

Lifting the covers on ‘Obamoogle’

An antitrust probe went away while Google snuggled with Obama.

Did Google bribe it's way out of another law enforcement investigation?



By [Tammy Bruce](#) -

ANALYSIS/OPINION:

During this past week as we've been swamped with bad news pouring out of every corner of the

globe, it wouldn't be surprising if you missed one of the more shocking revelations about [White](#)

[House](#) actions that would make even Richard Nixon blush.

The [Wall Street Journal](#) revealed that it had obtained a 2012 [Federal Trade Commission](#) report

detailing the closeness of [Google](#) and the Obama administration while the [FTC](#) was engaging in

an antitrust investigation of the Internet giant.

It's usually the case that you get more interesting information when the details were supposed to

remain secret, and that's the case here. The [FTC](#), responding to an open-records request,

accidentally sent 160 pages of a private 2012 report to the [Wall Street Journal](#), detailing

their antitrust investigation into [Google](#).

What was disclosed paints a picture of unusual activity between the [White House](#), [Google](#) and

the [FTC](#) while the antitrust investigation was being conducted. Ultimately, the [FTC](#) staff

recommended bringing a lawsuit against [Google](#) on antitrust grounds. Despite this, the

[commission](#) voted 5-0 against charges.

Most of the headlines focus on the number of visits [Google](#) executives and lobbyists made to

the [White House](#) during the investigation. Even the newspaper in its coverage cast the events as

a “sign of the Internet giant’s reach in Washington” implying that access to the Obama [White](#)

[House](#) is some sort of a byproduct of overall influence.

But in this case, that’s placing the cart well before the horse.

Since President [Obama](#) took office, The [Wall Street Journal](#) reports, employees of [Google](#) “have

visited the [White House](#) for meetings with senior officials about 230 times, or an average of

roughly once a week.” [Google](#)’s top lobbyist had more than 60 meetings at the [White House](#).

That’s more meetings than most of [Mr. Obama](#)’s Cabinet members.

For [White House](#) watchers, none of this should be a surprise. One of the people standing next to

[Mr. Obama](#) at his first press conference after winning the 2008 presidential election was Eric

Schmidt, the executive chairman of [Google](#). While Mr. Schmidt is not on record donating to an

[Obama](#) campaign, National Public Radio reports, “Eric Schmidt’s wife, Wendy, gave [Obama](#)’s

campaigns \$47,600. And Wendy Schmidt got behind [Obama](#)’s political career early, donating

\$2,000 to his Senate run in 2004.”

But some contributions are priceless and highlight the nature of the commitment to [Mr. Obama](#)

by one company. On the night of the November 2012 election, Mr. Schmidt personally handled

the custom voter-turnout software for [Mr. Obama](#). By the end of that election month, The [Wall](#)

[Street Journal](#) reports, the [FTC](#) decided to not file charges against [Google](#).

During the 2012 re-election campaign, [Google](#) employees were the second-largest source of

campaign donations to the Obama campaign, reports the Daily Caller.

Perhaps [Google](#) should just change its name to Obamoogle, but it wouldn't be the first time a

corporation has curried the favor of an administration. Between lobbyists and political donations,

and even long-standing relationships, Americans have seen how some companies manage to

secure Most Favored Nation-type relationships with presidents and their administrations.

Who can forget the hysterics of the left, bemoaning the relationship between Halliburton and the

George W. Bush [White House](#)? Yet, there are no complaints from the left about [Mr. Obama](#)'s

increasing reliance on [Google](#) and its extraordinary access to his administration. In fact, some

liberals, including one with whom I appeared on Fox News about this subject, explained away this

as nothing new, it happens all the time, and it's just the way Washington works.

Well, not really. This is wholly different. Special relationships are one thing, and working directly

on the president's re-election campaign only to have a federal agency walk away from a federal

lawsuit that same month is quite another.

All parties, of course, deny that any of the activity between [Google](#) and the [White House](#) had

anything to do with the [FTC](#)'s decision to not sue the company. At the same time, the agency

refuses to release the rest of the report that was accidentally sent to The [Wall Street Journal](#).

Even with this incomplete picture, Americans should be extremely concerned over the appearance

that if you help [Barack Obama](#) with what he wants, the rule of law will bend, or even break, for

you.

This revelation about the intensity of the Obama-[Google](#) merger also helps explain the Federal

Communications Commission's determination to regulate the Internet using the pretext of "net

neutrality.” The biggest winners of that action? [Obama](#) supporters [Google](#) (through YouTube)

and Netflix, which now consume at least 50 percent of Internet bandwidth.

[Google](#) has literally been at [Mr. Obama](#)’s side from the beginning of his presidency. They now

are the beneficiaries of administration policy. These days on the domestic and international front,

it’s becoming more and more difficult to determine for whom [Mr. Obama](#) works.

Copyright © 2016 The Washington Times, LLC.



[Tammy Bruce](#)