

Exhibit 18

From: [REDACTED]
To: [REDACTED]
Subject: [Industryinfo] Digest for [REDACTED] - 20 updates in 7 topics
Sent: Tue, 14 Aug 2018 07:28:18 +0000

Google Groups

Topic digest

[View all topics](#)

- AP Exclusive: Google tracks your movements, like it or not - 3 Updates
- Caesars Palace not-so-Praetorian guards intimidate DEF CON goers, seize soldering irons - 1 Update
- That New Android Update Broke a Key Perk of the Pixel XL - 3 Updates
- Musk Mulls Taking Tesla Private, Valuing Company at \$82 Billion - 6 Updates
- "Google plans censored search engine for China" - The Intercept - 3 Updates
- [NY Times Op-Ed] A Better Way to Ban Alex Jones - 3 Updates
- Axios: "How tech fuels authoritarians" - 1 Update

AP Exclusive: Google tracks your movements, like it or not

[REDACTED] Aug 13 04:06PM +0200

IIRC we've had reports like this in the past on this list but I don't remember major outlets like AP reporting this.

<https://apnews.com/828aefab64d4411bac257a07c1af0ecb>

SAN FRANCISCO (AP) — Google wants to know where you go so badly that it records your movements even when you explicitly tell it not to.

An Associated Press investigation found that many Google services on Android devices and iPhones store your location data even if you've used privacy settings that say they will prevent it from doing so.

Computer-science researchers at Princeton confirmed these findings at the AP's request.

For the most part, Google is upfront about asking permission to use your location information. An app like Google Maps will remind you to allow access to location if you use it for navigating. If you agree to let it record your location over time, Google Maps will display that history for you in a "timeline" that maps out your daily movements.

Storing your minute-by-minute travels carries privacy risks and has been used by police to determine the location of suspects — such as a warrant that police in Raleigh, North Carolina, served on Google last year to find

EXHIBIT NO. 18
P. Frederickson, CSR, CCR

devices near a murder scene. So the company will let you "pause" a setting called Location History.

Google says that will prevent the company from remembering where you've been. Google's support page on the subject states: "You can turn off Location History at any time. With Location History off, the places you go are no longer stored."

That isn't true. Even with Location History paused, some Google apps automatically store time-stamped location data without asking.

For example, Google stores a snapshot of where you are when you merely open its Maps app. Automatic daily weather updates on Android phones pinpoint roughly where you are. And some searches that have nothing to do with location, like "chocolate chip cookies," or "kids science kits," pinpoint your precise latitude and longitude — accurate to the square foot — and save it to your Google account.

The privacy issue affects some two billion users of devices that run Google's Android operating software and hundreds of millions of worldwide iPhone users who rely on Google for maps or search.

Storing location data in violation of a user's preferences is wrong, said Jonathan Mayer, a Princeton computer scientist and former chief technologist for the Federal Communications Commission's enforcement bureau. A researcher from Mayer's lab confirmed the AP's findings on multiple Android devices; the AP conducted its own tests on several iPhones that found the same behavior.

"If you're going to allow users to turn off something called 'Location History,' then all the places where you maintain location history should be turned off," Mayer said. "That seems like a pretty straightforward position to have."

Google says it is being perfectly clear.

"There are a number of different ways that Google may use location to improve people's experience, including: Location History, Web and App Activity, and through device-level Location Services," a Google spokesperson said in a statement to the AP. "We provide clear descriptions of these tools, and robust controls so people can turn them on or off, and delete their histories at any time."

To stop Google from saving these location markers, the company says, users can turn off another setting, one that does not specifically reference location information. Called "Web and App Activity" and enabled by default,

that setting stores a variety of information from Google apps and websites to your Google account.

When paused, it will prevent activity on any device from being saved to your account. But leaving "Web & App Activity" on and turning "Location History" off only prevents Google from adding your movements to the "timeline," its visualization of your daily travels. It does not stop Google's collection of other location markers.

You can delete these location markers by hand, but it's a painstaking process since you have to select them individually, unless you want to delete all of your stored activity.

You can see the stored location markers on a page in your Google account at myactivity.google.com, although they're typically scattered under several different headers, many of which are unrelated to location.

To demonstrate how powerful these other markers can be, the AP created a visual map of the movements of Princeton postdoctoral researcher Gunes Acar, who carried an Android phone with Location history off, and shared a record of his Google account.

The map includes Acar's train commute on two trips to New York and visits to The High Line park, Chelsea Market, Hell's Kitchen, Central Park and Harlem. To protect his privacy, The AP didn't plot the most telling and frequent marker — his home address.

Huge tech companies are under increasing scrutiny over their data practices, following a series of privacy scandals at Facebook and new data-privacy rules recently adopted by the European Union. Last year, the business news site Quartz found that Google was tracking Android users by collecting the addresses of nearby cellphone towers even if all location services were off. Google changed the practice and insisted it never recorded the data anyway.

Critics say Google's insistence on tracking its users' locations stems from its drive to boost advertising revenue.

"They build advertising information out of data," said Peter Lenz, the senior geospatial analyst at Dstillery, a rival advertising technology company. "More data for them presumably means more profit."

The AP learned of the issue from K. Shankari, a graduate researcher at UC Berkeley who studies the commuting patterns of volunteers in order to help urban planners. She noticed that her Android phone prompted her to rate a shopping trip to Kohl's, even though she had turned Location History off.

"So how did Google Maps know where I was?" she asked in a blog post .

The AP wasn't able to recreate Shankari's experience exactly. But its attempts to do so revealed Google's tracking. The findings disturbed her.

"I am not opposed to background location tracking in principle," she said. "It just really bothers me that it is not explicitly stated."

Google offers a more accurate description of how Location History actually works in a place you'd only see if you turn it off — a popup that appears when you "pause" Location History on your Google account webpage . There the company notes that "some location data may be saved as part of your activity on other Google services, like Search and Maps."

Google offers additional information in a popup that appears if you re-activate the "Web & App Activity" setting — an uncommon action for many users, since this setting is on by default. That popup states that, when active, the setting "saves the things you do on Google sites, apps, and services ... and associated information, like location."

Warnings when you're about to turn Location History off via Android and iPhone device settings are more difficult to interpret. On Android, the popup explains that "places you go with your devices will stop being added to your Location History map." On the iPhone, it simply reads, "None of your Google apps will be able to store location data in Location History."

The iPhone text is technically true if potentially misleading. With Location History off, Google Maps and other apps store your whereabouts in a section of your account called "My Activity," not "Location History."

Since 2014, Google has let advertisers track the effectiveness of online ads at driving foot traffic , a feature that Google has said relies on user location histories.

The company is pushing further into such location-aware tracking to drive ad revenue, which rose 20 percent last year to \$95.4 billion. At a Google Marketing Live summit in July, Google executives unveiled a new tool called "local campaigns" that dynamically uses ads to boost in-person store visits. It says it can measure how well a campaign drove foot traffic with data pulled from Google users' location histories.

Google also says location records stored in My Activity are used to target ads. Ad buyers can target ads to specific locations — say, a mile radius around a particular landmark — and typically have to pay more to reach this narrower audience.

While disabling "Web & App Activity" will stop Google from storing location markers, it also prevents Google from storing information generated by searches and other activity. That can limit the effectiveness of the Google Assistant, the company's digital concierge.

Sean O'Brien, a Yale Privacy Lab researcher with whom the AP shared its findings, said it is "disingenuous" for Google to continuously record these locations even when users disable Location History. "To me, it's something people should know," he said.

[REDACTED] Aug 13 06:51PM -0700

I agree with the article. Location off should mean location off; not except for this case or that case.

The current UI *feels* like it is designed to make things possible, yet difficult enough that people won't figure it out. New exceptions, defaulted to on, silently appearing in settings menus you may never see is <redacted>.

The general concept of what I'd like to see on the location settings :

Location: On/Off (Off disables everything; On enables the ones selected items)

Enable GPS location (on/off)

Enable Bluetooth location (on/off)

Enable Bluetooth to report, even when Bluetooth is off (on/off)

Enable Web/App Activity (on/off)

Enable ... (on/off)

We already have this menu/style for non-Google apps.

This way the user can see and set, in ONE place all of the items related to location. If users find it useful for all of the bluetooth settings to be together, then have the "enable bluetooth to report location when bluetooth is off" in both menus.

Btw. Thank you whomever added the option for bluetooth to not respond to queries when bluetooth is off. (It used to respond, thereby giving location information away, even when location and bluetooth were off.)

On Mon, Aug 13, 2018 at 7:06 AM, [REDACTED]

wrote:

Aug 14 12:03AM -0700

It is a bit complicated, and we might need better messaging.

There is a general location tracking for figuring out your home, work locations, and routines (you go to a cafe at the same time every week, then you might get a notification for that etc). This seems to run in the background all time.

But there is also a location information passed on with individual requests, like when you search for "Walmart", or ask for weather forecast. Each app, search, news, home, etc seem to have a separate setting.

There is a valid use case. I might want to keep getting local results, while disabling always on location tracking. Or disable location in weather but keep it in news, etc.

On Monday, August 13, 2018 at 6:52:57 PM UTC-7, wrote:

[Back to top](#)

Caesars Palace not-so-Praetorian guards intimidate DEF CON goers, seize soldering irons

Aug 13 04:30PM -0700

<https://arstechnica.com/tech-policy/2018/08/security-theater-meets-def-con-as-room-searches-spark-controversy/>

Caesars Palace not-so-Praetorian guards intimidate DEF CON goers, seize soldering irons Hotel policies drafted after last October's mass shooting arrive just in time for DEF CON.

Sean Gallagher <<https://arstechnica.com/author/sean-gallagher/>> - 8/13/2018, 3:40 PM

In the wake of the mass shooting in Las Vegas in October of 2017, hotels in the city started drafting more aggressive policies regarding security. Just as Caesars Entertainment was rolling out its new security policies, the company ran head on into DEF CON—an event with privacy tightly linked to its culture.

The resulting clash of worlds—especially at Caesars Palace, the hotel where much of DEF CON was held—left some attendees feeling violated, harassed, or abused, and that exploded onto Twitter this past weekend.

Caesars began rolling out a new security policy in February <https://www.playusa.com/caesars-do-not-disturb/> that mandated room searches when staff had not had access to rooms for over 24 hours. Caesars has been mostly tolerant of the idiosyncratic behavior of the DEF CON community, but it's not clear that the company prepared security staff for dealing with the sorts of things they would find in the rooms of DEF CON attendees. Soldering irons and other gear were seized, and some attendees reported being intimidated by security staff.

https://twitter.com/really_awolf

Andrew Wolf @really_awolf

https://twitter.com/really_awolf

https://twitter.com/really_awolf/status/1028062678881693697

WARNING HACKERS

Caesars staff are performing "random" security checks of rooms. If you opt out of room cleaning and used defcon discount they will check your room and WILL confiscate soldering irons + more!

Not a drill! Spread the word!#defcon

<https://twitter.com/hashtag/defcon?src=hash> #badgelif

<https://twitter.com/hashtag/badgelif?src=hash> #dc26

<https://twitter.com/hashtag/dc26?src=hash> #DEFCON26

<https://twitter.com/hashtag/DEFCON26?src=hash>

4:36 PM - Aug 10, 2018

https://twitter.com/really_awolf/status/1028062678881693697

And since the searches came without any warning other than a knock, they led, in some cases, to frightening encounters for attendees who were in those rooms. Katie Moussouris—a bug bounty and vulnerability disclosure program pioneer at Microsoft, an advocate for security researchers, and now the founder and CEO of Luta Security—was confronted by two male members of hotel security as she returned to her room. When she went into the room to call the desk to verify who they were, they banged on the door and screamed at her to immediately open it.

<https://twitter.com/k8em0>

Katie Moussouris *√* @k8em0

<https://twitter.com/k8em0>

<https://twitter.com/k8em0/status/1028375035285630976>

Current status: two members of hotel security banging on my door after I asked to go into my room and verify them with hotel security. I'm on speaker phone with hotel security, asking for a supervisor to come verify.

I'm terrified. What the hell is this @CaesarsPalace
<<https://twitter.com/CaesarsPalace>> #DEFCON
<<https://twitter.com/hashtag/DEFCON?src=hash>>
1:18 PM - Aug 11, 2018
<<https://twitter.com/k8em0/status/1028375035285630976>>

In another case, a hotel employee—likely hotel security—entered the room of a woman attending DEF CON without knocking:
<<https://twitter.com/maddiestone>>
Maddie Stone @maddiestone
<<https://twitter.com/maddiestone>>
<<https://twitter.com/maddiestone/status/1028498769732460544>>

This evening, a man in a light blue collared shirt with a walkie talkie, entered my room with a key without knocking while I was getting dressed. He left when I started screaming. @CaesarsPalace
<<https://twitter.com/CaesarsPalace>> is investigating whether it was a hotel employee. @defcon <<https://twitter.com/defcon>> has also been alerted.
9:29 PM - Aug 11, 2018
<<https://twitter.com/maddiestone/status/1028498769732460544>>

Beau Woods, cyber policy activist and co-founder of I Am The Cavalry, hacked the "Do Not Disturb" sign in an attempt to stave off searches:
<<https://twitter.com/beauwoods>>
<<https://twitter.com/beauwoods>>
<<https://twitter.com/beauwoods>> <<https://twitter.com/beauwoods>>
<<https://twitter.com/beauwoods>> View image on Twitter
<https://twitter.com/beauwoods/status/1028387331927986176/photo/1?ref_src=twrc%5Etfw%7Ctwcamp%5Etweetembed%7Ctwterm%5E1028387331927986176&ref_url=https%3A%2F%2Farstechnica.com%2Ftech-policy%2F2018%2F08%2Fsecurity-theater-meets-def-con-as-room-searches-spark-controversy%2F>
Beau Woods @beauwoods
<<https://twitter.com/beauwoods>>
<<https://twitter.com/beauwoods/status/1028387331927986176>>

For those trying to figure out how to avoid the hotel room (in)security checks, I've used this setup and so far no intrusions in two days.
2:07 PM - Aug 11, 2018
<<https://twitter.com/beauwoods/status/1028387331927986176>>

Ars attempted to reach Caesars for comment but received no response. After Ars reached out to DEFCON, the organizers posted this statement:

We understand that attendees want a statement from DEF CON about the Caesars room search policy. We are actively engaged with the hotel, seeking

answers and a clear policy document we can share with you. Please know that we hear your concerns and we've shared them with Caesars. We expect a venue where our attendees are secure in their persons and effects and a security policy that is codified, predictable, and verifiable. Thank you for your patience while we work this out.

There is a long history of legal precedent

<https://scholarship.shu.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1048&context=circuit_review>

surrounding the expectation of privacy in hotel rooms—overnight hotel guests are recognized to have an expectation of privacy under the Fourth Amendment. But things become murkier when the search is conducted by the property owner. Still, Moussouris' concern was for her physical safety more than her privacy; despite the new security policies, Caesars doesn't control access to its elevators by room key, and there is largely uncontrolled public access to the hotel's towers.

<<https://twitter.com/k8em0>>

Katie Moussouris *✓* @k8em0

<<https://twitter.com/k8em0>>

<<https://twitter.com/k8em0/status/1029059581136105472>>

Last view of the crime scene that was my invaded hotel room and violated space, courtesy of @CaesarsPalace <<https://twitter.com/CaesarsPalace>> who still have not told me anything, offered me anything (except to move my room - like that really would prevent their security team screaming at me again). My last #DEFCON <<https://twitter.com/hashtag/DEFCON?src=hash>> 10:38 AM - Aug 13, 2018

<<https://twitter.com/k8em0/status/1029059581136105472>>

DEF CON won't be at Caesar's Palace next year—but not because of these incidents. The conference has a multi-year contract with Caesars Entertainment to host DEF CON, and Caesars' convention center will be undergoing renovations in 2019. Moussouris said this was her last DEF CON.

[Back to top](#)

That New Android Update Broke a Key Perk of the Pixel XL

Aug 13 11:02AM -0700

<https://gizmodo.com/that-new-android-update-broke-a-key-perk-of-the-pixel-x-1828300671>

>From the article:

>The problem is that even for Pixel XL owners using the Google-made charging brick and cable that comes included with the device, no matter what you do, the phone won't recharge at full fast-charging speeds

>To make matters worse, the original bug report on Google's Issue Tracker <<https://issuetracker.google.com/issues/111907705>> was closed after being updated with the tag **"Status: Won't Fix (Infeasible)."**

[REDACTED] Aug 13 10:58PM +0200

I've noticed that on my Pixel XL - fast charging stopped working when I upgraded to P - there seems to non-closed be two bugs at least [REDACTED] and [REDACTED]. [Not sure why one of the assignees seems to work on Blogger, though.]

[REDACTED] Google Hamburg

[REDACTED] Aug 13 03:26PM -0700

It's because the person who originally reported the bug works on Blogger, and the bug was assigned back to him requesting more information.

[Back to top](#)

Musk Mulls Taking Tesla Private, Valuing Company at \$82 Billion

[REDACTED] Aug 13 02:19PM -0700

And now we know who the mystery investor is.

[REDACTED]
<https://www.tesla.com/blog/update-taking-tesla-private>
Update on Taking Tesla Private
Elon Musk August 13, 2018

As I announced <<https://www.tesla.com/blog/taking-tesla-private>> last

Tuesday, I'm considering taking Tesla private because I believe it could be good for our shareholders, enable Tesla to operate at its best, and advance our mission of accelerating the transition to sustainable energy. As I continue to consider this, I want to answer some of the questions that have been asked since last Tuesday.

What has happened so far?

On August 2nd, I notified the Tesla board that, in my personal capacity, I wanted to take Tesla private at \$420 per share. This was a 20% premium over the ~\$350 then current share price (which already reflected a ~16% increase in the price since just prior to announcing Q2 earnings on August 1st). My proposal was based on using a structure where any existing shareholder who wished to remain as a shareholder in a private Tesla could do so, with the \$420 per share buyout used only for shareholders that preferred that option.

After an initial meeting of the board's outside directors to discuss my proposal (I did not participate, nor did Kimbal), a full board meeting was held. During that meeting, I told the board about the funding discussions that had taken place (more on that below) and I explained why this could be in Tesla's long-term interest.

At the end of that meeting, it was agreed that as a next step, I would reach out to some of Tesla's largest shareholders. Our largest investors have been extremely supportive of Tesla over the years, and understanding whether they had the ability and desire to remain as shareholders in a private Tesla is of critical importance to me. They are the ones who believed in Tesla when no one else did and they are the ones who most believe in our future. I told the board that I would report back after I had these discussions.

Why did I make a public announcement?

The only way I could have meaningful discussions with our largest shareholders was to be completely forthcoming with them about my desire to take the company private. However, it wouldn't be right to share information about going private with just our largest investors without sharing the same information with all investors at the same time. As a result, it was clear to me that the right thing to do was announce my intentions publicly. To be clear, when I made the public announcement, just as with this blog post and all other discussions I have had on this topic, I am speaking for myself as a potential bidder for Tesla.

Why did I say "funding secured"?

Going back almost two years, the Saudi Arabian sovereign wealth fund has approached me multiple times about taking Tesla private. They first met with me at the beginning of 2017 to express this interest because of the important need to diversify away from oil. They then held several

additional meetings with me over the next year to reiterate this interest and to try to move forward with a going private transaction. Obviously, the Saudi sovereign fund has more than enough capital needed to execute on such a transaction.

Recently, after the Saudi fund bought almost 5% of Tesla stock through the public markets, they reached out to ask for another meeting. That meeting took place on July 31st. During the meeting, the Managing Director of the fund expressed regret that I had not moved forward previously on a going private transaction with them, and he strongly expressed his support for funding a going private transaction for Tesla at this time. I understood from him that no other decision makers were needed and that they were eager to proceed.

I left the July 31st meeting with no question that a deal with the Saudi sovereign fund could be closed, and that it was just a matter of getting the process moving. This is why I referred to "funding secured" in the August 7th announcement.

Following the August 7th announcement, I have continued to communicate with the Managing Director of the Saudi fund. He has expressed support for proceeding subject to financial and other due diligence and their internal review process for obtaining approvals. He has also asked for additional details on how the company would be taken private, including any required percentages and any regulatory requirements.

Another critical point to emphasize is that before anyone is asked to decide on going private, full details of the plan will be provided, including the proposed nature and source of the funding to be used. However, it would be premature to do so now. I continue to have discussions with the Saudi fund, and I also am having discussions with a number of other investors, which is something that I always planned to do since I would like for Tesla to continue to have a broad investor base. It is appropriate to complete those discussions before presenting a detailed proposal to an independent board committee.

It is also worth clarifying that most of the capital required for going private would be funded by equity rather than debt, meaning that this would not be like a standard leveraged buyout structure commonly used when companies are taken private. I do not think it would be wise to burden Tesla with significantly increased debt.

Therefore, reports that more than \$70B would be needed to take Tesla private dramatically overstate the actual capital raise needed. The \$420 buyout price would only be used for Tesla shareholders who do not remain with our company if it is private. My best estimate right now is that

approximately two-thirds of shares owned by all current investors would roll over into a private Tesla.

What are the next steps?

As mentioned earlier, I made the announcement last Tuesday because I felt it was the right and fair thing to do so that all investors had the same information at the same time. I will now continue to talk with investors, and I have engaged advisors to investigate a range of potential structures and options. Among other things, this will allow me to obtain a more precise understanding of how many of Tesla's existing public shareholders would remain shareholders if we became private.

If and when a final proposal is presented, an appropriate evaluation process will be undertaken by a special committee of Tesla's board, which I understand is already in the process of being set up, together with the legal counsel it has selected. If the board process results in an approved plan, any required regulatory approvals will need to be obtained and the plan will be presented to Tesla shareholders for a vote.

[REDACTED] Aug 13 02:29PM -0700

"I understood from him that no other decision makers were needed and that they were eager to proceed."

Trump would likely object to this.

[REDACTED] Aug 13 02:39PM -0700

On 08/13/2018 02:29 PM [REDACTED] wrote:

> "I understood from him that no other decision makers were needed and that they were eager to proceed."

> Trump would likely object to this.

Trump has been chatting with them and paid them a visit last year, coupled with an announcement to invest money in the US. The Saudi sovereign fund has around \$700 billion invested in a number of places, including American companies such as GE and Lockheed Martin.

[REDACTED] Aug 13 02:43PM -0700

On 08/13/2018 02:39 PM, [REDACTED] wrote:
>> "I understood from him that no other decision makers were needed and that they were eager to proceed."

>> Trump would likely object to this.

> Trump has been chatting with them and paid them a visit last year, coupled with an announcement to invest money in the US. The Saudi sovereign fund has around \$700 billion invested in a number of places, including American companies such as GE and Lockheed Martin.

Editing made my first sentence above ambiguous. "them" = Saudis

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Aug 13 03:07PM -0700

Politics aside, execs usually avoid making not completely correct statements on Twitter which has the potential to cause stock fluctuations to avoid SEC investigations.

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] Aug 13 03:18PM -0700

On 08/13/2018 03:07 PM [REDACTED] wrote:
> Politics aside, execs usually avoid making not completely correct statements on Twitter which has the potential to cause stock fluctuations to avoid SEC investigations.

There's something about Twitter. Hardly a week goes by without a media news cycle about someone getting themselves into major trouble by tweeting.

[REDACTED]

[Back to top](#)
"Google plans censored search engine for China" - The Intercept

[REDACTED] Aug 13 11:35PM +1000

> calculated, it's always wrong for a doctor to intentionally kill one of his
> patients. It's terrible that five patients would then die, but there was
> never anything the doctor could morally do to save them.

If you are talking about a specific case, my take is that the doctor cannot kill one to save five. This is because you cannot compare utility between specific persons. The utility for specific person will be very different depends on whose point of view you take. So in this case, the doctor cannot take action based on their own utility calculation.

When you are trying to setup a law, you base your analysis on "statistic life" and now you can calculate utility. For example, in hospital, there is a triage process that to treat the most severe patients first even they arrive later. This is because this process saves more lives than first come first serve, and therefore increases overall utility from more surviving "statistic life".

Take your doctor example, should we setup a law that if we can kill one person to save five persons, we should do it? If you calculate utility and you will see an increased utility of four statistic lives. However, the problem is that this law creates a bad incentive. Now no one cares about their health, and more and more people get killed. Although we see increased utility from one transaction, it reduces utility over the long run. This is why we don't see a law like this.

I will give you another example. Is it alright to rob a rich person and give the money to five poor persons? No, because you cannot compare utility between specific persons. Should we have a law that take money from the rich and give it to the poor? Yes, this increases overall utility for "statistic life", and it's called taxation. Should we take all money from all people and divide it evenly among all people to maximize utility? No, because this creates a bad incentive that reduces utility over the long run.

> make the world as great a place as we can. To go any further is to
> sacrifice our humanity itself for "the greater good," and choose to become
> an oppressor to fight oppression.

I will give you some examples that demonstrate violation towards human rights in order to exchange for some better utility.

U.S. has a road fatality rate at about 0.01%, that's about 30,000 lives a year. Let's say if we limit all traffic speed to 5 mph, we can greatly reduce the fatality rate to 0. That means the current traffic law takes away 0.01% people's life right. Based on your logic, we shouldn't violate

that 0.01% life right to allow driving at current speed limit. But in reality, the law traded small amount of our life right to economic efficiency.

Second example is that if we increase the thickness of the steel used in cars, we can create a stronger car to protect the passenger, and as a result, reduce fatality rate. Should the government set a law to say car steel needs to be at least 10mm thick? Or should it be 100mm thick? Should we all drive a tank? The standard for the thickness of car steel would only be a good trade-off point for utility.

> an action would Google need to perform, before it could no longer be
> justified by an appeal to "the greater good". Is there any such limit? If
> so, what is it?

There is a limit, when we cause more harm than the value we deliver. I will give you a more detailed analysis later, it's too late today.

[REDACTED] Aug 13 07:55PM +0100

Committing a crime to achieve an overriding aim (killing a patient to treat others), vs not killing a patient to forgo the same aim, sounds like a psychopath test rather than an ethical dilemma which will commonly split opinion.

Triage is part of an assessment (and sometimes basic treatment) process, so doesn't quite operate as you described. It is to aid efficient allocation of available resources, rather than than a system for ordering treatment of patients based on severity of injury. The most serious life threatening cases might not be top of the list if chance of survival or quality of outcome is low regardless of treatment. Medical staff sometimes have to make tough decisions around time and resources, and devoting available resources to sustaining a very low quality of life for one individual, may not be seen to be in the interests of that patient, nor in the interests of the other waiting patients. Providing good quality of life for the majority of patients might be seen as an overriding aim.

Speed/risk is a tradeoff around an overriding aim to get all the people from A to B during the required period. The mm of steel/risk overriding aim is to provide enough cars at a suitable price point for demand. In china there is a censorship/freedom of speech trade off, but the overriding aim might be defined in different ways. Someone might see it as a) to provide

search service in china, or b) to maintain policy consistent with that we declare elsewhere, (or something else) depending on their perspective.

Aug 13 12:24PM -0700

> their health, and more and more people get killed. Although we see
> increased utility from one transaction, it reduces utility over the long
> run. This is why we don't see a law like this.

A few folks in this thread have made similar utilitarian arguments against censorship. Societal instability in the short run (even over the course of a decades) might result in greater freedom and QoL in the long run. But, I'm not really a consequentialist, so I'll leave debating the specifics of this to those who are. :)

I will give you another example. Is it alright to rob a rich person and
> "statistic life", and it's called taxation. Should we take all money from
> all people and divide it evenly among all people to maximize utility? No,
> because this creates a bad incentive that reduces utility over the long run.

Taxation is a hotly contested issue in the US, mostly due to deontological issues. Some of my colleagues hold fast to the view that taxation is *always* immoral, as is any use of force by the state. This is intrinsic to a political position called "anarcho-capitalism," which holds that states are intrinsically immoral institutions. Left-leaning anarchism is similar, but extending this to consider using force to protect "private property" also immoral. I have some degree of sympathy for these views, but I don't exactly hold them.

It's also possible to view taxation as a way of preventing individuals from individually violating the human rights of others. For example, say a business pollutes a lake. The lake is public property, and all nearby businesses benefit from it. The one business has harmed the others, by polluting the lake, and as a result, the government might exact a tax in the form of a fine. This tax could go to providing restitution to the other businesses, and to pay for cleanup of the lake.

Some human rights may be violable to prevent an individual or organization from immediately violating the human rights of others. For instance, to hold someone back when he is about to murder someone is to violate his human right of liberty. I don't take this to be a fundamental violation of human rights, though, because of the paradox of tolerance. If we tolerate actions that would deny human rights to others, then "the tolerant would be destroyed, and tolerance with them" -- Karl Popper. Still, such violations

must be the demonstrably the absolute minimum required to prevent one individual or organization from violating the rights of another. Mass censorship does not come close to qualifying under that standard.

> that 0.01% life right to allow driving at current speed limit. But in
> reality, the law traded small amount of our life right to economic
> efficiency.

You've picked some other issues that are controversial regulations in the States, for much the same reason. I'll give my own views:

Speed limits are allowable to prevent one human from recklessly endangering the life of another on the road. By the above, they must be absolutely minimum to achieve this goal, so an overly restrictive speed limit would unduly limit one's liberty. If a less restrictive way were discovered to solve the problem, then speed limits should be abolished, in the name of liberty.

> steel needs to be at least 10mm thick? Or should it be 100mm thick? Should
> we all drive a tank? The standard for the thickness of car steel would only
> be a good trade-off point for utility.

Same deal. Auto manufacturing restrictions are allowable to prevent car companies from recklessly endangering the lives of their customers, and must be the minimum possible to accomplish that goal, to avoid unduly limiting the liberty of either the manufacturer or their customer. If a less restrictive way were discovered to solve the problem, then auto manufacturing regulations should be abolished, in the name of liberty.

[Back to top](#)

[NY Times Op-Ed] A Better Way to Ban Alex Jones

Aug 13 11:39AM +0200

That was not my point, either. To restate, and see if I can make it more clear, I interpreted your comment ("experience has shown the slope is often perilously slippery") to mean that more restrictive speech laws lead to even more restrictive speech laws. I don't deny that the UK (or other examples) are, in some cases, more restrictive than the US--that's actually why I brought them up. My question was whether you can show that those more restrictive laws lead to some sort of spiral of ever-greater restrictions on speech.

(To caveat things slightly, I think it's very easy to show that countries which in general support greater restriction in speech do so in the future as well as in the past. Britain, striking a somewhat different balance than the US in terms of speech vs other public interests, both historically embraced stronger libel laws and, more recently, more restrictions on Internet pornography. But to claim that the libel laws led to the pornography restrictions, or that the pornography restrictions will inevitably lead to such crackdowns on free speech as to harm the democratic process is stretching the evidence.)

So other country's speech laws may be "worse" (from your point of view), but that's irrelevant to my point. The "slippery slope" claim is not that hate speech laws are inherently worse, but that, even if they are themselves valuable, they lead to other, worse outcomes. This is an argument that avoids discussing the merits of hate speech laws themselves, but it's not an argument supported by any historical evidence I can see.

I hope that made things clear. Feel free to reply, but forgive me if I don't spend time responding in turn. I'm not super interested in this thread given the tone or lack of substance.

Aug 13 08:58AM -0700

Hi

I think [REDACTED] was referring to the Rotherham child sexual exploitation scandal (https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rotherham_child_sexual_exploitation_scandal). The Wikipedia article says that an estimated 1400 children were sexually exploited between 1997 and 2013. Also from the article: "Published in January 2015, the Casey report concluded that the council had a bullying, sexist culture of covering up information and silencing whistleblowers"

On Thursday, August 9, 2018 at 10:45:45 AM UTC-7, [REDACTED] wrote:

Aug 13 06:19PM +0100

Yes [REDACTED] and I chatted off the list before I sent my later email (on the 10th). [REDACTED] mentioned Rotherham, Oxford, Telford and Rochdale. As I explained on the 10th, I was objecting to the "political protection" claim, which did not apply to the recent cases.

The usual case where political "protection" is alleged (and I think was largely proven) is the first Rochdale scandal (there were two). A police report about local MP Cyril Smith was reportedly kept in a locked safe in a senior officers office at the station, before, it was claimed by one policeman, it was removed and lost at the behest of the security services. He had been knighted and it was claimed the case was not pursued until after his death for that reason, to avoid a scandal. It was claimed but not proven about others, but they also didn't fit the profile in the comment.

The MP for Rotherham indelicately commented recently about cases such as Rotherham, the second Rochdale scandal (which followed some years after the first) and the others. I mentioned that generalised comment in connection with hate speech on the 10th. These were also the last set of cases I mentioned on the last line below. There was no suggestion of political protection in those cases as far as I'm aware; however the authorities didn't believe the very vulnerable witnesses who first reported the cases, or didn't believe they could convict on their evidence; didn't believe the reported numbers; and were alleged to have treaded very carefully over concerns about the effect on community relations if they failed to gain convictions. When one case was revealed the others seemed to be pursued more thoroughly and the scale soon came to light. Any claim of political protection will be an especially sensitive one for cases like those, and after I read the rest of the posts it clearly wasn't intended to be as strong as it seemed to me on first reading. One of the MPs for those areas was the father of a friend of mine (and is now dead), and was well respected, so I figured I'd better correct the apparent mis-association even though no offense was meant.

[Back to top](#)

Axios: "How tech fuels authoritarians"

Aug 13 01:47PM +0100

This article is annoyingly slight, but the letter it's a writeup of doesn't seem to be publicly available. I'm going to share it anyway because I think this a worrying possibility we should all be conscious of.

<https://www.axios.com/big-tech-surveillance-authoritarianism-china-artificial-intelligence-2b91dedb-93a0-460c-a236-4a3bb7cf9c99.html>

We always assumed technology and the naked transparency of social media would feed people's taste for freedom and thirst for democracy.

The big picture: Right now, that assumption looks flawed: Technology might actually solidify the standing of despots and provide them with a new way to exert their power.

Ian Bremmer

<<https://link.axios.com/click/14141951.33/aHR0cHM6Ly90d2l0dGVyLmNvbS9pYW5icmVtbWVvP3V0bV9zb3VyY2U9bmV3c2xldHRlciZ1dG1fbWVkaXVlPWVtYWIsJnV0bV9jYW1wYWlnbj1zZW5kdG9fbmV3c2xldHRlcnRlc3Qmc3RyZWFiPXRvcA/586d9e571e560373298b467cBead59101>>

—
political scientist, president and founder of Eurasia Group

<https://link.axios.com/click/14141951.33/aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuZXVvYXNpYWdvd3VwLm5ldC8_dXRtX3NvdXJjZT1uZXdzdGV0dGVyJnV0bV9tZWVpdW09ZW1haWwmdXRtX2NhbnBhaWduPXRlbmR0b19uZXdzdGV0dGVydGVzdCZzdHJlYW09dG9w/586d9e571e560373298b467cB6fd65793>,

and author of "Us vs. Them"

<https://link.axios.com/click/14141951.33/aHR0cHM6Ly93d3cuYW1hem9uLmNvbS9Vcy12cy1UaGVtLUZhaWx1cmUtR2xvYmFsaXNtL2RwLzA1MjU1MzZmODQ_dXRtX3NvdXJjZT1uZXdzdGV0dGVyJnV0bV9tZWVpdW09ZW1haWwmdXRtX2NhbnBhaWduPXRlbmR0b19uZXdzdGV0dGVydGVzdCZzdHJlYW09dG9w/586d9e571e560373298b467cBd2d87bc5>:

"The Failure of Globalism" — recently unpacked this issue in a letter to clients, and he was kind enough to give me permission to share it.

- The backdrop: Through the Cold War and beyond, "the presumption was that the power of information — people with ideas — were ticking time bombs inside authoritarian regimes": That's why the Iron Curtain fell and the Soviet Union collapsed, why Tiananmen Square and the Arab Spring happened.
- But as Bremmer was rethinking that, the tipping point came in Syria: The Russian government "provided a few hundred programmers to work with the [Syrian] military, with the intention of surveilling citizen communications through text monitoring and social media and identifying exactly who was a threat to the regime." Today, President Bashar Assad has all but won the war.
- Why it matters: If "the world's most powerful authoritarian states can effectively marshal technologies that give them control over their people ... that's a much more geopolitically significant trade to keep favored despots in power than arms sales or even colonialism."

Bremmer says changing technology makes him think differently about political stability in China:

- Advances "in facial recognition technology and big data possessed by [Chinese] authorities has dramatically reduced public demonstrations."
- When everyone is registered in a public database and the Chinese

government "can immediately determine who is an enemy of the people, you get fewer self-proclaimed enemies pretty quickly."

Be smart: Bremmer's takeaway isn't that authoritarianism wins. But more growing economies "will end up economically and politically (and eventually, militarily) aligning" with China — strengthening America's biggest rival.

[Back to top](#)

You received this digest because you're subscribed to updates for this group. You can change your settings on the group membership page.

To unsubscribe from this group and stop receiving emails from it send an email to [REDACTED]