

“Russia Interfered!” - By Purchasing Anti-Trump Ads?

By [Moon of Alabama](#)

Global Research, October 11, 2017

[Moon of Alabama](#) 10 October 2017

Region: [Russia and FSU, USA](#)

Theme: [Media Disinformation](#)

After the ludicrous “Russian hacking” claims have died down for lack of evidence, the attention was moved to even more ludicrous claims of “Russian ads influenced the elections”. Some readers are upset that continue to debunk the nonsense the media spreads around this. But lies should not stand without response. If only to blame the reporters and media who push this dreck.

As evidence is also lacking for any “Russian interference” claims the media outlets have started to push deceiving headlines. These make claims that are not covered at all by the content of the related pieces. The headlines are effective because less than 20% of the viewers ever read beyond them.

On the NYT Homepage today we find another one of these: [Google Finds Russia Bought Ads to Interfere in Election](#).

Google has found no ads that “Russia”, the state or nation, has bought. There is also no evidence that the ads in question interfered in any way with the election. There is evidence that any of the ads in questions aimed to achieve that. The opener of the piece repeats the false headline claims. But now we have “Russian agents”, not “Russia”, which allegedly did something.

Google has found evidence that Russian agents bought ads on its wide-ranging networks in an effort to interfere with the 2016 presidential campaign.

The term “Russian agents” is not defined at all. Where these “secret agents” or Public Relation professionals in Washington DC hired by some Russian entity?

Using accounts believed to be connected to the Russian government, the agents purchased \$4,700 worth of search ads and more traditional display ads, according to a person familiar with the company’s inquiry ...

“Accounts *believed to be connected* to the Russian government.” Believed by whom? And how is “connected” defined? Isn’t any citizen “connected” to his or her government?

Those *believed, connected* accounts bought a whopping \$4,700 of ads? Googles 2016 revenue was \$89,000,000,000. The total campaign expenditures in 2016 were some \$6,000,000,000. The Clinton campaign spent some \$480,000 on social network ads alone. But something “Russian” spending \$4,700 was “interference”?

But wait. There is more:

Google found a separate \$53,000 worth of ads with political material that were purchased from Russian internet addresses, building addresses or with Russian currency. It is not clear whether any of those were connected to the Russian government, and they may have been purchased by Russian citizens, the person said.

So now we are on to something. A full \$53,000 worth of ads. But

The messages of those ads spanned the political spectrum. One account spent \$7,000 on ads to promote a documentary called "You've Been Trumped," a film about **Donald J. Trump's** efforts to build a golf course in Scotland along an environmentally sensitive coastline. Another spent \$36,000 on ads questioning whether **President Barack Obama** needed to resign. Yet another bought ads to promote political merchandise for Mr. Obama.

The film is anti-Trump. Obama not resigning would have been anti-Trump. Selling Obama merchandise may have been good business, but is certainly not pro-Trump. So at least \$43,000 of a total of \$53,000 mentioned above was spent by *believed, connected* "Russians" on ads that promoted anti-Trump material. How does that fit with the claims that "Russia" wished to get Trump elected? Putin pushed the wrong button?

The allegedly "Russian" Facebook ads were just [a click-bait scheme](#) by some people trying to make money. The allegedly "Russian" Goggle ads were of a volume that is unlikely to have made any difference in anything. They were also anti-Trump.

Clinton lost because people on all sides had learned to dislike her policies throughout the years. She was unelectable. Her party was and is acting against the interest of the common people. No claim of anything "Russian" can change those facts.

Featured image is from [outsidethebeltway.com](#).

The original source of this article is [Moon of Alabama](#)
Copyright © [Moon of Alabama](#), [Moon of Alabama](#), 2017

[Comment on Global Research Articles on our Facebook page](#)

[Become a Member of Global Research](#)

Articles by: [Moon of Alabama](#)

Disclaimer: The contents of this article are of sole responsibility of the author(s). The Centre for Research on Globalization will not be responsible for any inaccurate or incorrect statement in this article. The Centre of Research on Globalization grants

permission to cross-post Global Research articles on community internet sites as long the source and copyright are acknowledged together with a hyperlink to the original Global Research article. For publication of Global Research articles in print or other forms including commercial internet sites, contact: publications@globalresearch.ca

www.globalresearch.ca contains copyrighted material the use of which has not always been specifically authorized by the copyright owner. We are making such material available to our readers under the provisions of "fair use" in an effort to advance a better understanding of political, economic and social issues. The material on this site is distributed without profit to those who have expressed a prior interest in receiving it for research and educational purposes. If you wish to use copyrighted material for purposes other than "fair use" you must request permission from the copyright owner.

For media inquiries: publications@globalresearch.ca