Exhibit 19

From: ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮
To: ▮
Subject: [Industryinfo] Digest for ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ - 25 updates in 7 topics
Sent: Tue, 14 Aug 2018 17:43:51 +0000

▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮

Google Groups

Topic digest
View all topics

- AP Exclusive: Google tracks your movements, like it or not - 11 Updates
- Musk Mulls Taking Tesla Private, Valuing Company at $82 Billion - 3 Updates
- "Google plans censored search engine for China" - The Intercept - 4 Updates
- [NY Times Op-Ed] A Better Way to Ban Alex Jones - 1 Update
- Brandon Downey: "Some thoughts on an Old Approach to China by Google." - 4 Updates
- Artificial intelligence 'did not miss a single urgent case' - 1 Update
- Google's censored Chinese search engine: a catalogue of ethical violations? - 1 Update

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

▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ Aug 14 10:01AM +0200

+1

▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ Aug 14 10:50AM +0200

There are three location-related settings on Android:

Location History: this controls whether your location is recorded in your timeline in Google Maps.

Location toggle on the device: simplifying a little, this controls whether GPS is enabled and can be found in the notification pulldown. If this is off, the phone will not attempt to determine its precise location. Most people never turn this off, since it will prevent Maps from telling you where you are.

Web and App Activity: a catch-all for recording search and Assistant query history. If you turn this off, you can't use Assistant.

The complaint in this article is that if you have Web and App Activity enabled and the location toggle enabled, then your search history entries contain your approximate location at the time you made the query. It's also not possible to remove them by clearing your location history, which is counter-intuitive - you have to clear your search history instead.

EXHIBIT NO. 19

P. Frederickson, CSR, CCR

Definitely confusing from a user point of view if we need googlers explain it to us :)

[image: Google Logo]

Google Cloud Platform UX
London, UK

On Tue, Aug 14, 2018 at 11:17 AM
wrote:

Although I know how it works and what the difference between "Location" and "Location History" is, I did not know Web and App activity had anything to do with location.

Also seems like we are not very good at explaining this to users.

Here is the screenshot from "My activity" setting:
https://screenshot.googleplex.com/s3AeEc4ZsEo

And When You click on Learn More:
https://screenshot.googleplex.com/qfNYTUS9h3C

cheers

--

.
. Publisher Solutions Consultant gPS
* • *Google Inc.

On Tue, Aug 14, 2018 at 11:28 AM ██████████████ wrote:

████████████████ Aug 14 08:26AM -0400

> Although I know how it works and what the difference between "Location" and "Location History" is, I did not know Web and App activity had anything to do with location.

> Also seems like we are not very good at explaining this to users.

Indeed we aren't very good at explaining this to users. Add me to the list of Googlers who didn't understand how this worked an was surprised when I read the article.

Of course, we shouldn't have to explain this to users. The real failure is that we shipped a UI that confuses users and requires explanation. We should redesign the UI so it's obvious what's

happening, and make it easy for users to choose the settings they want in one place without parsing complex details about product interactions.

████████████████

████████████████████████████ Aug 14 02:35PM +0200

Please don't comment!

██ 14. Aug. 2018, 14:27.

████████████████████████████ Aug 14 02:37PM +0200

Why?

████████████████████████████ Aug 14 01:39PM +0100

REDACTED - PRIVILEGE

On Tue, Aug 14, 2018 at 1:26 PM ████████████████████ wrote:

████████████████████████████ Aug 14 02:52PM +0200

In this case you can just as well demand switching industryinfo to readonly mode. People on the thread were extremely nice and careful in their statements and only meant to suggest a way to improve our services. This is why ▮▮▮▮▮▮ is useful in my opinion. But if the management believes that it generates more risk than reward, it should be made readonly. This would remove an important feedback mechanism, though.

Aug 14 02:16PM +0100

REDACTED - PRIVILEGE

Aug 14 10:36AM -0700

On Tue, Aug 14, 2018 at 1:50 AM, ▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮▮ wrote:

> contain your approximate location at the time you made the query. It's also
> not possible to remove them by clearing your location history, which is
> counter-intuitive - you have to clear your search history instead.

I believe the complaint of the article is that Google records location information when "Location" is off. The rest of the article is giving an example of the additional information gathered. It is not the primary complaint.

[I hope that commenting on the article proper is still acceptable.]

Back to top

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

███████████████████████████████ Aug 14 09:02AM -0700

Chrysler was acquired by private equity fund Cerberus in 2007.
https://www.cnbc.com/id/18646336

███████████████████████████████ Aug 14 09:31AM -0700

I could see Tesla being acquired someday for ~$10 billion.

███████████████████████████████ Aug 14 10:32AM -0700

I understand Saudi wants to diversify from oil.
But, what is their motivation for wanting to take Tesla private? Elon says
they have been asking for this for a while.

Back to top
"Google plans censored search engine for China" - The Intercept

███████████████████████████████ Aug 14 06:11AM -0700

On Monday, 13 August 2018 23:36:43 UTC+10, ████████ wrote:
>> 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.

I will try to respond to the question "where is the limit that we cannot do
it (comply with Chinese government requests) anymore?" To answer this, we
can first take a look why Google exited China in 2010.

There are two major parts in such a decision:

██
██
██
██
██
██

[image: Value provided by Google China.png] <about:invalid#zClosurez>
This chart is completely based on my speculation. The blue chart is based
on ███ interview that mentioned by ███ post ███████████████
██

Google was reasonably successful for the first few years but thing went
downhill after 2008 Olympics.

Given the blue chart, it's also reasonable to predict the trend like the
red dotted line, which made Google think that it's better to pull out.

However, there is one key difference between value perceived by Google and
value perceived by Chinese users.████████████████████████
████████████████████ While IMHO, Google censoring content doesn't harm
Chinese users, regardless how bad the censored content is. It just doesn't
provide value in this area. As people already pointed out before, Chinese
users don't have access to these information anyway. It is the censorship
law that harms the user, not companies that complies with the law.

>From my personal experience, I definitely felt a loss of value when I
couldn't access Youtube, Facebook and Google back in 2009. However, if all
these services complied with censorship, it probably won't have triggered
my curiosity to use VPN to try to find out more. But on the other hand, if
Google never entered China, it won't trigger my curiosity either.

██
███████████████████████████ I think this backfired. If we just
comply with local law without using any tricks, it wouldn't give users a
false sense of security. Users will know that all their data are subject to
government inspection. Since users' data are under surveillance with or
without Google, Google won't cause harm if we stick to this rule.████
██

The third point is that 2009 was a very difficult year for China as well.
There are troubles in Xinjiang, Tibet, 20th anniversary of Tiananmen
Incident. That's why we saw Youtube, Facebook all blocked in 2009. Now we
look back, that red dotted trend line is probably not true.

If you are concerning China might use it's leverage to pressure Google to
do something outside of China, I think we should just treat Chinese
government as any other government and follow our protocol about how to
resolve international disputes.

So to summarize, I think it's almost always a good idea to stay in the Chinese market from moral perspective. This is because how terrible are the censored contents and whether we are actively doing the censorship are all irrelevant factors. And of course, I'm taking a consequentialism view.

Aug 14 10:15AM -0700

> provide value in this area. As people already pointed out before, Chinese
> users don't have access to these information anyway. It is the censorship
> law that harms the user, not companies that complies with the law.

I find this a bit puzzling. How does someone writing something on a piece of paper in Beijing harm the user? If we imagine two perfectly identical versions of the world, one where a censorship law was officially entered into the lawbooks, but everyone refuses to enforce it, and one where it was not, it seems unlikely to declare the version with the law drastically worse than the version without. One could say that rule of law is violated, or that a cruel law being enacted is a wrong on its own, but not really that people were directly being hurt.

Then, is it not the enforcement of an unjust law that causes harm? And would Google not be deputized into this enforcement if it censored itself? If Google were the only organization willing to enforce the law (and not even the police were), would it not be the sole agent harming the users? And if so, why does the presence of other agents harming the user change whether it is allowable for us to do so?

Aug 14 06:20PM +0100

One would always live in fear that the law *could be* enforced, which would be a demonstrable harm to the mental health of the citizens.

Aug 14 10:27AM -0700

Good point. I guess I'd ascribe that harm to those drafting the law. The drafters may also compel enforcers to comply using threats and duress, which does limit the culpability of enforcers IMHO. "I'm doing this because

it's the law." is a bit different than "I'm doing this because if I don't they'll kill me." In our case, I believe we are presently (mostly) free of such duress, but there may be a line of argumentation along those lines that I'm not thinking of.

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

████████████████████   Aug 14 09:59AM -0700

On the Internets...

"Noam Chomsky has come out in defense of Infowars' right to exist and pointed out the obvious danger of monopolies engaged in coordinated censorship of speech."

Brandon Downey: "Some thoughts on an Old Approach to China by Google."

██████████████████████████████   Aug 14 09:41AM +0100

Downey was a Xoogler of 10 years tenure ███████████████████████████ (2004-2014) and has a historical perspective on our first foray into China that I didn't know --

███████████████████████████████████████ And it didn't work out.

██
██

I woke up this week and saw a story in the intercept:

https://theintercept.com/2018/08/01/google-china-search-engine-censorship/

If you haven't read the story (and you should), here's a little bit of background.

If you live in China, the government has a firewall around the internet connections in and out of the country. There are now all sorts of laws about your data in China, but the important bit for our story here is this:

If you are in China and try to search for a term like 'democracy' on the

web, there is a series of technological controls that will stop you. Look
for the wrong term, and the DNS for the hosting site might be poisoned.
Your connected might be 'reset', and access to the site blocked for a half
hour or more. Or maybe the government just decides that the entire site is
a menace, and blocks every IP address for it they can find. 700-odd million
users, all of them in a default state of being unable to access anything
the Chinese government doesn't want them to see -- blocked by a series of
technologies collectively referred to as 'The Great Firewall'.

This article is about Google's upcoming answer to this problem, which is

██

product). Those solutions might sound utopian to you, which is ok, because
they apparently sound that way to Google's CEO too.

No, Google's solution (codenamed "Dragonfly
<https://www.bloomberg.com/news/videos/2018-08-01/google-and-code-named-
dragonfly-video>")
is a lot more basic:

They're going to do what China wants. They're going to launch a search
engine that will live in China, and will censor itself to be in conformity
with the Chinese government's wishes. They're also going to launch a mobile
app like Google News, except that they will dutifully remove any stories
which reference things that upset the government of China.

The argument being presented is a pretty basic rationalization:

"Look, China is already censoring the internet. So why don't we at least
give people what information we can, because some is better than none?".

Whatever you think about this as an argument, there is one key fact you
should know, and it's this:

Google has already done this once, and it ended in disaster.

=

So let's talk about history; some personal and some from the internet.

I had the great fortune of working for Google for the better part of a

decade.

Here's something you should know: For the vast majority of my time there, it really was a place that was focused on making the world better. And reviewing the things I worked on there, I would say that while there were some value neutral things, I feel very happy with how I got to work on things that helped people (or at least, helped people who were helping people).

Except for this one little thing.

Around 2006, Google made a decision: It was going to China.

Let's walk it back just a step, but there are some things you should know about running a foreign internet business in China. Even in those days, the big catch was you needed to do business with a "Joint Venture" -- a locally owned Chinese company, and they needed to own 49% of your venture there.

It helped, of course, if they did real work so it looked good to regulators.

I'm pretty sure a lot of these joint ventures are a little shady -- I suspect most of them are companies run by people who run local "joint ventures as a service" (if you catch my drift), but this was the way you entered the China market.

Here was the pitch for Google's entry into China in 2006:

-

██████████████████████████
█████████████████

-

██████████████████████████
███████████████████

██████████████████████████
██████████████

██████████████████████████
███████

[REDACTED]

If you want to be real about it, this was part of the foundational myth of the internet here:

"Here is a place where you can be yourself without the world knowing who you are. Information here will flow freely (or at least "too cheap to meter"). No government can catch up with this new frontier, which is advancing faster than you can imagine; and even if it did, by then citizens will be so drunk on this freedom it will be political suicide to stand in the way of Progress."

You could find echoes of this in Google's published value statements with lines like this one:

"Democracy on the web works <https://www.google.com/about/philosophy.html>"

I wish I could say I believed this today, but I just can't, not anymore.

Technology can provide us with great, powerful tools, but unfortunately it is a Failed Dream to suppose that the force is provides is some sort of historical inevitability that will solve the hard problems of human governance and societal order. Technology isn't a magic genie that sweeps the chores of civics under a rug; in most cases it isn't even magic.

It is, however, a tool -- a force amplifier for doing a thing. And like any tool, it can be used or misused.

Not to belabor the point, but as I write this, an eleven year old just followed a script to hack a US voting machine <https://www.buzzfeednews.com/article/kevincollier/voting-hackers-defcon-failures-manufacturers-ess>.
Along with being a legitimately hard problem, technological progress can't even push back the political torpor that gave us Diebold voting machines;

how do you think it fares against active political corruption? Is Twitter going to give us the next Arab Spring, or is it going to be in the selling megaphones to Nazis business?

███
██

Like I said, I don't believe this now, but there was a time when I did. Or at least, I thought loftily "hey, this is an experiment. Let's try it and see how it works!"

=

███
███
███████████████████████████████████

"Cost of doing business", I mused.

It was a fun project technically: I got to work with talented people, learn some new and exciting things about proxy servers, and travel to exotic places.

We got bad press about it; a lot of human rights organizations flamed us for it, and it even showed up at shareholder meetings. There were a lot of good points made ████████████████████████████████████
███

███
███
███

███
███
███

=

Before I go any further, I want to jump back in history just a little bit.

In 1993, I left to go to college. When I was packing, I brought with me a metric ton of books -- amongst them, the very battered and worn copy of the World
Book Encyclopedia I had gotten from my grandparents. Why do this when there was a giant library close to my dorm full of vastly more accurate reference tomes?

I loved looking stuff up so much, I was worried what I would do when the library closed. There was no Google then, no Wikipedia, not even a Lycos. There was, of course, gopher and archie and ftp.wustl.edu; and it was a beginning that I had just discovered.

When the web came, and Google, and all the other tools you take for granted, it seemed like a miracle to me; an unalloyed one, and if you'd asked me at any point in my personal history, I would have said everyone should have, and in fact would be wrong to take it away.

Why didn't I think about the ramifications of what I was I was doing helping with a project like our joint venture? I wasn't like some sort of Captain Planet villain, chortling over dumping my trash on the street while rolling around in money (as it turns out, the payoff was just getting to be comfortably middle class). No, what makes scenarios like this so scarily plausible is the two things: the power of our brains to rationalize, and the power of success to warp our perception of the world.

You can write a book about the stories we tell ourselves to rationalize our behavior (and there are a lot of them these things), but I wanted to highlight why I went along with it:

-

I really believed that technological progress was an ethically positive force.
-

I really believed that the virtuous cycle of our business model was something that made the consequences worth it. Which is to say, I believed in a kind of 'carbon credits for ethics' deal, where we might do something clearly not good in return for a greater good.
-

I really believed that the only way to change the status quo was to

collaborate with a bunch of authoritarians -- even with the best of intentions.

I want to emphasize that the people and management were actually very supportive during this process: I was even told if I was uncomfortable with this (and I was), I didn't have to work on this project. I also never thought "well it's a paycheck" (a much simpler rationalization to spot).

I do think that if you are reading this, it's worth it to think about these things in your own life. I don't think my attitude is unique amongst technologists -- human problems are hard, so when presented with a kind of 'royal road' to solving them -- just through improving technology, it's a pretty tempting proposition.

If you asked me what I believe now, it's closer to this:

We have a responsibility to the world our technology enables. If we build a tool and give it to people who are hurting other people with it, it is our job to try to stop it, or at least, not help it. Technology can of course be a force for good, but it's not a magic bullet -- it's more like a laser and it's up to us what we focus it on.

What we can't do is just collaborate, and assume it will have a happy ending.

=

You may have noticed that my arguments have not really touched on how doing the wrong thing might have had bad consequences for Google (or for myself). I want to tell you that thinking about this has spawned a massive research project in ethics, but in reality, I learned something by watching The Good Place.

Sometimes, our bad actions don't have bad consequences. We get away with it; converting our externality into somebody else's problem: a big ball of plastic in the Pacific, a few earthquakes one town over from our fracking, or a convenient financial collapse which we sell a few derivatives and make a killing from it.

Other times, our actions do have consequences, and have a moral desert -- we get what's coming to us. This isn't a happy thing, but it is a useful one, because we can get a chance to learn from our mistakes; to pull back from the brink.

That's what happened for Google. The situation where we had a business partner who censored the web for us in China persisted until an Incident in 2010.

I'll let the Google blog describe it for you:

https://googleblog.blogspot.com/2010/01/new-approach-to-china.html

"In mid-December, we detected a highly sophisticated and targeted attack on our corporate infrastructure originating from China that resulted in the theft of intellectual property from Google. However, it soon became clear that what at first appeared to be solely a security incident--albeit a significant one--was something quite different.

First, this attack was not just on Google. As part of our investigation we have discovered that at least twenty other large companies from a wide range of businesses--including the Internet, finance, technology, media and chemical sectors--have been similarly targeted. We are currently in the process of notifying those companies, and we are also working with the relevant U.S. authorities.

Second, we have evidence to suggest that a primary goal of the attackers was accessing the Gmail accounts of Chinese human rights activists. Based on our investigation to date we believe their attack did not achieve that objective. Only two Gmail accounts appear to have been accessed, and that activity was limited to account information (such as the date the account was created) and subject line, rather than the content of emails themselves.

Third, as part of this investigation but independent of the attack on Google, we have discovered that the accounts of dozens of U.S.-, China- and Europe-based Gmail users who are advocates of human rights in China appear to have been routinely accessed by third parties. These accounts have not been accessed through any security breach at Google, but most likely via phishing scams or malware placed on the users' computers."

Short summary: China was not being made more liberal by the presence of our minimally-censored search engine. Not only had their society not become more liberal as a result of us being there, there was an escalation of their behavior, resulting in a program of hacking western companies for things like information about human rights workers and other dissidents.

Aug 14 02:31PM

I'm not really supportive of Google's decision to offer censored services in China, but the above seems like a very large non sequitur to me. Yes, Google tried this once before, but it did not "end in disaster". It ended, but the cause of the end had nothing to do with the decision to offer censored services. There's no reason to believe that the offering of those services in any way enabled or encouraged the hacking by the Chinese.

So, there's no historical reason to believe that this new venture will cause any particular problems, or that the notion that offering something to the Chinese people is worse than offering nothing is erroneous. It may be that this is a bad idea, but as far as I can tell nothing from the first attempt indicates that it is.

On Tue, Aug 14, 2018 at 2:42 AM █████████████████

wrote:

> For more options, visit this group at
> ████████████████████████████████

> --
██████████ █████████████ █████████████████

████████████████████████ ug 14 04:59PM +0200

For those joining Google after the 2010 decision to pull out of China, it is really hard to imagine what kind of security tech/tools were in use then vs now (ex: ████████████████ etc). Which I guess is why the focus of internal arguments is not about how secure we are now vs then: the barrier to ethical discussions requires a lot less specialized knowledge.

> ████████████████████████████
> For more options, visit this group at
> ████████████████████████████████

--
Google Switzerland GmbH
Brandschenkestrasse 110,
Zurich, Switzerland
8002 Zurich
Identifikationsnummer: CH-020.4.028.116-1

Diese E-Mail ist vertraulich. Wenn Sie nicht der richtige Adressat sind, leiten Sie diese bitte nicht weiter, informieren Sie den Absender und löschen Sie die E-Mail und alle Anhänge. Vielen Dank.

By opening this email you agree to approve one of my code changes without
comment.

███████████████████████ Aug 14 09:46AM -0700

Thanks for sharing the interesting article. As a noogler I gradually
started to see how we take ownership and responsibility for our technology,
as quoted in the article: "We have a responsibility to the world our
technology enables."

It's a privilege but very hard at the same time. I hate to use guns as
example, so I'll just use knife: whoever invented the knife is not
responsible (or at least too hard) for controlling how people use it. We'll
try out best regardless.

Artificial intelligence 'did not miss a single urgent case'

███████████████████████ Aug 14 12:27PM +0100

A news story to be proud of.

https://www.bbc.com/news/health-44924948

Artificial intelligence can diagnose eye disease as accurately as some
leading experts, research suggests.

A study by Moorfields Eye Hospital <https://www.moorfields.nhs.uk/> in
London and the Google company DeepMind <https://deepmind.com/> found that a
machine could learn to read complex eye scans and detect more than 50 eye
conditions.

Doctors hope artificial intelligence could soon play a major role in
helping to identify patients who need urgent treatment.

They hope it will also reduce delays.

A team at DeepMind, based in London, created an algorithm, or mathematical set of rules, to enable a computer to analyse optical coherence tomography (OCT), a high resolution 3D scan of the back of the eye.

Thousands of scans were used to train the machine how to read the scans.

Then, artificial intelligence was pitted against humans.

The computer was asked to give a diagnosis in the cases of 1,000 patients whose clinical outcomes were already known.

The same scans were shown to eight clinicians - four leading ophthalmologists and four optometrists.

Each was asked to make one of four referrals: urgent, semi-urgent, routine and observation only.
'Jaw-dropping'

Artificial intelligence performed as well as two of the world's leading retina specialists, with an error rate of only 5.5%.

Crucially, the algorithm did not miss a single urgent case.

The results, published in the journal Nature Medicine <https://www.nature.com/nm/>, were described as "jaw-dropping" by Dr Pearse Keane, consultant ophthalmologist, who is leading the research at Moorfields Eye Hospital.

He told the BBC: "I think this will make most eye specialists gasp because we have shown this algorithm is as good as the world's leading experts in interpreting these scans."

Artificial intelligence was able to identify serious conditions such as wet age-related macular degeneration (AMD), which can lead to blindness unless treated quickly.

Dr Keane said the huge number of patients awaiting assessment was a "massive problem".

He said: "Every eye doctor has seen patients go blind due to delays in referral; AI should help us to flag those urgent cases and get them treated early."
Computer reasoning

Dr Dominic King, medical director, DeepMind Health, explained how his team

trained artificial intelligence to read eye scans: "We used two neural networks, which are complex mathematical systems which mimic the way the brain operates, and inputted thousands of eye scans.

"They divided the eye into anatomical areas and were able to classify whether disease was present."

Some previous attempts at using AI have led to what's known as a "black box" problem - where the reasoning behind the computer analysis is hidden.

By contrast, the DeepMind algorithm provides a visual map of where the disease is, allowing clinicians to check how the AI has come to its decision, which is crucial if doctors and patients are to have confidence in its diagnoses.

- Eight ways intelligent machines are already in your life
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-39657382>
- AI will create as many jobs as it displaces
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/business-44849492>
- AI a new weapon in cancer fight
<https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-44191444>

So how soon could AI be used to diagnose patient scans in hospital?

Dr Keane said: "We really want to get this into clinical use within two to three years but cannot until we have done a major real-time trial to confirm these exciting findings.

He said the evidence suggests AI will ease the burden on clinicians, enabling them to prioritise the more urgent cases.
'My remaining vision is precious'

Elaine Manna lost her sight in her left eye 18 years ago.

In 2013, her vision began deteriorating in her right eye and an OCT scan revealed she needed urgent treatment for wet AMD, which occurs when abnormal blood vessels grow under the retina.

She now has regular injections which stop the vessels growing or bleeding.

Elaine told me: "I was devastated when I lost sight in my left eye, so my remaining vision is precious."

She said the research findings were "absolutely brilliant", adding: "People will have their sight saved because of artificial intelligence, because doctors will be able to intervene sooner."

Future potential

DeepMind is also doing research with Imperial College London to see if AI can learn how to interpret mammograms, and improve the accuracy of breast cancer screening.

The company also has a project with University College London Hospitals (UCLH) to examine whether AI can differentiate between cancerous and healthy tissue on CT and MRI scans.

This might help doctors speed up the planning of radiotherapy treatment, which can take up to eight hours in the case of very complex cancers.

Within a few years it seems highly likely that artificial intelligence will play a key role in the diagnosis of disease, which should free up clinicians to spend more time with patients.

But there will be some who will be unhappy about their health details being shared with a tech giant like Google.

Dr Dominic King, from DeepMind, said: "Patients have an absolute right to know how, where and who is processing their data. We have a best in class security system; data is protected and encrypted at all times."

The Royal Free Hospital in north London was criticised in 2017 for sharing 1.6 million patient data records with DeepMind.

The controversy related to an app DeepMind developed to identify patients at risk of kidney disease.

The Information Commission <https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/technology-40497020> ruled that the hospital had not done enough to safeguard patient data.

Back to top

Google's censored Chinese search engine: a catalogue of ethical violations?

▊▊▊▊▊▊▊▊▊▊▊▊ ug 14 10:29AM +0200

> <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/google-set-to-pull-out-of-china-over-censorship-1925052.html>,
> pulling its search and other services out because of country's limits to
> freedom of speech.

This keeps being repeated in the press, but it's not true. The withdrawal

from China was caused by the Chinese government continuing to hinder Google's operations (constant outages caused by IP blocks, cyberattacks, and so on) despite implementing the mandatory censorship.

Let the Google employee base and other non-shareholder stakeholders decide
> where the red lines for Google's values should be.

The author appears to believe that most employees are not shareholders. In any case, ████ and ████ maintain full control through supervoting stock, so bringing shareholders into any of these discussions is somewhat besides the point.