This article recounts key events along a time line that stretches from 1986 to the present. Follow the bouncing ball.

Since Facebook went public with an IPO (Initial Public Offering) of stock in 2012, I've been following the trail of its stock price.

In 2012, I wrote:

"But now the Facebook stock has tanked. On Friday, August 17 [2012], it weighed in at half its initial IPO price. For the first time since the IPO, venture-capital backers were legally permitted to sell off their shares, and some did, at a loss."

"Articles have begun appearing that question Zuckerberg's ability to manage his company. 'Experts' are saying he should import a professional team to run the business side of things and step away."

"This has the earmarks of classic shakeout and squeeze play…

First, [insiders] drive down the price of the stock, then they trade it at low levels that discourage and demoralize public investors, who sell their shares…As the stock continues to tank, the insiders quietly buy up as much of it as they can."
Finally, when the price hits a designated rock bottom, they shoot it up all the way to new highs and win big."

In 2013, I followed up and wrote:

"Facebook launched its IPO and went public on May 18, 2012. The opening stock price was 42 dollars a share."

"In September 2012, the collapsing stock hit a low of 17.55."

"On October 17, 2013, a year later, after a long climb, the stock reached an all-time high: 52.21."

"So… Facebook, a company with CIA-front connections, a company that encourages people to offer up surveillance data on themselves [and censors politically incorrect news], goes through a financial transformation. Its IPO price collapses like ice in a heat wave. It keeps trading at its new low prices, scaring lots of investors."

"They sell their shares. Insiders buy up those shares at delicious discounts."

"Then, when the insiders have scooped up enough, they begin to move the price. Up. The long climb begins."

Now, in June of 2017, it's time to check in again.

What's happened to Facebook's stock price since the high of $54 a share in 2013?

From October 2016 to December 2016, there was another shakeout that convinced many shareholders to dump their stocks - and of course, insiders gobbled up those shares for themselves.

The shakeout took the stock price down from an all-time high of $127.88 a share to $115.05.

Then, once again, the relentless climb resumed. On June 2nd of this year, the stock reached a new all-time high of $153.61.

All in all, quite a ride. From the IPO price of $42, down to $17… and now $150.

Are some of the insiders who have been engineering Facebook's long-term stock-rise front-men for the CIA?

I ask that question because of Facebook's CIA connections:

The big infusion of cash that sent Mark Zuckerberg and his fledgling college enterprise on their way came from Accel Partners, in 2004.

Jim Breyer, head of Accel, attached a $13 million rocket to Facebook, and nothing has ever been the same.

Earlier that same year, a man named Gilman Louie joined the board of the National Venture Capital Association of America (NVCA). The chairman of NVCA? Jim Breyer.

Gilman Louie happened to be the first CEO of the important CIA start-up, In-Q-Tel.

In-Q-Tel was founded in 1999, with the express purpose of funding companies that could develop technology the CIA would use to "gather data."

That's not the only connection between Facebook funder Jim Breyer and the CIA's man, Gilman Louie.

In 2004, Louie went to work for BBN Technologies, headed up by Breyer. Dr. Anita Jones also joined BBN at that time. Jones had worked for In-Q-Tel and was an adviser to DARPA, the Pentagon's technology department that helped develop the Internet.

With these CIA/DARPA connections, it's no surprise that Jim Breyer's jackpot investment in Facebook is not part of the popular mythology of Mark Zuckerberg. Better to omit it.

Who can fail to realize that Facebook, with its endless stream of personal data, and its tracking capability, is an ideal CIA asset?

From the time Mark Zuckerberg was a child and attended the summer camp for "exceptional children," CTY (Center for Talented Youth), run by Johns Hopkins University, he, like other CTY students, Sergey Brin (co-founder of Google), and Lady Gaga, have been easy to track.

CTY and similar camps filter applications and pick the best and brightest for their accelerated learning programs. Tracing the later progress of these children in school and life would be a walk in the park for agencies like the CIA.
When Zuckerberg founded an interesting little social network at Harvard, and then sought to turn it into a business, the data-mining possibilities were obvious to CIA personnel.

Through their cutouts, as described above, they stepped in and lent a helping hand.

During the 2016 presidential campaign, Facebook/CIA presented an anti- Trump stance, which meant a pro- Hillary stance.

Is that a pro-CIA stance?

Let's look at a fascinating piece of history involving the CIA and the other Clinton:

Bill.

The source here is the explosive 1995 book, Compromised - Clinton, Bush and the CIA, by Terry Reed and John Cummings.

According to the authors, Bill Clinton, way back in the 1980s, was involved with the CIA in some very dirty dealings in Arkansas - and I'm not just talking about the cocaine flights landing at the Mena airport (see The Mena operation).

It seems Bill had agreed to set up CIA weapons-making factories in his home state, under the radar.

But because Arkansas, when it comes to money, is all cronies all the time, everybody and his brother found out about the operation and wanted in. Also, Bill was looking for a bigger cut of the action.

This security breach infuriated the CIA, and a meeting was held to dress down Bill and make him see the error of his ways. His CIA handlers told him they were going to shut down the whole weapons operation, because Bill had screwed up royally.

A screaming match ensued - but the CIA people backed off a bit and told Bill,

HE WAS STILL THEIR MAN FOR AN EVENTUAL RUN FOR THE PRESIDENCY.

Of course, there are people who think Reed and Cummings's book contains fiction, but John Cummings was a top-notch reporter for Newsday.

He co-authored the 1990 book, Goombata, about the rise and fall of John Gotti.

He exposed US operations to destroy Cuban agriculture with bio-weapons. It's highly doubtful he would have put his name on Compromised without a deep conviction he was correctly adding up the facts.

Here, from Compromised, is an account of the extraordinary meeting, in Arkansas, between Bill Clinton and his CIA handlers, in March of 1986, six years before Clinton would run for the Presidency.

Author Terry Reed, himself a CIA asset at the time, was there. So was Oliver North, and a man named "Robert Johnson," who was representing CIA head Bill Casey.

Johnson said to Bill Clinton:

"Calm down and listen... We are all in this together. We all have our personal agendas... but let's not forget, both the Vice President and Mr. Casey want this operation to be a success.

We need to get these assets and resources in place and get them self-sustaining and prospering on their own while we have the chance. This is a golden opportunity. The timing is right.

We have communists taking over a country in this hemisphere. We must all pull together and play as a team. This is no time for lone wolves...

"I'm not here to threaten you [Bill Clinton]. But there have been mistakes. The Mena operation survived undetected and unexposed only because Mr. [Barry] Seal carried with him a falsely created, high-level profile of a drug runner. All the cops in the country were trying to investigate a drug operation.

That put the police in a position where we could control them.

We fed them what we wanted to feed them, when we wanted to feed them; it was our restaurant and our menu... now we have to shut it down..."
"Bill, you are Mr. Casey's fair-haired boy. But you do have competition for the job you seek. We would never put all eggs in one basket. You and your state have been our greatest asset.

The beauty of this, as you know, is that you're a Democrat, and with our ability to influence both parties, this country can get beyond partisan gridlock.

Mr. Casey wanted me to pass on to you that unless you fuck up and do something stupid, you're No. 1 on the short list for a shot at the job you've always wanted.

"That's pretty heady stuff, Bill. So why don't you help us keep a lid on this and we'll all be promoted together. You and guys like us are the fathers of the new government.

Hell, we are the new covenant."

By this account, Bill Clinton was the CIA's boy back in 1986, long before he launched himself into his first 1992 Presidential campaign. That speaks of major planning.

In 1992, an obscure governor from a rather obscure state suddenly gains national prominence and vaults to the head of the line in the race for the White House.

Now, consider the role of the CIA-connected Facebook in the 2016 presidential election.

- Did Facebook's strategy of cutting off pro-Trump postings/information and instead supporting ANOTHER CLINTON, HILLARY, signal the continuation of a long-running covert CIA op to put and keep the Clintons in power?
- Since 1986, have the Clintons been a package deal for the CIA?
- Was the most recent incarnation of that deal the Facebook op to put Hillary in the White House?

Most people have a problem looking at long-term ops.

They conceive of covert actions taking place along severely limited time lines. That's exactly what major operatives count on. They can plan in the dark for two or three decades ahead (or longer) and feel they're in the clear.

And when a little social networking company comes along and needs an infusion of cash, they can step in, help, and, seeing the possibilities, they can help push the stock to new highs and accomplish elite surveillance and censor true information and support their favored presidential candidate - all during the same dozen years.

It's an easy program.

All sorts of cards can be played from the bottom of the deck.