Seeds of Surveillance: How the Intelligence Community Shaped the Dawn of Big Data

Introduction: The Ghost in the Machine

On July 14, 1995, a Finnish computer scientist named Tatu Ylönen forwarded a two-year-old "Call for Abstracts" to the Cypherpunks mailing list, a hub for advocates of strong cryptography and digital privacy. The notice, which had originally circulated on the academic dbworld mailing list, announced an unclassified workshop on the topic of "Massive Digital Data Systems" (MDDS). At first glance, it appeared to be a standard academic conference, soliciting research on managing the burgeoning volumes of digital information. Yet, the sponsor was not a university or a technology corporation, but an obscure entity deep within the U.S. government: the Community Management Staff of the Intelligence Community. Appended to his email, Ylönen, the creator of the Secure Shell (SSH) protocol for encrypted communications, added a simple, prescient question: "Crypto relevance?".

That question, posed five years before the founding of Google and nearly two decades before the Snowden revelations, contained the seed of a hidden history. It hinted at the dual-use nature of the technologies being sought—tools that could organize information could just as easily be used to monitor it. This digital fossil, a seemingly innocuous email, serves as the Rosetta Stone for understanding a critical, yet largely untold, chapter of the digital age. It poses a central question: How and why did the U.S. Intelligence Community (IC), in the immediate aftermath of the Cold War, begin a public-facing initiative to guide the world's brightest academic minds toward solving the problem of "Big Data" before the term even existed?

This report presents documented evidence to demonstrate that the creation of the technologies underlying modern big data and mass surveillance was not an organic commercial development but a direct, intended outcome of a strategic U.S. Intelligence Community initiative. This initiative, the Massive Digital Data Systems (MDDS) program, identified the core technical challenges of a data-saturated world, funded key academic research at Stanford University, and directly supported the work of Sergey Brin. The technological breakthroughs that emerged from this research, which Brin and his colleague Larry Page would later incorporate as Google, provided the exact capabilities the Intelligence Community had sought from the outset. This is the story of how the seeds of 21st-century surveillance were deliberately planted in the fertile soil of 1990s academia, and how they grew into the most powerful information-gathering apparatus in human history.

Chapter 1: A World Without a Wall: The Intelligence Community's Data Crisis

The early 1990s marked an existential turning point for the U.S. Intelligence Community. The sudden collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991 removed its singular, monolithic adversary, leaving the vast apparatus of American intelligence without its primary organizing principle. The IC was forced to pivot from a "gentlemanly" Cold War footing, focused on a known state actor, to a world of "less well known and less predictable" threats. This profound shift necessitated a fundamental change in the nature of intelligence gathering. The mission evolved from a deep, long-term analysis of a single target to the monitoring of diffuse, multidimensional issues, including transnational terrorism, economic espionage, and complex regional conflicts.

This new mission was compounded by a looming technological crisis. The dawn of the digital age and the early internet were creating a "worldwide information explosion" that threatened to overwhelm the IC's existing capabilities. An unclassified NASA presentation from the era, discussing new architectural paradigms for storage systems, highlights the scale of the problem. It notes that the Intelligence Community was already ingesting over 4 terabytes of data per day from classified sources alone, a figure that did not include the "thousands of unclassified sources worldwide that are routinely accessed". The presentation correctly predicted that a 10 terabyte problem would become a multi-petabyte problem within a decade. This "data deluge" was identified as a critical challenge; the IC urgently needed "new collection strategies" and "new ways to coordinate" to manage the flood of information.

To a modern reader, for whom terabyte drives are a consumer commodity, these figures may seem manageable. In the context of 1993, they were astronomical. A single 1 gigabyte hard drive cost approximately $2,000. A terabyte of raw storage, therefore, represented a capital investment of roughly $2 million, a figure that does not account for the immense cost of the mainframe computers, specialized cooling, and physical space required to operate them. The vision articulated in the MDDS call for abstracts—managing "20 petabytes of data," an amount it equated to "200 megabytes of data on every man, woman, and child on earth"—was, in 1993, a breathtakingly ambitious and almost unimaginably expensive goal. It signaled both the IC's remarkable foresight and the gravity of the problem it sought to solve.

The strategic shift in the early 1990s was more profound than simply finding new targets; it was a fundamental reorientation from an *enemy-centric* model to a *data-centric* one. The primary adversary was no longer a single nation-state but chaos and complexity itself, manifested as an unmanageable volume of digital information. The sources from the period reveal this transition explicitly. The old "Soviet paradigm" was gone, replaced by an environment of "less predictable" and "complex multidimensional issues". The demand for "actionable intelligence" was surpassing the need for "reflective analytical pieces," implying a shift from long-term state analysis to real-time data processing. The problem was quantified not in terms of enemy capabilities but in terms of data volume: terabytes and petabytes. The IC's primary challenge was no longer a single, knowable enemy, but the data environment itself. The goal of the MDDS initiative was to build the tools to master this new environment, a necessary prerequisite for tackling any specific threat that might emerge from within it.

Chapter 2: The Call from the Community: Architecting the Solution

To confront the data crisis, the Intelligence Community turned to two key organizations: the Community Management Staff (CMS) to provide strategic direction and the MITRE Corporation to supply the technical architecture.

The Architects: CMS and MITRE

The Community Management Staff was the central nervous system of the entire Intelligence

Community. It was not an operational agency like the CIA or NSA but a strategic body that reported directly to the Director of Central Intelligence (DCI). Its mission was to assist the DCI with IC-wide coordination and management, including policy development, budget formulation, and requirements definition. The CMS was mandated to act as a corporate headquarters, identifying "cross-program trade-offs," reducing "unnecessary duplication of effort," and evaluating "competitive investment proposals" across the community's 13 member agencies. This unique, cross-cutting authority positioned the CMS as the logical entity to launch a forward-looking, multi-agency initiative like the Massive Digital Data Systems program.
The MITRE Corporation served as the IC's technical brain trust. As a Federally Funded Research and Development Center (FFRDC), MITRE operated as a not-for-profit company providing engineering and technical guidance to the government. Its history was deeply intertwined with the IC, having developed critical data systems like the Operational Application of Special Intelligence Systems (OASIS), a precursor to the Intelink network that connected intelligence agencies. MITRE's involvement, with its employee Susan L. Hanlon listed as the point of contact on the "Call for Abstracts," provided the MDDS initiative with both technical credibility and the project management infrastructure needed to engage with academia and industry.

Deconstructing the "Call for Abstracts": The IC's Wish List

The 1993 "Call for Abstracts" was a blueprint for the future of data analysis. It explicitly stated the IC's problem: "The Intelligence Community is being challenged to provide timely intelligence... from massive volumes of data." It then laid out a specific list of technical "issues" that the IC needed the nation's brightest minds to solve. These included:

- **Scalability:** Systems capable of handling terabytes to petabytes of data.
- **Federated Architectures:** The ability to query and manage data distributed across multiple, autonomous systems.
- **Data Fusion:** Techniques to combine and correlate information from different sources and formats.
- **Query Optimization:** Methods for efficiently retrieving information from massive datasets.
- **Data Mining:** The ability to automatically discover patterns and relationships within the data.
- **Information Retrieval:** Advanced search capabilities for unstructured text, imagery, and signals data.

This list was, in effect, a detailed specification for the core functionalities of a modern search engine and a global-scale data analysis platform. It was a clear signal of the IC's intent to move beyond traditional database management and pioneer the field of what would later be called "Big Data."

The "Unclassified" Strategy

A crucial element of the MDDS initiative was its public, unclassified nature. The "Call for Abstracts" itself notes that it follows a prior *classified* workshop, indicating a deliberate, two-pronged strategy. The unclassified workshop was designed to harness the intellectual power of the broader academic and commercial worlds, a resource the IC knew it could not replicate in secret. The goal was to guide the entire public research and development ecosystem toward solving the IC's problems. As one analysis of the program notes, the strategy was to fund research through unclassified agencies like the National Science Foundation (NSF)

to "allow the architecture to be scaled up in the private sector".
The MDDS initiative was not merely a funding program; it was a sophisticated act of "market shaping." The Intelligence Community, acting as a strategic customer, defined a problem set so ambitious and fundamental that any solutions would inevitably have massive commercial applications. By publicly outlining their needs via an unclassified call sent to a broad academic mailing list, they created a powerful incentive for academia and the nascent tech industry to align their research priorities with the IC's long-term goals. The stated objective was to identify solutions and "incorporate IC requirements into commercial products". This approach leveraged the dynamism of the free market. Instead of paying a single contractor to build a proprietary, classified "spy tool," the IC guided the entire market to develop foundational technologies that could then be adapted for intelligence purposes. It was an infinitely more powerful and cost-effective method of achieving its strategic objectives, ensuring that the commercial world would, of its own accord, build the tools the IC required.

Chapter 3: The Stanford Nexus: A Tale of Two Grants

In the mid-1990s, Stanford University's Computer Science department became the fertile ground for the seeds planted by the MDDS initiative. It was here that two graduate students, Larry Page and Sergey Brin, would develop the technology that fulfilled the IC's vision. Their work was supported by a complex and overlapping web of funding, a tale of two distinct grants: one public and widely celebrated, the other clandestine and largely forgotten.

The Public Story: The Stanford Digital Library Project (SDLP)

The official and well-known narrative of Google's origins centers on the Stanford Digital Library Project. The SDLP was a major, multi-university initiative launched in 1994 with the goal of developing the technologies for a "single, integrated and universal digital library". Stanford's part of the project was supported by a cooperative agreement (IRI-9411306) funded jointly by the National Science Foundation (NSF), the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA), and NASA.
Larry Page and Sergey Brin were both PhD students working under the umbrella of this project, with Stanford professors Hector Garcia-Molina and Terry Winograd serving as the principal investigators. This grant is consistently and correctly cited in the official histories of Google and is the sole source of government funding acknowledged in Brin and Page's most famous academic paper, "The Anatomy of a Large-Scale Hypertextual Web Search Engine," published in 1998.

The Hidden Story: The Massive Digital Data Systems (MDDS) Grant

Running parallel to the public SDLP funding was a second, more direct stream of support from the intelligence community. Multiple sources, including journalistic investigations and Wikipedia's extensively sourced "History of Google" article, state that Brin and Page's research team at Stanford also received funding from the Massive Digital Data Systems (MDDS) program. This program is explicitly described as being "managed for the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) and the National Security Agency (NSA) by large intelligence and military contractors".
The definitive piece of primary evidence for this funding stream comes from another 1998 paper

co-authored by Sergey Brin, titled "What can you do with a Web in your Pocket?" Published in the *Bulletin of the IEEE Computer Society Technical Committee on Data Engineering*, a footnote on the first page contains a stunning admission: the work was "Partially supported by the Community Management Staff's Massive Digital Data Systems Program". This acknowledgement provides an irrefutable, citable link between Sergey Brin's foundational research and the Intelligence Community initiative that is the focus of this report.

This funding was not a secret, but it has been systematically omitted from the popular narrative of Google's creation. The NSF's own article on the origins of Google, for instance, mentions the DLI project and Brin's separate NSF Graduate Fellowship but makes no mention of the MDDS program. The existence of these two parallel grants reveals a more complex and deliberate story of how Google's core technology was nurtured.

Grant/Program Name	Sponsoring Agency/Agencies	Grant/Award Number	Key Stanford PIs	Key Student Researchers Supported	Acknowledged In (Key Publication)
Stanford Integrated Digital Library Project (SDLP)	NSF, DARPA, NASA, Interval Research, Industrial Partners	IRI-9411306	Hector Garcia-Molina, Terry Winograd	Larry Page, Sergey Brin	"The Anatomy of a Large-Scale Hypertextual Web Search Engine"
Massive Digital Data Systems (MDDS) Program	Community Management Staff (for CIA/NSA)	Not Publicly Available	Jeffrey Ullman (supervisor)	Sergey Brin	"What can you do with a Web in your Pocket?"
NSF Graduate Fellowship	National Science Foundation (NSF)	Not Applicable	N/A	Sergey Brin	"History of Google" , "On the Origins of Google"

The two funding streams were not redundant but symbiotic. The large, public NSF/DARPA grant provided the foundational infrastructure—servers, network bandwidth, and institutional legitimacy—and supported a broad range of digital library research, including Larry Page's work on web crawling. Within this resource-rich environment, the smaller, more targeted MDDS grant acted as "seed-funding," as described by its manager Bhavani Thuraisingham, for Sergey Brin's research on the components most critical to the IC's mission: "query optimization of very complex queries," data mining, and making sense of user behavior within massive datasets. This dual-funding structure allowed the Intelligence Community to discreetly nurture its specific interests within the protective and well-resourced ecosystem of a larger, publicly funded project. The public grant created the environment, while the IC grant cultivated the specific technology it wanted to see flourish. This represents a highly efficient and subtle method of guiding academic research toward national security objectives.

Chapter 4: PageRank: The Engine of Intelligence

The research conducted by Page and Brin at Stanford culminated in a technical breakthrough that would not only form the foundation of their future company but also provide a perfect solution to the problems laid out by the Intelligence Community. This breakthrough was an algorithm they called PageRank.

The Technical Breakthrough

Prior to PageRank, search engines primarily relied on lexical features—ranking pages based on how many times a search term appeared in the text. This method was crude and easily manipulated. PageRank revolutionized this by analyzing the link structure of the web itself. The core idea, inspired by citation analysis in academic literature, was to treat a hyperlink from page A to page B as a "vote" by page A for page B's importance.
Crucially, not all votes were equal. A link from a well-established, authoritative page (like the homepage of a major university) was worth far more than a link from an obscure personal page. This created a recursive system where a page's importance was determined by the importance of the pages linking to it. The algorithm produced an objective, numerical rank for every page on the web, automating the discovery of authority and relevance in a chaotic, uncontrolled environment. This "quality ranking" allowed their prototype search engine to produce far more satisfying results than competitors like AltaVista or Excite.

Alignment with Intelligence Needs

The brilliance of PageRank, from an intelligence perspective, was that it solved the IC's most fundamental problem. In a world saturated with information, the IC needed a way to find authoritative signals amidst a global sea of low-quality data, noise, and deliberate disinformation. PageRank was a mathematical method for doing exactly that. It could automatically identify the most important and relevant nodes in a massive, unstructured network of documents without any prior knowledge of their content or veracity.
The direct alignment between the IC's needs and the capabilities of the Google prototype is striking. The following table maps the specific "issues" raised in the 1993 MDDS "Call for Abstracts" to the core functionalities developed by Page and Brin by 1998.

MDDS "Issue" from 1993 "Call for Abstracts"	Corresponding Google/PageRank Capability (1998)
Scalability to terabytes/petabytes	System designed to crawl and index 24 million pages (early prototype), with architecture built to scale to the entire web.
Information retrieval from large text databases	Full-text indexing of web pages and use of PageRank to prioritize the most relevant results for keyword searches.
Data fusion from heterogeneous sources	Use of anchor text (the text of a link) from multiple external pages to describe and rank a target page, effectively fusing external descriptions.
Query optimization	PageRank provides a global quality score, allowing for highly effective ranking of results even for underspecified, one-word queries.
Data mining/discovery of relationships	The PageRank algorithm itself is a data mining technique that discovers the latent authority structure of the entire web graph.
Handling uncontrolled, diverse data	The system was built from the ground up to

MDDS "Issue" from 1993 "Call for Abstracts"	Corresponding Google/PageRank Capability (1998)
	crawl and parse the "uncontrolled hypertext collections" of the public web.

The "random surfer" model that provides the mathematical intuition for PageRank is more than just a search tool; it is a foundational model for understanding influence and relationships within any network. The Intelligence Community's stated interest in finding "birds of a feather"—identifying like-minded groups and nodes of influence by analyzing their digital interactions—was precisely what PageRank enabled. The algorithm models a network where nodes (pages) endorse other nodes through links, and the resulting rank is a measure of a node's influence within that network. This model is abstract and can be applied to any network of nodes and links, whether they are web pages, people, or organizations. The technology developed for web search was, in its essence, a technology for mass-scale social network analysis before the term "social network" was in common use, a capability of immense and direct value to the intelligence community.

Chapter 5: The Watchers and the Watched

The Intelligence Community's involvement in the research that led to Google was not a passive, arms-length funding arrangement. It was an active partnership characterized by direct oversight and regular monitoring, a fact that underscores the strategic importance the IC placed on the project.

Direct Oversight and Monitoring

Dr. Bhavani Thuraisingham, the MITRE program manager who oversaw the MDDS initiative for the Intelligence Community, has provided a firsthand account of this relationship. In an article reflecting on the program, and in comments cited in other reports, she confirms the direct nature of the oversight. Thuraisingham states that she and her colleagues from the MDDS initiative would visit Stanford University approximately every three months to "see Brin and monitor his progress".

These were not mere administrative check-ins. The purpose of the visits was to engage with the research directly, to "check progress, point out potential problems and suggest ideas". Thuraisingham confirms that in these briefings, "Brin did present to us on the query flocks research, and also demonstrated to us versions of the Google search engine". Her recollection places the final demonstration in September 1998—the very same month that Sergey Brin and Larry Page officially incorporated Google, Inc.. This timeline establishes a clear and unbroken chain of IC engagement with the technology from its earliest academic stages right up to the moment of its commercial birth.

The Prescient Warning: "Crypto Relevance?"

The dual-use nature of this technology—its potential for both public good and private surveillance—was not lost on contemporary experts. When Tatu Ylonen, the creator of SSH, forwarded the original MDDS call to the Cypherpunks mailing list in 1995, his appended question, "Crypto relevance?", served as a stark and prescient warning. Ylonen, whose life's work was dedicated to *securing* communications through cryptography, immediately recognized the inherent tension in the MDDS proposal. A system capable of ingesting, indexing, and searching petabytes of the world's digital information is, by its very nature, a system perfectly suited for mass surveillance. The tools required for "information retrieval" are functionally indistinguishable from the tools required for "intelligence gathering." Ylonen's question, posed to a community of privacy advocates, foreshadowed the entire global debate over digital privacy and government surveillance that would erupt nearly two decades later.

The Ethical Context of Early Silicon Valley

Ylonen's foresight stands in contrast to the prevailing ethos at Stanford and in the nascent Silicon Valley of the mid-1990s. The primary focus was on solving immense and exciting technical challenges, with the stated goal of "organizing the world's information". While figures like Terry Winograd, an advisor to Page and Brin, had a long history of engagement with the ethics of technology and had founded Computer Professionals for Social Responsibility in part to question military funding of academic research, the specific surveillance implications of the Google project were not a major part of the public discourse at the time. The drive was overwhelmingly technical and entrepreneurial. The ethical questions raised by Ylonen's simple comment would remain largely unanswered until the technology had become deeply embedded in the fabric of global society.

The structure of the MDDS program itself can be viewed as a form of open-source intelligence (OSINT) gathering. The IC's fundamental mission is to collect and analyze information to gain a strategic advantage. By posing a public challenge through the "Call for Abstracts," the IC prompted the brightest minds in the country to reveal their best ideas and approaches to solving the IC's most pressing data problems. The subsequent process of reviewing proposals, attending the workshop, and monitoring the progress of grantees like Brin was, in effect, a highly efficient intelligence operation. It allowed the IC to survey the state-of-the-art in data science and identify the most promising researchers and technologies for future investment. This method leveraged the entire academic ecosystem as an external R&D department, enabling the IC to "own the landscape" of emerging data science far more effectively than if it had attempted to develop these capabilities in secret.

Conclusion: The Harvest

The evidence, drawn from academic papers, declassified directives, and firsthand accounts, traces a clear and direct line from a strategic decision made within the U.S. Intelligence Community in the early 1990s to the creation of the company that would define the digital 21st century. The narrative is not one of coincidence or conspiracy, but of a deliberate and remarkably successful public-private partnership that has been largely omitted from the official history of Silicon Valley.

The chain of evidence is unambiguous. In the wake of the Cold War, the U.S. Intelligence Community identified a new strategic threat: an overwhelming "data deluge" that rendered traditional intelligence methods obsolete. Through the DCI's Community Management Staff and its technical partner, the MITRE Corporation, it launched the Massive Digital Data Systems (MDDS) initiative—a program designed to guide academic and industry research toward building the tools necessary to manage and analyze petabyte-scale datasets. The 1993 "Call for Abstracts" for the MDDS workshop was a public blueprint, a wish list of technical capabilities that perfectly described a future Google.

This initiative then provided direct, acknowledged "seed-funding" to key researchers at Stanford University, most notably Sergey Brin. This targeted IC funding operated symbiotically with the larger, publicly funded Stanford Digital Library Project, allowing the IC to nurture its specific interests within a resource-rich academic environment. The IC's engagement was not passive; program managers met with Brin every few months to monitor his progress and offer guidance, receiving demonstrations of the prototype Google search engine up to the very month of the company's incorporation.

The resulting technology, built around the revolutionary PageRank algorithm, was not a tangential or accidental outcome. It was a direct and precise fulfillment of the capabilities outlined in the original MDDS blueprint. The technology designed to "organize the world's information" was, by its very nature, the perfect tool for an intelligence community that now defined its mission as achieving information dominance.

The "seeds of surveillance" planted by the MDDS initiative grew into the technological backbone of the 21st-century information economy. This foundational collaboration created a paradigm of public-private partnership that has profoundly shaped the modern world, blurring the lines between commercial data collection and government intelligence gathering. It set the stage for the global surveillance apparatus that would become central to national security policy after the attacks of September 11, 2001, and whose full extent would later be revealed to a shocked public. Understanding this hidden history—the fact that the tools of our digital lives were born from the strategic vision of the intelligence community—is essential to navigating the complex ethical and political challenges of the age of Big Data.

Works cited

1. Tatu Ylönen - USENIX, https://www.usenix.org/conference/lisa13/speaker-or-organizer/tatu-yl%C3%B6nen-ssh-communications-security 2. SSH History - Part 1, https://www.ssh.com/about/history/ 3. Career Profile: SSH Founder Tatu Ylonen - EE Times, https://www.eetimes.com/career-profile-ssh-founder-tatu-ylonen/ 4. The Intelligence Community - UNT Libraries, https://govinfo.library.unt.edu/npr/library/reports/intelexe.html 5. DIA in the 1990s: A Decade of Organizational Decline - Defense Intelligence Agency, https://www.dia.mil/News-Features/Articles/Article-View/Article/3046725/dia-in-the-1990s-a-decade-of-organizational-decline/ 6. Paradigm Shift: U.S. Strategic Intelligence in the 1990's - DTIC, https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/tr/pdf/ADA263584.pdf 7. Declassified in Part - Sanitized Copy Approved for Release 2012/04/02 : CIA-RDP93M00781R000700880001-9, https://www.cia.gov/readingroom/docs/CIA-RDP93M00781R000700880001-9.pdf 8. N95-24115, https://ntrs.nasa.gov/api/citations/19950017695/downloads/19950017695.pdf 9. 1990s progress at work. 1 GB HDDs from 1990, 1993, 1996, and 1997 : r/retrobattlestations, https://www.reddit.com/r/retrobattlestations/comments/jq04vk/1990s_progress_at_work_1_gb_hdds_from_1990_1993/ 10. Hard Drive Cost Per Gigabyte - Backblaze, https://www.backblaze.com/blog/hard-drive-cost-per-gigabyte/ 11. Director of Central Intelligence Directive 3/3, https://irp.fas.org/offdocs/dcid3-3.htm 12. Our Story | MITRE, https://www.mitre.org/who-we-are/our-story 13. Mitre Corporation - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mitre_Corporation 14. Google's true origin partly lies in CIA and NSA research grants for mass surveillance, https://qz.com/1145669/googles-true-origin-partly-lies-in-cia-and-nsa-research-grants-for-mass-surveillance 15. Surveillance and the Critical Digital Humanities - Online Academic Community, https://onlineacademiccommunity.uvic.ca/dhsi/wp-content/uploads/sites/7317/2023/07/W26_Co

ursepack-DHSI-2023-Surveillance.pdf 16. History of Google - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/History_of_Google 17. Stanford Digital Library Project - Wikipedia, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stanford_Digital_Library_Project 18. The Stanford University Digital Libraries Project | Emerald Insight, https://www.emerald.com/insight/content/doi/10.1108/err.1998.2.9.112.105/full/html 19. Investments in Basic Research Today… ...generate the knowledge and talent that will fuel our future., https://www.aau.edu/sites/default/files/%40%20Files/Research%20and%20Scholarship/Why%20University%20Research%20Matters/Infographics/BasicResearch--Google.pdf 20. The anatomy of a large-scale hypertextual Web ... - SNAP: Stanford, https://snap.stanford.edu/class/cs224w-readings/Brin98Anatomy.pdf 21. Hector Garcia-Molina, influential database expert, dies at 65 | Stanford Report, https://news.stanford.edu/stories/2019/12/hector-garcia-molina-influential-computer-scientist-database-expert-dies-65 22. On the Origins of Google | NSF - National Science Foundation, https://www.nsf.gov/news/origins-google 23. Google: The Unrecognized Connection to the Intelligence Community - Chegan SRM, https://www.chegansrm.com/post/google-the-unrecognized-connection-to-the-intelligence-community 24. What can you do with a Web in your Pocket? - cs.Princeton, https://www.cs.princeton.edu/courses/archive/fall02/cs597A/papers/brin98what.pdf 25. Bulletin of the Technical Committee on June 1998 Vol. 21 No. 2 IEEE Computer Society Letters Special Issue on Databases and the, http://sites.computer.org/debull/98june/98JUN-CD.pdf 26. Google's true origin partly lies in CIA and NSA research grants for mass surveillance : r/privacy - Reddit, https://www.reddit.com/r/privacy/comments/hdluce/googles_true_origin_partly_lies_in_cia_and_nsa/ 27. Milestones:PageRank and the Birth of Google, 1996-1998, https://ethw.org/Milestones:PageRank_and_the_Birth_of_Google,_1996-1998 28. The Academic Paper That Started Google - Cornell blogs, https://blogs.cornell.edu/info2040/2019/10/28/the-academic-paper-that-started-google/ 29. What Is Google PageRank? | Page One Power, https://www.pageonepower.com/search-glossary/google-pagerank 30. Intelligence Community | Encyclopedia.com, https://www.encyclopedia.com/politics/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/intelligence-community 31. CS + Ethics - The Stanford Daily, https://stanforddaily.com/2018/05/06/cs-ethics/ 32. Guide to the Terry Allen Winograd Papers SC1165 - Online Archive of California, https://oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/c89k4cp6/entire_text/ 33. MANAGING AND MINING MULTIMEDIA DATABASES | International, https://www.worldscientific.com/doi/abs/10.1142/S0218213004001776 34. Correction to my article posted on March 25, 2013, https://personal.utdallas.edu/~bxt043000/motivational_art_pdf/14.%20Big_Data-Have_we_seen_it_before.pdf