

Appendix 2

Response to Google Submission Gerard Hosier

Google may have started with noble ideals such as “do no evil” but as it has matured and become an incredible power that has lost its way.

1. Is a motherhood statement saying yes we comply with the law.
2. Covers the safety of children. Almost every line item in this list is a result of the threat of, or actual legal requirements.

Without legal and public pressure our children would still be in the out at the mercy of the Google wilds.

3. A lot of effort is put in here into the wallpaper of well being. Please remember that the core interest of media publishers is engagement, engagement, engagement which translates into addiction, addiction, addiction. If publishers were so committed to users addiction health why does YT not turn off Autoplay by default for all users, instead of only under 18's as it is highly successful in engaging or addicting users.
4. In Google's partnerships to promote online safety, the list of bodies appear to be industry trade companies some that appear to cooperate to avoid government pushback and save their apparent related interests from hard legislation. Some may be noble. In not one of the descriptions of outcomes of each operation did the organisations focus on the privacy interests of a single individual human, not one. None appear to be classic cartels.
5. Search. <https://www.google.com/search/howsearchworks/how-search-works/ranking-results/>
The description linked above shows how search results are designed to keep the user in an information bubble.
6. Google talks about transparency in their submission. However if one were to examine their version of transparency it is keyhole transparency that just is used as a tool for their propaganda or PR required to make their case against whatever their required agenda is at the time.

A good example of how contemptuous Google is of their user is in the simple requirement of cookie opt out, almost every web service/site allows opt-out with just one or two clicks. However Google tries to maximise the friction to opt out by requiring the user to click twice than scroll, click again, scroll and then finally click for a forth time. This behaviour is the perfect metaphor of Google.

Omitted in this PR response is Ai ethics, long term user identity storage, managing monopolist like behaviour, data destruction once primary purpose is finished, responsibility as a publisher, Deep Data mining of child and adult data, what is done with this knowledge, performing psychoanalytical research on people without their knowledge or consent, collecting data, illegally, collecting data without consent, collecting data deceptively and keeping it. The potential of in house data abuse. The risk of a data breach.