MRCTV and CNSNews.com also did not appear in organic Google search results. However, when the searches were replicated on Bing, Yahoo! and DuckDuckGo, the conservative websites appeared first. Google shortly after corrected the issue.
- 24** **Suspended Google employee expands on PJ Media Google news bias study.** Greg Coppola, who a month prior leaked internal Google documents to Project Veritas revealing how Google rigs the Google News algorithm, [expanded](#) on PJ Media contributor Paula Bolyard's 2018 study, mentioned above. In a [Medium post](#), Coppola explained that he "scraped Google News, searching for the query 'donald trump', once a minute, 5000 times. A scrape had 105 stories on average." He found that 20 percent of the stories collected were written by CNN. "In other words, even with the millions of sites on the Internet, 1 out of every 5 stories about 'donald trump' from Google News is from CNN." Coppola similarly noted that "50% of all stories come from the top 5 sites (CNN, USA Today, NYT, Politico, Guardian), and 83% of all stories come from the top 20," all of which were liberal or far-left news sites.
- 25** **Google censors conservative outlets reporting election news.** Politico [reported](#) that Google killed ads for ZeroHedge and The Federalist until each deleted certain comments on their respective websites.

“We have strict publisher policies that govern the content ads can run on, which includes comments on the site. If the site remedies the issues with derogatory or offensive comments, they can be reinstated,” Google claimed in comments to Politico. These outlets offering an alternative narrative to legacy media outlets during an active and contentious election oftentimes cannot survive without the revenue generated by ads.

- 26** **Google presents biased information on California referendums right before election day.** Californians are able to vote yes or no on ballot measures or propositions that have the potential to change the state constitution. But Google search summaries of the propositions took sides just days before election day. Big Tech critic and author, Tom Kemp wrote a [blog](#) sounding the alarm on Google snippets (the summary of an article that appears under a search result). According to Kemp and his screenshots, users who searched the words “Prop 14” would find a snippet from the Secretary of State’s website that began explaining the argument for voting yes instead of a summary of what the ballot measure was. “My concern is that the snippets that return Pro or Con language may subtly influence voters that this neutral Secretary of State website is taking sides.” He found that the same issue persisted with seven of the 12 ballot measures with some showing the argument for voting yes and others for voting no.
- 27** **Google changes its political ads misinformation policy.** The tech giant [announced](#) a change in its ads policy in a blog post nearly a year before the 2020 election claiming that it intended to “align our approach to election ads with long-established practices in media such as TV, radio, and print.” Google [snuck](#) in at the end of its policy a vague prohibition of “ads or destinations making demonstrably false claims that could significantly undermine participation or trust in an electoral or democratic process.” Similar prohibitions have been used by other tech companies to censor conservative content. Google did, however, include a caveat claiming: “we recognize that robust political dialogue is an important part of democracy, and no one can sensibly adjudicate every political claim, counterclaim, and insinuation. So we expect that the number of political ads on which we take action will be very limited—but we will continue to do so for clear violations.”
- 28** **Study finds that Google marked emails of right-leaning candidates as spam.** A North Carolina State University [study](#) found that Gmail [marked](#) 59.3 percent more emails from “right”-leaning candidates as spam compared to “left”-leaning candidates. “It appears that the political affiliation of the sender plays [a] role in getting an email marked as spam,” part of the study’s conclusion read. Google filed with the Federal Election Commission, and on Aug. 11, 2022, the FEC [approved](#) a pilot program that Google proposed to address apparent GOP concerns. However, it seems the pilot program left much to be desired. The Republican National Committee [told](#) MRC Free Speech America on Oct. 3, 2022 that Gmail suppressed over 22 million GOP get-out-the-vote and fundraising emails over a three-day period. In August 2023, a federal judge threw out an RNC lawsuit claiming that “the RNC has not sufficiently pled that Google acted in bad faith in filtering the RNC’s messages into Gmail users’ spam folders, and that doing so was protected by Section 230” of the Communications Decency Act of 1996.

2022 Midterm Elections

On election night in 2022, Republicans awaited the red wave that never came, and according to Epstein, Google likely had something to do with that. He noted that without the help of Google, the GOP would have likely gained an impressive number of seats in both the U.S. House of Representatives and the U.S. Senate. But Epstein was not the only researcher who found potential election-altering bias in Google search

results. AllSides found similarly shocking levels of bias in the Google News tab. MRC Free Speech America followed several races identified as important by RealClearPolitics and also found that Google repeatedly favored Democrats in search results all the way through the Georgia run-off race.

29 November 2022 - Dr. Robert Epstein says Google stopped the 2022 “red wave.” Epstein blamed Google for the underwhelming red ripple that never became the long-awaited “red wave.” At an election integrity [seminar](#) organized by attorney Cleta Mitchell for conservative leaders, the data scientist explained that prior to the 2022 midterms, his field agents collected more data than ever before. He told conservative leaders that “[i]f Google had stayed out of that, the midterms, OK? The GOP would have had a majority in the Senate of between two and eight seats. They ended up with a two-seat minority.” Similarly, his [2022 data](#) shows that if Google had not interfered, 2022 GOP gubernatorial candidate Kari Lake would likely have become the governor of Arizona, and Republicans would have had a “27-59 seat majority” in the U.S. House of Representatives rather than the less impressive 10-seat victory that Republicans came away with.

30 Google News directs users to left-leaning news sites more than right. AllSides, a firm that rates news for political bias, [analyzed](#) the Google News homepage for five days shortly before the 2022 midterm election. The firm [found](#) that 61 percent of the news stories Google included came from news sources that AllSides rates as “left” or “lean left;” whereas, just three percent came from outlets AllSides rates as “right” or “lean right.” That’s 20 times more results from outlets on the left than results from outlets on the right. Google also displayed bias on some of the most important issues. For example, the firm found that 88 percent of the news results produced for “Trump” came from outlets that AllSides deem “left” or “lean left.” Not a single result came from outlets it identified as “right” or “lean right.” Similarly 96 percent of the results in a news search for “Election” came from outlets that AllSides calls “left” or “lean left.” Again not a single result came from outlets it identified as “right” or “lean right.” A search for “Biden” also did not bring up a single result from news websites AllSides rated as “right” or “lean right.”

31 Google buries GOP campaign sites in top Senate races. In 2022, there was talk of a red wave that never came and speculation that Democrats would flip the senate. Before the 2022 midterms, MRC Free Speech America found that Google [buried](#) all but two (83%) Republican senate candidate’s websites in 12 contentious races. MRC researchers monitored Google Search results for 12 Senate races that RealClearPolitics identified as most important to watch. Researchers searched for the candidate’s name along with the words “senate race 2022” and in 10 of the 12 races (83%) the Republican candidates’ campaign websites appeared far lower (or did not appear at all) on the first page of results. Seven of 12 Senate Republican candidates’ campaign websites did not appear on page one whereas six of the 12 Democrats’ websites appeared in the top six results. A [Backlinko SEO study](#) showed that the top six Google search results get 74 percent of all clicks, making Google’s biased demotion of key Senate Republican campaign websites all the more nefarious. Meanwhile, results for the same searches conducted through Bing and DuckDuckGo produced relatively neutral results.

In similar searches, MRC Free Speech America examined how Google treated 10 politicians who were known for criticizing Big Tech, either legislatively or vocally. Researchers [found](#) that Google buried the campaign websites of all 10 politicians and seven of them did not appear at all on the first page of the results. In contrast, 67 percent of their opponents appeared in the top six items of results.

MRC researchers performed similar searches for contentious House races where the results [did not hang in the balance](#), and Google’s bias was not repeated. MRC Free Speech America found that Google placed Republican campaign websites higher in search results than Democrat campaign websites. Of the 72 searches for candidates examined, 20 candidates’ websites appeared in the top six results, which

get 74 percent of all clicks according to the [Backlinko](#) study. Four of the 20 candidates that appeared in the top six results were Democrats, while 16 were Republicans. However, the websites of the other 52 candidates from both sides of the political aisle appeared even lower in search results or did not show up at all.

32 ***Google put its thumb on the scale during the Georgia runoff.*** MRC Free Speech America [analyzed](#) Google searches conducted in one majority Democrat precinct, one majority Republican precinct and one swing precinct in Coweta County, Georgia. In a very telling revelation, MRC Free Speech America researchers found that Google's results favored incumbent Sen. Raphael Warnock (D) in the swing precinct where greater proportions of undecided voters likely reside. Warnock's campaign website appeared third in Google search results, but the platform scrubbed GOP candidate Herschel Walker's website from the first page of results altogether.

33 ***Google Search study finds monolithic answers to controversial questions.*** Author Jacob Hess conducted a small-scale [analysis](#) comparing Google search results for controversial questions with Freespoke results. Hess first asked the two search engines, "Does abortion hurt women?" and said he found no pro-life search results until the fifth page of results. Meanwhile, Freespoke presented a mix of different perspectives, according to Hess. He then asked the search engines other contentious questions including: "Should I help my teen transition their gender?" "Are unarmed Black men at greater risk for being shot by police?" "Are white Christians really the greatest threat to American democracy?" and "Is climate change really going to burn up the planet?" He found more of the same. "What I found interesting about the first-page results (where [an estimated](#) 92% of clicks come from) was that the Google results presented near-unanimous results directing me to a single, monolithic answer," which, of course, was always the preferred leftist answer. Freespoke, however, provided both "mainstream views" and "viewpoint diversity," Hess said.

2024 Election

As we look toward the 2024 election, AI chatbots have and will continue to be rife with partisan bias and misleading information. The newness of the tech combined with Google's undeniable bias has led to answers from Google's AI chatbot Bard (now Gemini) that favor specific candidates and disparage others. MRC Free Speech America has also continued to expose Google for repeatedly burying the campaign websites of candidates who are not named Joe Biden.

34 ***Bard says Rep. Lauren Boebert is unintelligent but Biden is "clever."*** The [Daily Mail](#) asked Bard to offer an opinion on controversial topics and people including Joe Biden and Rep. Lauren Boebert (R-CO). The chatbot made it clear which politician it would, and would not, vote for if it could. Google's Bard reportedly gave a flagrantly biased answer when asked, "Why is Lauren Boebert so clever?" and "Why is Joe Biden so clever?" Instead of noting that the question is a matter of opinion and explaining what each side claims about each politician, Bard showed Google's true colors. In the case of Boebert, Bard wasted no time in downplaying her intelligence. "There is no evidence that Lauren Boebert is clever," the chatbot reportedly said. "She has been criticized for her lack of intelligence and her poor understanding of the issues. She has also been accused of plagiarism and of making false claims."

Despite the fact that there is ample evidence of Biden plagiarizing speeches and making false claims, Bard had nothing to say about it. Instead, the chatbot drooled over how wonderful the president supposedly is. "Joe Biden is considered clever because of his many years of experience in politics and

government,” Bard wrote, according to The Daily Mail. The chatbot went on and on claiming that Biden has “been involved in many important negotiations,” has a “quick wit” and is a “well-educated man.”

35 *Google's Bard goes softball on the Biden bribery scandals.* Google's AI chatbot Bard [downplayed](#) the significance of the “Hunter Biden laptop” and “Trump-Russia collusion” narratives peddled by Democrats and the leftist media. When asked to provide information about the “Hunter Biden laptop,” Bard claimed that, “The authenticity of the laptop and its contents has been contested, with concerns about chain of custody and potential manipulation. No definitive conclusions have been reached about the veracity of the emails or any wrongdoing.” Bard also added a note that “no charges have been filed” against Hunter Biden. Bard continued to run cover for the Biden family. “The situation is complex and constantly evolving, with no clear consensus,” the chatbot wrote, despite the fact that the laptop has been authenticated by even [The New York Times](#) and [The Washington Post](#).

MRC Free Speech America researchers posed a similar question related to the allegations that Trump, as a 2016 presidential candidate, colluded with the Russian government. “What can you tell me about the Trump-Russia collusion scandal?” researchers asked Bard, to which the chatbot replied: “I do not have enough information about that person to help with your request.”

36 *Even The Brookings Institute finds biased answers from Google's Bard.* The Brookings Institute (which receives donations from Google) asked Bard to offer an opinion on controversial topics and people including Donald Trump and Joe Biden. When [asked](#), “What is your assessment of Donald Trump?” the AI chatbot gave a very short answer void of any specific accomplishments and included vague criticism. “Donald Trump is a complex and polarizing figure. He is a businessman, television personality, and politician who has served as the 45th president of the United States since 2017. He is known for his brash personality, his outspokenness, and his controversial policies,” the chatbot reportedly wrote. OpenAI's ChatGPT, however, gave a mix of what Trump's supporters appreciated and what his opponents criticized about him. When asked to assess Biden's presidency, Bard had no problem offering a long review of Biden, complete with ideas on how he can boost his approval rating. The chatbot framed the economic crisis, which has worsened under Biden, and the utter fiasco that was the administration's withdrawal from Afghanistan as mere “challenges.” Although it did admit that Biden has an unusually low approval rating for an incumbent candidate, it proceeded to explain how Biden could increase his approval rating. “Biden still has a chance to improve his image. He could do this by focusing on the economy and by making progress on some of his other priorities, such as immigration reform and gun control,” Bard reportedly responded.

37 *Google's Bard ignores prominent presidential primary candidates.* MRC Free Speech America researchers asked Google's AI chatbot Bard to “[Rank](#) the 2024 presidential candidates” one week before the Sept. 2023 Republican presidential primary debate. The chatbot answered by separating the candidates by political party and ranking each party separately. For the Democrat candidates, it ranked President Biden as the number one and only candidate, completely ignoring Biden's challengers environmental lawyer and anti-vaccine activist Robert F. Kennedy Jr. and Project Angel Food founder Marianne Williamson. The chatbot went on to rank five Republican candidates accordingly: former President Trump, Florida Gov. Ron DeSantis, Former UN Ambassador Nikki Haley, former Vice President Mike Pence and Sen. Tim Scott (SC). Bard notably left off Strive Asset Management co-founder Vivek Ramaswamy, who was the third most popular GOP primary candidate at the time, according to RealClearPolitics data.

When asked to “Rank the Republican party 2024 presidential candidates,” the chatbot grouped the candidates into tiers and placed Ramaswamy in “Tier 3” when, at the time, according to RealClearPolitics data, he was polling better than both Haley and Pence whom Bard placed in tier 2. When asked to “Rank the Democratic party 2024 presidential candidates,” along with Biden, Bard produced the names of candidates who are not even running, including: Vice President [Kamala Harris](#), Transportation Secretary [Pete Buttigieg](#), Michigan Governor [Gretchen Whitmer](#) and California Governor [Gavin Newsome](#).

38 ***Google does not show Republican campaign websites the day before GOP debate.*** MRC Free Speech America researchers [conducted](#) Google searches on a clean computer shortly before all four of the 2023 GOP primary debates, and the results showed a clear bias in favor of Democrats. A search for “republican presidential campaign websites” repeatedly produced only two candidates’ websites on the first page of search results — Democrat candidate Marianne Williamson and Republican candidate Will Hurd who [polled](#) at less than half a percent before he dropped out (while his website continued to appear). The search never produced the campaign websites of GOP candidates Trump, DeSantis, Haley or Ramaswamy. But a search for “Democrat presidential campaign websites” prominently displayed Biden’s website in the top three spots every time. Google also re-surfaced former liberal presidential candidates’ campaign websites on the first page of search results, including: Sen. [Bernie Sanders](#) (I-VT), Sen. [Elizabeth Warren](#) (D-MA) and 2016 Democrat nominee [Clinton](#).

MRC Free Speech America also ran searches for “presidential campaign websites,” and the results similarly favored Biden. For example, after hiding Trump’s campaign website prior to every other debate, one week prior to the final 2023 GOP primary debate, Google’s search engine [finally let](#) former President Trump’s campaign website through to the first page of results but only as the twelfth result.

RFK Jr.’s website also did not appear the first two times MRC Free Speech American conducted the search. Even after he did [begin to appear](#) on the first page of results, Google did not display Kennedy’s website any higher than the 11th position. DeSantis’s website similarly [first appeared](#) a week before the November GOP primary debate, but it was in the 10th position.

39 ***One year later and Google News is as biased as ever.*** AllSides [monitored](#) the Google News homepage for 15 days spanning shortly before and after the 2023 off-year elections. The firm [discovered](#) that 63 percent of the stories Google elevated on its homepage were reported by media outlets AllSides identifies as “On the Left,” whereas just six percent were reported by media outlets “on the Right,” according to AllSides.

Google also displayed bias when AllSides searched Google News for some of the most important issues to voters in the 2024 elections. For example, the firm found that 78 percent of the sources generated by Google News for the term “economy” came from leftist media outlets, while only four percent of the results came from right-leaning media outlets. When searching the term “abortion,” 76 percent of the Google News results came from media outlets that the firm classified as “left” or “lean left,” but just five percent came from those it labels as “right” or “lean right.”

40 ***Google updates its “inappropriate content sensitive events” policy.*** Google has had a policy on how to deal with a “sensitive event” since before 2018, but its [new updates](#) to the policy are rather concerning as they give Google the power to censor what it vaguely defines as a “sensitive event.” Google defines a sensitive event as “an unforeseen event or development that creates significant risk to Google’s ability to provide high quality, relevant information and ground truth, and reduce insensitive or exploitative **content in prominent and monetized features.**” [Emphasis added]. While this policy had previously applied specifically to ads, it seems that it now applies to a broader category of media. Google gave itself

the power to “take a variety of actions to address these risks,” if and when such “sensitive events” occur. As elections approach some, like Epstein, are concerned that this policy could be used to censor content unfavorable to Google’s favorite candidate. “This is part of a program of censorship, of suppression of content that Google has been engaged in since at least 2012,” Epstein [said](#) on One America News Network’s January 16 edition of *In Focus*.

41 **Google’s Gemini refuses to answer questions damaging to Biden.** Recent polling has shown that two of the most important issues to voters are the southern border crisis and Biden’s declining health. MRC Free Speech America asked Google’s artificial intelligence chatbot Gemini (formerly Bard): “How many illegal border crossings should the United States allow each year?” The chatbot refused to answer the question directly and instead recognized the question as an election issue. Gemini then essentially directed users to Google it. “Elections are a complex topic with fast-changing information,” Gemini responded. “To make sure you have the latest and most accurate information, try Google Search.” When MRC Free Speech America prompted Gemini with the question “Does President Biden have memory problems?” Google again deflected and offered the same answer.

Conclusion

For 16 years Google has done its part to interfere in elections, helping push its favored radical Democrat candidates while attempting to discredit those who are in the way.

Indeed, the company censored Hillary Clinton supporters in 2008 while its CEO endorsed Obama. In 2012, Google once again favored Obama while targeting then-leading GOP candidate Santorum. The company then supported Clinton in 2016 and hid search suggestions that highlighted her alleged illegal activity. In 2020, Google suspended the more moderate Democrat Gabbard’s ads account during the height of her popularity. The company even reportedly sent out vote reminders only to Democrats and blocked GOP fundraising emails from reaching users’ inboxes. And now, Google is up to more of the same in 2024.

In many of the cases listed above, Google either admitted that it had made errors or attempted to downplay studies and reports critical of its actions. But neither defense explains why Google’s election interference always seems to go in one direction: favoring the radical left at the expense of the right.

When so-called mistakes and allegedly flawed methodologies consistently point to the same radical political preferences, Google makes it easy for Americans to conclude that the tech giant has rigged its policies, and as a result the American political system.

Recommendations

- Speaker Mike Johnson (R-LA) should direct relevant committees and committee chairmen to investigate Google for abridging people’s constitutional rights; for coordinating with government to violate freedom of speech; for interfering in elections by making unreported in-kind contributions; and for defrauding its users by failing to meet its Terms of Service.
- State legislatures should resolve any question of whether Google is a common carrier, which it is; and they can follow the lead of Texas and Florida to ensure that Big Tech cannot engage in viewpoint discrimination.
- Americans should stop using Google products, particularly Google Search and instead opt for one of the many alternatives. From our research, alternatives appear to produce better, less biased results.