

GOOGLE (IE: ALPHABET) IS THE MOST SOCIALLY DESTRUCTIVE COMPANY IN THE WORLD

Wed, 06 Mar 2024 11:37:54, admin45789, [post_tag: google-ie-alphabet-is-the-most-socially-destructive-company-in-the-world, category: news]

Have you heard about this company called "Google"? It is actually a cartel of over 200 shell corporations and they have a horrific effect on our society. Google/Alphabet spied on our technologies, copied our patented technologies and then spent over \$5M in attacks on our team when we reported them to authorities. Google/Alphabet is protected by Nancy Pelosi, Dianne Feinstein and other politicians that Google pays stock market bribes to. That is why Google never gets properly regulated!

Criticism of Google includes concern for [tax avoidance](#), misuse and manipulation of [search results](#), its use of others' [intellectual property](#), concerns that its compilation of data may violate people's [privacy](#) and collaboration with the US military on [Google Earth](#) to spy on users,^[1] [censorship of search results and content](#), and the energy consumption of its servers as well as concerns over traditional business issues such as monopoly, [restraint of trade](#), [antitrust](#), [patent infringement](#), indexing and presenting false information and propaganda in search results, and being an "[Ideological Echo Chamber](#)".



Google's parent company, [Alphabet Inc.](#), is an American multinational public corporation invested in [Internet search](#), [cloud computing](#), and advertising technologies. Google hosts and develops a number of Internet-based services and products,^[2] and generates profit primarily from advertising through its [Google Ads](#) (formerly AdWords) program.^{[3][4]}

Google's [stated mission](#) is "to organize the world's information and make it universally accessible and useful".^[5] this mission, and the means used to accomplish it, have raised concerns among the company's critics. Much of the criticism pertains to issues that have not yet been addressed by [cyber law](#).

Shona Ghosh, a journalist for [Business Insider](#), noted that an increasing digital [resistance movement](#) against Google has grown.^[6]



Tax evasion

Google cut its taxes by \$3.1 billion in the period of 2007 to 2009 using a technique that moves most of its foreign profits through [Ireland](#) and The [Netherlands](#) to Bermuda. Afterwards, the company started to send £8 billion in profits a year to [Bermuda](#).^[7] Google's income shifting—involving strategies known to lawyers as the "[Double Irish](#)" and the "[Dutch Sandwich](#)"—helped reduce its overseas tax rate to 2.4 percent, the lowest of the top five U.S. technology companies by market capitalization, according to regulatory filings in six countries.^{[8][9]}

According to economist and member of the [PvdA](#) delegation inside the [Progressive Alliance of Socialists & Democrats in the European Parliament](#) (S&D) [Paul Tang](#), the EU lost, from 2013 to 2015, a loss estimated to be 3.955 billion Euros from Google.^[10] When comparing to other countries outside the EU, the EU is only taxing Google with a rate of 0,36 – 0,82% of their revenue (approx. 25-35% of their EBT) whereas this rate is near 8% in countries outside the EU. Even if a rate of 2 to 5% – as suggested by [ECOFIN](#) council – would have been applied during this period (2013-2015), a fraud of this rate from Facebook would have meant a loss from 1.262 to 3.155 billion euros in the EU.^[10]

Google has been accused by a number of countries of [avoiding](#) paying tens of billions of dollars of tax through a convoluted scheme of inter-company licensing agreements and transfers to [tax havens](#).^{[11][12]} For example, Google has used highly contrived and artificial distinctions to avoid paying billions of pounds in [corporate tax](#) owed by its UK operations.^[13]

On May 15, 2013, [Margaret Hodge](#), the chair of the [United Kingdom Public Accounts Committee](#), accused Google of being "calculated and [...] unethical" over its use of the scheme.^[13] Google Chairman [Eric Schmidt](#) has claimed that this scheme of Google is "capitalism",^[14] and that he was "very proud" of it.^[15]

In November 2012, the [UK government](#) announced plans to investigate Google, along with [Starbucks](#) and [Amazon.com](#), for possible [tax avoidance](#).^[16] In 2015, the UK Government introduced a new law intended to penalize Google's and other large [multinational](#) corporations' artificial tax avoidance.^[17]

On 20 January 2016, Google announced that it would pay £130m in back taxes to settle the investigation.^[18] However, only 8 days later, it was announced that Google could end up paying more, and UK tax officials were under investigation for what has been termed a "sweetheart deal" for Google.^[19]

	2013			2014			2015			2016			2017		
	Total	EU	Rest of the world	Total	EU	Rest of the world	Total	EU	Rest of the world	Total	EU	Rest of the world	Total	EU	Rest of the world
Alphabet Inc.(Google)	40 257	18 614	21 643	11 529	343 11 186		1 986	84 1 902		17% 25% 17%			4,93% 0,45% 8,79%		
	54 362	19 159	35 203	14 215	285 13 930		2 997	69 2 928		21% 24% 21%			5,51% 0,36% 8,32%		
	68 879	25 320	43 559	18 050	586 17 464		3 034	207 2 827		17% 35% 16%			4,40% 0,82% 6,49%		


Antitrust



The examples and perspective in this section **deal primarily with Western culture and do not represent a worldwide view of the subject**. You may [improve this section](#), discuss the issue on the [talk page](#), or create a new section, as appropriate. *(May 2018)* [\(Learn how and when to remove this template message\)](#)

From the 2000s onward, [Google](#) and parent company [Alphabet Inc.](#) have faced [antitrust](#) scrutiny over alleged [anti-competitive conduct](#) in violation of [competition law](#) in a particular jurisdiction.^[20] **Antitrust scrutiny of Google** has primarily centered on the company's dominance in the [search engine](#) and [digital advertising](#) markets.^{[21][22]} The company has also been accused of leveraging control of the [Android operating system](#) to illegally curb competition.^[23]

Google has also received antitrust scrutiny over its control of the [Google Play](#) store and alleged "self-preferencing" at the expense of third-party developers.^{[24][25]} Additionally, Google's alleged discrimination against rivals' advertisements on [YouTube](#) has been subject to antitrust litigation.^{[26][27]} More recently, [Google Maps](#) and the [Google Automotive Services](#) (GAS) package have become the target of antitrust scrutiny.^[28]



European Union

The [European Commission](#) has pursued several competition law cases against Google, namely:^[29]

- Complaint that Google abused its position as a dominant search engine to favor its own services over those of competitors. In particular, Google operated a free [comparison shopping website](#) Froogle, which it abandoned in favor of a paid-placement-only site called [Google Shopping](#). Other comparison sites complained of a precipitous drop in web traffic due to changes in the Google search algorithm, and some were driven out of business.^[30] The investigation began in 2010 and concluded in July 2017 with a €2.42 billion fine against the parent company Alphabet, and an order to change its practices within 90 days.^[29]
- Complaint opened in 2015 that the dominance of the [Android operating system](#) was abused to make it difficult for competing third-party apps and search engines to be pre-installed on mobile phones. (See [European Union vs. Google](#).)^[31]
- Complaint opened in 2016 that Google abused its market dominance to prevent competing advertising companies to sell ads to websites already using [Google AdSense](#).^[32]
- In June 2023, the EU accused Google of abusing its control of the EU market for buying and selling online advertising to undercut rivals.^[33]

U.S. antitrust issues

In testimony before a [U.S. Senate antitrust](#) panel in September 2011, [Eric Schmidt](#), Google's chairman, said that "the Internet is the ultimate level playing field" where users were "one click away" from competitors.^[34] Nonetheless, Senator Kohl asked Schmidt if Google's market share constituted a monopoly – a special power dominant – for his company. Schmidt acknowledged that Google's market share was akin to a monopoly, but noted the complexity of the law.^{[35][36]}

During the hearing, [Mike Lee](#), Republican of Utah, accused Google of cooking its search results to favor its own services. Schmidt replied, "Senator, I can assure we haven't cooked anything."^[34] In testimony before the same Senate panel, [Jeffrey Katz](#) and [Jeremy Stoppelman](#), the chief executives from Google's competitors [Nextag](#) and [Yelp](#), said that Google tilts search results in its own favor, limiting choice and stifling competition.^[34]

In October 2012, it was reported that the [U.S. Federal Trade Commission](#) staff were preparing a recommendation that the government sue Google on antitrust grounds. The areas of concern include accusations of manipulating the search results to favor Google services such as [Google Shopping](#) for buying goods and [Google Places](#) for advertising local restaurants and businesses; whether Google's automated advertising marketplace, [AdWords](#), discriminates against advertisers from competing online commerce services like comparison shopping sites and consumer review Web sites; whether Google's contracts with smartphone makers and carriers prevent them from removing or modifying Google products, such as its [Android operating system](#) or [Google Search](#); and Google's use of its smartphone patents. A likely outcome of the antitrust investigations is a negotiated settlement where Google would agree not to discriminate in favor of its products over smaller competitors.^[37] Federal Trade Commission ended its investigation during a period which the co-founder of Google, [Larry Page](#), had met with individuals at the [White House](#) and the Federal Trade Commission, leading to voluntary changes by Google; since January 2009 to March 2015 employees of Google have met with officials in the White House about 230 times according to [The Wall Street Journal](#).^[38]

In June 2015, Google reached an advertising agreement with Yahoo!, which would have allowed Yahoo! to feature Google advertisements on its web pages. The alliance between the two companies was never completely realized because of [antitrust](#) concerns by the [U.S. Department of Justice](#). As a result, Google pulled out of the deal in November 2018.^{[39][40][41]}

In September 2023 Google's antitrust trial [United States v. Google LLC \(2020\)](#) began at federal court in Washington, D.C.^[42] in which the DOJ accuses Google of illegally abusing its monopoly power as the largest online search tool.

In January 2023, Google was [sued](#) by the federal government and several states for its alleged monopoly over digital advertising technology. The complaint alleged that the company had engaged in "anticompetitive and exclusionary conduct" over the previous 15 years.^[43]

Android

On April 20, 2016, the European Union filed a formal antitrust complaint against Google's leverage over Android vendors, alleging that the mandatory bundling of the entire suite of proprietary Google software, hindered the ability for competing search providers to be integrated into Android and that barring vendors from producing devices running forks of Android both constituted anti-competitive practices.^[44] In June 2018, the European Commission determined a \$5 billion fine for Google regarding the April 2016 complaints.^[45]


In August 2016, Google was fined US\$6.75 million by the Russian [Federal Antimonopoly Service](#) (FAS) under similar allegations by [Yandex](#).^[46]

On April 16, 2018, [Umar Javeed, Sukarma Thapar, Aaqib Javeed vs. Google LLC & Ors](#), resulted in the [Competition Commission of India](#) ordering a wider probe investigation order against Google Android illegal business practices. The investigations arm of the CCI should complete the wider probe in the case within 150 days, the order said, though such cases at the watchdog typically drag on for years. The CCI also said the role of any Google executive in the alleged abuse of the Android platform should also be examined.^[47]

"Jedi Blue" advertising market monopolization in collusion with Facebook

According to the group of 15 state attorneys general suing Google for antitrust issues,^[48] Google and Facebook entered into a price-fixing agreement termed [Jedi Blue](#) to monopolize the online advertising market and prevent the entry of the fairer [header bidding](#) method of advertisement sales on any major advertising platform. The agreement consisted of Facebook using the Google-managed system for bidding on and managing online ads in exchange for preferential rates and priority on prime ad placement. This allowed Google to retain its profitable monopoly over online ad exchanges, while saving Facebook billions of dollars on attempts to build competing systems.^{[49][50]} Over 200 newspapers have sued Google and Facebook to recover losses incurred by the collusion.^[51]

Google admitted that the deal contained, "a provision governing cooperation between Google and Facebook in the event of certain government investigations."^[52] Google has an internal team called gTrade dedicated to maximizing Google's advertising profits, reportedly using insider information, price fixing, and leveraging Google's relative monopoly positions.^[53]



Criticism of search engine

Possible misuse of search results

In 2006/2007, a group of Austrian researchers observed a tendency to misuse the Google engine as a "reality interface". Ordinary users as well as journalists tend to rely on the first pages of Google Search, assuming that everything not listed there is either not important or simply does not exist. The researchers say that "Google has become the main interface for our whole reality. To be precise: with the Google interface, the user gets the impression that the search results imply a kind of totality. In fact, one only sees a small part of what one could see if one also integrates other research tools".^[54]



[Eric Schmidt](#), former executive chairman of Google

[Eric Schmidt](#), Google's chief executive, said in a 2007 interview with the *Financial Times*: "The goal is to enable Google users to be able to ask the question such as "What shall I do tomorrow?" and "What job shall I take?"".^[55] Schmidt reaffirmed this during a 2010 interview with *The Wall Street Journal*: "I actually think most people don't want Google to answer their questions; they want Google to tell them what they should be doing next."^[56]

Numerous companies and individuals, for example, MyTriggers.com^[57] and transport tycoon [Sir Brian Souter](#),^[58] have voiced concerns regarding the fairness of Google's PageRank and search results after their web sites disappeared from Google's first-page results. In the case of MyTriggers.com, the Ohio-based shopping comparison search site accused Google of favoring its own services in search results (although the judge eventually ruled that the site failed to show harm to other similar businesses).

Danger of ranking manipulation

See also: [Search engine manipulation effect](#) and [Search neutrality](#)

[PageRank](#), Google's page ranking algorithm, can and has been manipulated for political and humorous reasons. To illustrate the view that Google's search engine could be subjected to manipulation, Google Watch implemented a [Google bomb](#) by linking the phrase "out-of-touch executives" to Google's own page on its corporate management. The attempt was mistakenly attributed to disgruntled Google employees by *The New York Times*, which later printed a correction.^{[59][60]}

Daniel Brandt started the Google Watch website and has criticized Google's [PageRank](#) algorithms, saying that they discriminate against new websites and favor established sites.^[61] Chris Beasley, who started Google Watch-Watch, disagrees, saying that Mr. Brandt overstates the amount of discrimination that new websites face and that new websites will naturally rank lower when the ranking is based on a site's "reputation". In Google's world, a site's reputation is in part determined by how many and which other sites link to it (links from sites with a "better" reputation of their own carry more weight). Since new sites will seldom be as heavily linked as older more established sites, they aren't as well known, won't have as much of a reputation, and will receive a lower page ranking.^[62]

In testimony before a [U.S. Senate antitrust](#) panel in September 2011, Jeffrey Katz, the chief executive of [NexTag](#), said that Google's business interests conflict with its engineering commitment to an open-for-all Internet and that: "Google doesn't play fair. Google rigs its results, biasing in favor of [Google Shopping](#) and against competitors like us." Jeremy Stoppelman, the chief of [Yelp](#), said sites like his have to cooperate with Google because it is the gateway to so many users and "Google then gives its own product preferential treatment." In earlier testimony at the same hearing, [Eric Schmidt](#), Google's chairman, said that Google does not "cook the books" to favor its own products and services.^[34]

Portrayals of race and gender

In 2013, Emily McManus, managing editor for [TED.com](#), searched for "english major who taught herself calculus" which prompted Google to ask, "Did you mean: english major who taught *himself* calculus?"^[63] Her tweet of the incident gained traction online. One response included a screengrab of a search for "how much is a wrba ticket?" to which the auto-correct feature suggested, "how much is an nba ticket?" Google responded directly to McManus and explained that the phrase "taught himself calculus" appeared about 282,000 times, whereas the phrase "taught herself calculus" appeared about 4,000 times. The company also made note of its efforts to bring more [women into STEM fields](#).^[64]

In 2015, a man tweeted a screengrab showing that Google Photos had tagged two [African American](#) people as gorillas.^[65] Google apologized, saying they were "appalled and genuinely sorry" and was "working on longer-term fixes."^[66] An investigation by [WIRED](#) two years later showed that the company's solution has been to censor searches for "gorilla," "chimp," "chimpanzee," and "monkey."^[67]

Google Shopping rankings

Main article: [Google Shopping](#)



This section needs to be **updated**. Please help update this article to reflect recent events or newly available information. (*March 2015*)

In late May 2012, Google announced that they will no longer be maintaining a strict separation between search results and advertising. Google Shopping (formerly known as Froogle) would be replaced with a nearly identical interface, according to the announcement, but only paid advertisers would be listed instead of the neutral aggregate listings shown previously. Furthermore, rankings would be determined primarily by which advertisers place the highest "bid", though the announcement does not elaborate on this process. The transition was completed in the fall of 2012.^[68]

As a result of this change to Google Shopping, [Microsoft](#), who operates the competing search engine [Bing](#), launched a public information campaign titled [Scroogled](#).^[69] The ad campaign was developed by leading political campaign strategist [Mark Penn](#).^[70]

It is unclear how consumers have reacted to this move. Critics charge that Google has effectively abandoned its "[Don't be evil](#)" motto and that small businesses will be unable to compete against their larger counterparts. There is also concern that consumers who did not see this announcement will be unaware that they are now looking at paid advertisements and that the top results are no longer determined solely based on relevance but instead will be manipulated according to which company paid the most.^{[71][72]}

Copyright issues

Google Print, Books, and Library

Main articles: [Google Books](#) and [Authors Guild, Inc. v. Google, Inc.](#)

Google's ambitious plans to scan millions of books and make them readable through its search engine have been criticized for [copyright infringement](#).^[73] The [Association for Learned and Professional Society Publishers](#) and the [Association of American University Presses](#) both issued statements strongly opposing [Google Print](#), stating that "Google, an enormously successful company, claims a sweeping right to appropriate the property of others for its own commercial use unless it is told, case by case and instance by instance, not to."^[74]

China Written Works Copyright Society (CWWCS)

In a separate dispute in November 2009, the China Written Works Copyright Society (CWWCS), which protects Chinese writers' copyrights, accused Google of scanning 18,000 books by 570 Chinese writers without authorization, for its Google Books library.^[75] Toward the end of 2009 representatives of the CWWCS said talks with Google about copyright issues are progressing well, that first they "want Google to admit their mistake and apologize", then talk about compensation, while at the same time they "don't want Google to give up China in its digital library project". On November 20, 2009, Google agreed to provide a list of Chinese books it had scanned, but did not admit having "infringed" copyright laws. In a January 9, 2010 statement the head of Google Books in the Asia-Pacific said "communications with Chinese writers have not been good enough" and apologized to the writers.^[76]

Links and cached data

[Kazaa](#) and the [Church of Scientology](#) have used the [Digital Millennium Copyright Act](#) (DMCA) to demand that Google remove references to allegedly [copyrighted](#) material on their sites.^{[77][78]}

Search engines such as Google's that link to sites in "good faith" fall under the safe harbor provisions of the [Online Copyright Infringement Liability Limitation Act](#) which is part of DMCA. If they remove links to infringing content after receiving a [take down notice](#), they are not liable. Google removes links to infringing content when requested, provided that supporting evidence is supplied. However, it is sometimes difficult to judge whether or not certain sites are infringing and Google (and other search engines) will sometimes refuse to remove web pages from its index. To complicate matters there have been conflicting rulings from U.S. courts on whether simply linking to infringing content constitutes "contributory infringement" or not.^{[79][80]}

[The New York Times](#) has complained that the [caching](#) of their content during a web crawl, a feature utilized by search engines including [Google Web Search](#), violates copyright.^[81] Google observes Internet standard mechanisms for requesting that caching be disabled via the [robots.txt](#) file, which is another mechanism that allows operators of a website to request that part or all of their site not be included in search engine results, or via META tags, which allow a content editor to specify whether a document can be crawled or archived, or whether the links on the document can be followed. The U.S. District Court of Nevada ruled that Google's caches do not constitute copyright infringement under [American law](#) in [Field v. Google](#) and [Parker v. Google](#).^{[82][83]}

On February 20, 2017, Google agreed to a voluntary United Kingdom code of practice obligating it to demote links to copyright-infringing content in its search results.^{[84][85]}

Google Map Maker

[Google Map Maker](#) allows user-contributed data to be put into the [Google Maps](#) service,^[86] similar to [OpenStreetMap](#) it includes concepts such as organising mapping parties and mapping for humanitarian efforts.^[87] It has been criticized for taking work done for free by the general public and claiming commercial ownership of it without returning any contributions back to the [commons](#).^[88] as their restrictive license makes it incompatible with most open projects by preventing commercial use or use by competitive services.^[89]

Google Pinyin

Google allegedly used code from Chinese company [Sohu's Sogou Pinyin](#) for its own [input method editor](#), [Google Pinyin](#).^[90]


Where's the Fair Use?

On February 16, 2016, internet [reviewer Doug Walker](#) (The [Nostalgia Critic](#)) posted a video about his concerns related to YouTube's current copyright-claiming system, which was apparently being tipped in favor of claimants rather than creators despite many of those videos being reported as covered under [Fair Use](#) laws. The video featured stories of other YouTubers' experiences with the copyright system, including fellow [Channel Awesome](#) producer [Brad Jones](#), who received a strike on his channel for uploading a film review that took place in a parked car and contained no footage from the film itself. In the video, Walker encouraged others to spread the message using the [hashtag #WTFU](#) (Where's the Fair Use?) on social media.^[91] The hashtag spread among multiple YouTubers, who gave their support to Walker and Channel Awesome and relaying their own stories of issues with YouTube's copyright system, including Dan Murrell of [Screen Junkies](#),^[92] GradeAUnderA, and [Let's Play](#) producers Mark Fishbach ([Markiplier](#)) and Seán William McLoughlin ([Jacksepticeye](#)).^[91]

Ten days later, on February 26, 2016, YouTube CEO [Susan Wojcicki](#) tweeted a link to a post from the YouTube Help Forum and thanked the community for bringing the issue to their attention. The post, written by a member of the YouTube Policy Team named Spencer (no last name was given), stated that they will be working to strengthen communication between creators and YouTube Support and "improvements to increase transparency into the status of monetization claims."^[93]

Privacy

Main article: [Privacy concerns regarding Google](#)



[PRISM](#): a [clandestine surveillance](#) program under which the [NSA](#) collects user data from companies like Google.^[94] (Slide sourced from [The Washington Post](#) that briefed intelligence analysts at the National Security Agency about the PRISM program touting its capabilities and featuring the logos of the companies involved)

Google's March 1, 2012 privacy change enables the company to share data across a wide variety of services.^[95] This includes embedded services in millions of third-party websites using AdSense and Analytics. The policy was widely criticized as creating an environment that discourages Internet innovation by making Internet users more fearful online.^[96]

In December 2009, after privacy concerns were raised, Google's CEO, [Eric Schmidt](#), declared: "If you have something that you don't want anyone to know, maybe you shouldn't be doing it in the first place. If you really need that kind of privacy, the reality is that search engines—including Google—do retain this information for some time and it's important, for example, that we are all subject in the United States to the [Patriot Act](#) and it is possible that all that information could be made available to the authorities."^[97]

[Privacy International](#) has raised concerns regarding the dangers and privacy implications of having a centrally located, widely popular data warehouse of millions of Internet users' searches, and how under controversial existing U.S. law, Google can be forced to hand over all such information to the [U.S. government](#).^[98] In its 2007 Consultation Report, Privacy International ranked Google as "Hostile to Privacy", its lowest rating on their report, making Google the only company in the list to receive that ranking.^{[98][99][100]}

At the Techonomy conference in 2010, Eric Schmidt predicted that "true transparency and no anonymity" is the way forward for the internet: "In a world of asynchronous threats it is too dangerous for there not to be some way to identify you. We need a [verified] name service for people. Governments will demand it." He also said that "If I look at enough of your messaging and your location, and use artificial intelligence, we can predict where you are going to go. Show us 14 photos of yourself and we can identify who you are. You think you don't have 14 photos of yourself on the internet? You've got Facebook photos!"^[101]

In the summer of 2016, Google quietly dropped its ban on personally identifiable info in its [DoubleClick](#) ad service. Google's privacy policy was changed to state it "may" combine web-browsing records obtained through DoubleClick with what the company learns from the use of other Google services. While new users were automatically opted-in, existing users were asked if they wanted to opt-in, and it remains possible to opt-out by going to the Activity controls in the My Account page of a Google account. *ProPublica* states that "The practical result of the change is that the DoubleClick ads that follow people around on the web may now be customized to them based on your name and other information Google knows about you. It also means that Google could now, if it wished to, build a complete portrait of a user by name, based on everything they write in email, every website they visit and the searches they conduct." Google contacted *ProPublica* to correct the fact that it doesn't "currently" use Gmail keywords to target web ads.^[102]

Google has a US\$1.2 billion artificial intelligence and [surveillance](#) contract with the [Israeli military](#) known as [Project Nimbus](#). According to Google employees, the Israeli military could use this technology to expand its surveillance of Palestinians living in occupied territories.^[103] In what has been described as "retaliation for publicly criticizing the contract,"^[104] Google relocated an outspoken employee overseas. Other Palestinian employees have described an "institutionalised bias" within the company.^[105]

Disha Ravi's arrest

Google shared environment activist [Disha Ravi](#)'s document on Google Docs with the Delhi police which led to her arrest.^[106]

Censorship

Main article: [Censorship by Google](#)

Google has been criticized for various instances of [censoring](#) its search results, many times in compliance with the laws of various countries, most notably while it operated in [China](#) from January 2006 to March 2010.

Web search

See also: [Censorship by Google § Google Search](#)

As of December 12, 2012, Google's SafeSearch feature applies to image searches in the United States. Prior to the change, three SafeSearch settings—"on", "moderate", and "off"—were available to users. Following the change, two "Filter explicit results" settings—"on" and "off"—were newly established. The former and new "on" settings are similar and exclude explicit images from search results. The new "off" setting still permits explicit images to appear in search results, but users need to enter more specific search requests, and no direct equivalent of the old "off" setting exists following the change. The change brings image search results into line with Google's existing settings for web and video search.

Some users have stated that the lack of a completely unfiltered option amounts to "censorship" by Google. A Google spokesperson disagreed, saying that Google is "not censoring any adult content", and "[wants] to show users exactly what they are looking for—but we aim not to show sexually explicit results unless a user is specifically searching for them."^[107]

The search term "[bisexual](#)" was blacklisted for [Instant Search](#) until 2012, when it was removed at the request of the [BiNet USA](#) advocacy organization.^[108]

China

See also: [Google China](#)

Google has been involved in the censorship of certain sites in specific countries and regions. Until March 2010, Google adhered to the [Internet censorship policies of China](#)^[109] enforced by filters colloquially known as "The [Great Firewall of China](#)". Google.cn search results were filtered to remove some information perceived to be harmful to the People's Republic of China (PRC). Google claimed that some censorship is necessary in order to keep the Chinese government from blocking Google entirely, as occurred in 2002.^[110] The company claims it did not plan to give the government information about users who search for blocked content, and will inform users that content has been restricted if they attempt to search for it.^[111] As of 2009, Google was the only major China-based search engine to explicitly *inform* the user when search results are blocked or hidden. As of December 2012, Google no longer informs the user of possible censorship for certain queries during search.^[112]

Some Chinese Internet users were critical of Google for assisting the Chinese government in repressing its own citizens, particularly those dissenting against the government and advocating for human rights.^[113] Furthermore, Google had been denounced and called hypocritical by [Free Media Movement](#) for agreeing to China's demands while simultaneously fighting the United States government's requests for similar information.^[114] Google China had also been condemned by [Reporters Without Borders](#),^[114] [Human Rights Watch](#)^[115] and [Amnesty International](#).^[116]


In 2009, [China Central Television](#), [Xinhua News Agency](#), and [People's Daily](#) all reported on Google's "dissemination of obscene information", and People's Daily claimed that "Google's 'don't be evil' motto becomes a fig leaf".^{[117][118]} The Chinese government imposed administrative penalties to Google China, and demanded a reinforcement of censorship.^[119]

In 2010, according to a [leaked diplomatic cable](#) from the U.S. Embassy in Beijing, there were reports that the Chinese Politburo directed the [intrusion of Google's computer systems in a worldwide coordinated campaign of computer sabotage and the attempt to access information about Chinese dissidents](#), carried out by "government operatives, public security experts and Internet outlaws recruited by the Chinese government."^[120] The report suggested that it was part of an ongoing campaign in which attackers have "broken into American government computers and those of Western allies, the [Dalai Lama](#) and American businesses since 2002."

In response to [the attack](#), Google announced that they were "no longer willing to continue censoring our results on Google.cn, and so over the next few weeks we will be discussing with the Chinese government the basis on which we could operate an unfiltered search engine within the law, if at all."^{[121][122]} On March 22, 2010, after talks with Chinese authorities failed to reach an agreement, the company redirected its censor-complying [Google China](#) service to its Google Hong Kong service, which is outside the jurisdiction of Chinese censorship laws. From the business perspective, many recognize that the move was likely to affect Google's profits: "Google is going to pay a heavy price for its move, which is why it deserves praise for refusing to censor its service in China."^[123] However, at least as of March 23, 2010, "The Great Firewall" continues to censor search results from the Hong Kong portal, www.google.com.hk (as it does with the US portal, www.google.com) for controversial terms such as "[Falun gong](#)" and "the June 4 incident" ([1989 Tiananmen Square protests and massacre](#)).^{[124][125][126]}

In 2018, [Lhadon Tsethony](#), director of the [Tibet Action Institute](#), said there was a, "crisis of repression unfolding across China and territories it controls." and that, "it is shocking to know that Google is planning to return to China and has been building a tool that will help the Chinese authorities engage in censorship and surveillance." She further noted that "Google should be using its incredible wealth, talent, and resources to work with us to find solutions to lift people up and help ease their suffering — not assisting the Chinese government to keep people in chains."^[127]

Turkey

 This section **needs expansion**. You can help by [adding to it](#). (May 2020)

Google has been involved in censorship of Google Maps satellite imagery countrywide affecting Android and iOS apps using .com, .tr, and .tdl automatically. Desktop users can easily evade this censorship by just removing .tr, and .tdl from the URL but the same technique is impossible with smartphone apps.

Russia

Google removed the [Smart Voting](#) app from the Play Store before the [2021 Russian legislative election](#). The application, which had been created by the associates of the imprisoned opposition leader [Alexei Navalny](#), offered voting advice for all voting districts in Russia. It was removed after a meeting with Russian Federation Council officials on 16 September 2021. The Wired reported that several Google employees were threatened with criminal prosecution. Google's actions were condemned as political censorship by Russian opposition figures.^[128]

In March 2022, Google removed an app, designed to help Russians register protest votes against Putin, from its Play Store.^[129]

AdSense/AdWords

Main articles: [Google AdSense](#) and [Google AdWords](#)

In February 2003, Google stopped showing the advertisements of [Oceana](#), a non-profit organization protesting a [major cruise ship operation](#)'s sewage treatment practices. Google cited its editorial policy at the time, stating "Google does not accept advertising if the ad or site advocates against other individuals, groups, or organizations."^[130] The policy was later changed.^[131]

In April 2008, Google refused to run ads for a UK Christian group opposed to abortion, explaining that "At this time, Google policy does not permit the advertisement of websites that contain 'abortion and religion-related content.'" The UK Christian group sued Google for discrimination, and as a result, in September 2008 Google changed its policy and anti-abortion ads were allowed.^[132]

In August 2008, Google closed the AdSense account of a site that carried a negative view of [Scientology](#), the second closing of such a site within 3 months.^[133] It is not certain if the account revocations actually were on the grounds of anti-religious content, however, the cases have raised questions about Google's terms in regards to AdSense/AdWords. The AdSense policy states that "Sites displaying Google ads may not include [...] advocacy against any individual, group, or organization",^[134] which allows Google to revoke the above-mentioned AdSense accounts.

In May 2011, Google cancelled the AdWord advertisement purchased by a Dublin sex worker rights group named "Turn Off the Blue Light" (TOBL),^[135] claiming that it represented an "egregious violation" of company ad policy by "selling adult sexual services". However, TOBL is a nonprofit campaign for sex worker rights and is not advertising or selling adult sexual services.^[136] In July, after TOBL members held a protest outside Google's European headquarters in Dublin and wrote to complain, Google relented, reviewed the group's website, found its content to be advocating a political position, and restored the AdWord advertisement.^[137]

In June 2012, Google rejected the [Australian Sex Party](#)'s ads for [AdWords](#) and sponsored search results for the July 12 by-election for the [state seat of Melbourne](#), saying the Party breached its rules which prevent solicitation of donations by a website that did not display tax-exempt status. Although the Sex Party amended its website to display tax deductibility information, Google continued to ban the ads. The ads were reinstated on election eve after it was reported in the media that the Sex Party was considering suing Google. On September 13, 2012, the Party lodged formal complaints against Google with the [US Department of Justice](#) and the Australian competition watchdog, accusing Google of "unlawful interference in the conduct of a state election in [Victoria](#) with corrupt intent" in violation of the [Foreign Corrupt Practices Act](#).^[138]

YouTube

Main article: [Censorship by Google § YouTube](#)

See also: [YouTube § Moderation and offensive content](#), and [YouTube copyright issues](#)

YouTube is a [video sharing](#) website acquired by Google in 2006. YouTube's [Terms of Service](#) prohibits the posting of videos which violate [copyrights](#) or depict pornography, illegal acts, gratuitous violence, or [hate speech](#).^[139] User-posted videos that violate such terms may be removed and replaced with a message stating: "This video is no longer available because its content violated YouTube's Terms of Service".

YouTube has been criticized by national governments for failing to police content. For example, videos^[140] have been critically accused for being "left up", among other videos featuring unwarranted violence or strong ill-intention against people who probably didn't want this to be published. In 2006, Thailand blocked access to YouTube for users with Thai IP addresses. Thai authorities identified 20 offensive videos and demanded that YouTube remove them before it would unblock any YouTube content.^[141] In 2007 a Turkish judge ordered access to YouTube blocked because of content that insulted [Mustafa Kemal Atatürk](#), which is a crime under Turkish law.^[141] On February 22, 2008, [Pakistan Telecommunications Authority](#) (PTA) attempted to block regional access to YouTube following a government order. The attempt inadvertently caused a worldwide YouTube blackout that took 2 hours to correct.^[142] Four days later, PTA lifted the ban after YouTube removed controversial religious comments made by a Dutch Member of Parliament^[143] concerning Islam.^[144]

YouTube has also been criticized by its users for attempting to censor content. In November 2007, the account of [Wael Abbas](#), a well known Egyptian activist who posted videos of police brutality, voting irregularities and anti-government demonstrations, was blocked for three days.^{[145][146][147]}

In February 2008, a video produced by the [American Life League](#) that accused a [Planned Parenthood](#) television commercial of promoting [recreational sex](#) was removed, then reinstated two days later.^[148] In October, a video by political speaker [Pat Conde](#)ll criticizing the British government for officially sanctioning sharia law courts in Britain was removed, then reinstated two days later.^[149] YouTube also pulled a video of columnist [Michelle Malkin](#) showing violence by Muslim extremists.^[150] Siva Vaidhyanathan, a professor of Media Studies at the University of Virginia, commented that while, in his opinion, Michelle Malkin disseminates bigotry in her blog, "that does not mean that this particular video is bigoted; it's not. But because it's by Malkin, it's a target."^[151]

In 2019, YouTube settled for \$170 million the [FTC](#) and the New York Attorney General for alleged violations of the US [Children's Online Privacy Protection Act](#) (COPPA), which prohibits internet companies from collecting data from kids under 13. YouTube's enactment of the settlement started in January 2020; this required creators to indicate whether their videos were intended for children, with fines of up to \$42,530 per violation of COPPA.^[152] Some features that depend on [user data](#) are disabled on videos designated for children, including comments and channel branding watermarks; the 'donate' button; cards and end screens; live chat and live chat donations; notifications; and 'save to playlist' or 'watch later' features. Such channels will also become "[ungoogleable](#)".^[152]

In October 2021, YouTube, together with Snapchat and TikTok, participated in a Senate hearing on protecting children online.^[153] The session was prompted by Facebook whistle blower [Frances Haugen](#)'s hearing prior. In the hearing, the social media companies tried to distance themselves from Facebook, to which Senate Commerce consumer protection Chair [Richard Blumenthal](#) responded saying "Being different from Facebook is not a defense", "That bar is in the gutter."^[154]

Ungoogleable

Main article: [Google \(verb\)](#)

In 2013, Google successfully prevented the [Swedish Language Council](#) from including the [Swedish](#) version of the word "[ungoogleable](#)" ("[ogooglebar](#)"^[sv]) in its list of new words.^[155] Google objected to its definition (which referred to web searches in general without mentioning Google specifically) and the council was forced to remove it to avoid legal confrontation with Google.^[156] They also accused Google of "trying to control the Swedish language".^[157]

Other types of censorship

In August 2022, Google closed a person's account on sharing pictures of his son's genitals with the doctor, as it was flagged as child abuse by Google's automated systems.^[158]

Labor practices

Several former Google employees have spoken out about working conditions, practices, and ethics at the company. As the company became more concerned about leaks to the press in 2019, it scaled employee all-hands meetings from weekly to monthly, limiting question topics to business and product strategy.^[159] Google CEO [Sundar Pichai](#) told employees in late 2019 that the company is "genuinely struggling with some issues" including transparency and employee trust.^[160]

On 2 December 2020, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) filed a complaint against Google for 'terminations and intimidation in order to quell workplace activism'. The complaint was filed after a year-long investigation by a terminated employee. He filed a petition in 2019, after that many Google employees carried out internal protests against Google's work with US Customs and Border Protection.^[161]

Diversity politics

Main article: [Google memo](#)

A widely circulated internal memo, written by senior engineer James Damore, [Google's Ideological Echo Chamber](#), sharply criticized Google's political biases and employee policies.^[162] Google said the memo was "advancing harmful gender stereotypes" and fired Damore.^[163] [David Brooks](#) demanded the resignation of its CEO [Sundar Pichai](#) for mishandling the case.^{[164][165]}

Ads criticizing Pichai and Google for the firing were put up shortly after at various Google locations.^[166] Some have called to boycott Google and its services, with a hashtag #boycottGoogle coming up on Twitter.^[167] A rally against Google alleged partisanship was planned as "March on Google", but later cancelled due to threats and the Charlottesville mayhem.^{[168][169]}

Arne Wilberg, an ex-YouTube recruiter, claimed that he was fired in November 2017 when he complained about Google's new practices in not hiring white and Asian men to YouTube in favor of women and minority applicants. According to the lawsuit, an internal policy document stated that for three months in 2017, YouTube recruiters should only hire diverse candidates.^[170]

In June 2021, Google removed its global lead for diversity strategy and research after being made aware of an [antisemitic](#) comment he made in 2007.^[171]

Harassment and discrimination

'Google Silicon Valley Employees Join a Worldwide Protest' – video news report from [Voice of America](#)^[172]

Further information: [2018 Google walkouts](#)

In February 2016, [Amit Singhal](#), vice president of Google Search for 15 years, left the company following sexual harassment allegations. Google has awarded Singhal \$15 million in severance.^{[173][174]}

On November 1, 2018, approximately 20,000 employees of [Google](#) engaged in a worldwide^[175] [walkout](#) to protest the way in which the company has handled sexual harassment, and other grievances.^{[176][177][178][179][180]}

In July 2019, Google settled a long-running age discrimination lawsuit brought by 227 over-40 employees and job seekers. Although Google denied it had age discrimination, it agreed to a settlement of \$11 million for the plaintiffs, to train its employees not to have age-based bias, and to have its recruiting department focus on age diversity among its engineering employees.^{[181][182]}

In January 2020, the [San Francisco Pride](#) organization voted to ban Google and YouTube from their annual [Pride parade](#) due to hate speech on their platforms and retaliation against LGBTQ activists.^[183]

In 2020, HR executive Eileen Naughton joined long-time Chief Legal Counsel David Drummond in stepping down from their positions over a lawsuit naming them and the company founders in accusations of mishandling years of sexual harassment complaints.^[184]

In February 2020, the [U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission](#) (EEOC) opened an investigation into former Google employee [Chelsey Glasson](#)'s allegations of pregnancy discrimination.^[185] Glasson filed a state civil lawsuit while the EEOC investigated, with a trial date set for January 2022.^{[186][187][188]} She settled with the company in February 2022.^[189] She revealed that Google's legal team obtained therapy notes from her sessions through the company's [Employee assistance program](#) counseling provider, and that the provider dropped her as a client when she filed the lawsuit, which sparked Senator [Karen Keiser](#) to introduce a bill in [Washington](#) in January 2022 to prohibit [private sector](#) providers from disclosing private information typically covered under [Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act](#) laws.^{[190][191][192]} Also in January 2022, she criticized the company's use of [non-disclosure agreements](#) (NDAs) in testimony to the [Washington House of Representatives](#) for whistleblower protection legislature, which she said intimidated her from speaking out about the discrimination she allegedly witnessed and experienced. In response, Google told [Protocol](#) that their confidentiality agreements do not prevent current and former workers from disclosing facts pertaining to harassment or discrimination.^[193] Both laws were passed into legislature in March 2022.^{[194][195]}

Allegations of union busting

The official settlement agreement that Google signed with the NLRB in 2019 includes this notice to be sent to employees:^[196]

"YOU HAVE THE RIGHT to discuss wages, hours, and working conditions with other employees, the press/media, and other third parties, and WE WILL NOT do anything to interfere with your exercise of those rights."

Google has been criticized for hiring IRI Consultants, a firm that advertises its accomplishments in helping organizations prevent successful union organizing.^[197] Google Zurich attempted to cancel employee-organized meetings about labor rights in June and October 2019.^[198] Some Google employees and contractors are already unionized, including security guards, some service workers, and analysts and trainers for Google Shopping in Pittsburgh employed by contractor HCL.^[199] In 2021 court documents revealed that between 2018 and 2020 Google ran an anti-union campaign called Project Vivian to "convince [employees] that unions suck".^[200]

As of December 2019, the [National Labor Relations Board](#) is investigating whether several firings were in retaliation for labor organizing-related activities.^{[201][202]} One of the fired employees was tasked with informing her colleagues about Google policy changes, and created a message informing them that they, "have the right to participate in protected concerted activities," when they visited the IRI Consultants site.^{[203][204]}

Xinjiang region

In 2020, the [Australian Strategic Policy Institute](#) accused at least 82 major brands, including Google, of being connected to forced [Uyghur](#) labor in [Xinjiang](#).^[205]

Other

Non-alignment with US defense

See also: [Artificial intelligence arms race § Disassociation](#)

Former [Deputy Defense Secretary Robert O. Work](#) in 2018 criticized Google and its employees have stepped into a [Moral Hazard](#) for themselves as not continuing Pentagon's [artificial intelligence](#) project, Project Maven,^[206] while helping China's AI technology that "could be used against the United States in a conflict." He described Google as hypocritical, given it has opened an AI center in China and "Anything that's going on in the AI center in China is going to the Chinese government and then will ultimately end up in the hands of the Chinese military." Work said "I didn't see any Google employee saying, 'Hmm, maybe we shouldn't do that.'" Google's dealings with China is decrying as unpatriotic.^{[207][208][209]}

[Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff](#) General [Joseph Dunford](#) also criticizes [Google](#) as "it's inexplicable" that it continue investing in China, "who uses [censorship technology to restrain freedoms](#) and [crackdown on people](#) there and has long history of [intellectual property](#) and [patent](#) theft which hurts U.S. companies," while simultaneously not renewing further research and development collaborations with [the Pentagon](#). He said, "I'm not sure that people at Google will enjoy a world order that is informed by the norms and standards of Russia or China." He urges Google to work directly with the U.S. government instead of making controversial inroads into China.^[210] Senator [Mark Warner](#) (D-VA) criticized Dragonfly evidences China's success at "recruit[ing] U.S. companies to their information control efforts" while China exports cyber and censorship infrastructure to countries like Venezuela, Ethiopia, and Pakistan.^[211]

Energy consumption

See also: [Google Energy](#)

Google has been criticized for the high amount of energy used to maintain its servers,^[212] but was praised by [Greenpeace](#) for the use of renewable sources of energy to run them.^[213] Google has pledged to spend millions of dollars to investigate cheap, clean, [renewable energy](#), and has installed [solar panels](#) on the roofs at its [Mountain View](#) facilities.^{[214][215]} In 2010, Google also invested \$39 million in wind power.^[216]

Google bus protests

Main article: [San Francisco tech bus protests](#)

In late 2013, activists in the San Francisco Bay Area began protesting the use of shuttle buses by Google and other tech companies, viewing them as symbols of [gentrification](#) and [displacement](#) in a city where the rapid growth of the tech sector has driven up housing prices.^{[217][218]}

Google Video

Main article: [Google Video](#)

On August 15, 2007, Google discontinued its Download-to-own/Download-to-rent (DTO/DTR) program.^[219] Some videos previously purchased for ownership under that program were no longer viewable when the embedded [Digital Rights Management](#) (DRM) licenses were revoked. Google gave refunds for the full amount spent on videos using "gift certificates" (or "bonuses") to their customers' "Google Checkout Account".^{[220][221]} After a public uproar, Google issued full refunds to the credit cards of the Google Video users without revoking the gift certificates.

Search within search

Main article: [Google Search](#)

For some search results, Google provides a secondary search box that can be used to search within a website identified from the first search. It sparked controversy among some online publishers and retailers. When performing a second search within a specific website, advertisements from competing and rival companies often showed up together with the results from the website being searched. This has the potential to draw users away from the website they were originally searching.^[222] "While the service could help increase traffic, some users could be siphoned away as Google uses the prominence of the brands to sell ads, typically to competing companies."^[223] In order to combat this controversy, Google has offered to turn off this feature for companies who request to have it removed.^[223]

According to software engineer Ben Lee and Product Manager Jack Menzel, the idea for search within search originated from the way users were searching. It appeared that users were often not finding exactly what they needed while trying to explore within a company site. "Teleporting" on the web, where users need only type part of the name of a website into Google (no need to remember the entire URL) in order to find the correct site, is what helps Google users complete their search. Google took this concept a step further and instead of just "teleporting", users could type in keywords to search within the website of their choice.^[224]

Naming of Go programming language

Main articles: [Go \(programming language\)](#) and [Go! \(programming language\)](#)

Google is criticized for naming their programming language "[Go](#)" while there is already an existing programming language called "[Go!](#)".^{[225][226][227]}

Potential security threats

Google's [Street View](#) has been criticized for providing information that could potentially be useful to terrorists. In the United Kingdom during March 2010, [Liberal Democrats](#) MP [Paul Keetch](#) and unnamed military officers criticized Google for including pictures of the entrance to the British Army [Special Air Service](#) (SAS) base, stating that terrorists might use the information to plan attacks. Google responded that it "only takes images from public roads and this is no different to what anyone could see traveling down the road themselves, therefore there is no appreciable security risk." Military sources stated that "It is highly irresponsible for military bases, especially special forces, to be pictured on the internet. [...] The question is, why risk a very serious security breach for the sake of having a picture on a website?"^{[228][229]} Google was subsequently forced to remove images of the SAS base and other military, security and intelligence installations, admitting that its trained drivers had failed to not take photographs in areas banned under the [Official Secrets Act](#).^[230]

In 2008, Google complied with requests from [The Pentagon](#) to remove Street View images of the entrances to military bases.^{[231][232]}

Politics

Scope of influence

Despite being one of the world's largest and most influential companies, unlike many other technology companies, Google does not disclose its political spending. In August 2010, New York City Public Advocate [Bill de Blasio](#) launched a national campaign urging the corporation to disclose all of its political spending.^[233] In the 2010s, Google spent about \$150 million on lobbying, largely related to privacy protections and regulation of monopolies.^{[234][235]}

Google sponsors several non-profit lobbying groups, such as the Coalition for a Digital Economy (CoadeC) in the UK.^[236] Google has sponsored meetings of the conservative [Competitive Enterprise Institute](#) who have had speakers including libertarian Republican and [Tea Party](#) member, and Senator for Kentucky, [Rand Paul](#).^[237]

[Peter Thiel](#) stated that Google had too much influence on the [Obama administration](#), claiming that the company "had more power under Obama than [Exxon](#) had under [Bush 43](#)".^[238] There are many [revolving door](#) examples between Google and the U.S. government. This includes: 53 revolving door moves between Google and the White House; 22 former White House officials who left the administration to work for Google and 31 Google executives who joined the White House;^[239] 45 [Obama for America](#) campaign staffers leaving for Google or Google controlled companies; 38 revolving door moves between Google and government positions involving national security, intelligence or the Department of Defense;^[240] 23 revolving door moves between Google and the State Department; and 18 Pentagon officials moving to Google.

As of 2018, studies found that employees of Alphabet donated largely to support the election of candidates from the [Democratic Party](#).^[241]

In 2023, Alphabet lobbied on antitrust issues and three particular antitrust bills, spending \$7.43 million in the first quarter of 2023, lobbying the federal government and more money in the second quarter of 2023, than in any quarter since 2018.^[42]

Climate change

In 2013, Google joined the [American Legislative Exchange Council](#) (ALEC).^{[242][243]} In September 2014, Google chairman Eric Schmidt announced the company would leave ALEC for lying about climate change and "hurting our children".^[244]

In 2018, Google started an oil, gas, and energy division, hiring Darryl Willis, a 25-year [BP](#) executive who *The Wall Street Journal* said was intended "to court the oil and gas industry."^[245] Google Cloud signed an agreement with the French oil company [Total S.A.](#), "to jointly develop artificial intelligence solutions for subsurface data analysis in oil and gas exploration and production."^[246] A partnership with Houston oil investment bank Tudor, Pickering, Holt & Co. was described by the *Houston Chronicle* as giving Google "a more visible presence in Houston as one of its oldest industries works to cut costs in the wake of the oil bust and remain competitive as electric vehicles and renewable power sources gain market share."^[247] Other agreements were made with oilfield services companies [Baker Hughes](#) and [Schlumberger](#),^[247] and [Anadarko Petroleum](#), to use "artificial intelligence to analyse large volumes of seismic and operational data to find oil, maximise output and increase efficiency,"^[248] and negotiations were started with petroleum giant [Saudi Aramco](#).^[249]

In 2019, Google was criticised for sponsoring a conference that included a session promoting [climate change denial](#). LibertyCon speaker Caleb Rossiter belongs to the [CO₂ Coalition](#), a nonprofit that advocates for more carbon dioxide in the atmosphere.^[250] In November 2019, over 1,000 Google employees demanded that the company commit to zero emissions by 2030 and cancel contracts with fossil fuel companies.^[251]

In February 2022, the NewClimate Institute, a German environmental policy think tank, published a survey evaluating the transparency and progress of the climate strategies and carbon neutrality pledges announced by 25 major companies in the United States that found that Alphabet's carbon neutrality pledge and climate strategy was unsubstantiated and misleading.^{[252][253]}

In April 2022, Alphabet, [Meta Platforms](#), [Shopify](#), [McKinsey & Company](#), and [Stripe, Inc.](#) announced a \$925 million [advance market commitment](#) of [carbon dioxide removal](#) from companies that are developing the technology over the next 9 years.^{[254][255]} In January 2023, the [American Clean Power Association](#) released an annual industry report that found that 326 corporations had contracted 77.4 gigawatts of wind or solar energy by the end of 2022 and that the three corporate purchasers of the largest volumes of wind and solar energy were Alphabet, [Amazon](#), and [Meta Platforms](#).^[256]

AGreenerGoogle.com

In April 2020, [Extinction Rebellion](#) launched "*agreenergoogle.com*", a [spoof website](#) containing a fake announcement by Google CEO [Sundar Pichai](#) claiming that "they would stop funding of organizations that deny or work to block action on climate change, effective immediately".^{[257][258]}

YouTube user comments

Main article: [YouTube § Comment system](#)

Most YouTube videos allow users to leave comments, and these have attracted attention for the negative aspects of both their form and content. In 2006, *Time* praised [Web 2.0](#) for enabling "community and collaboration on a scale never seen before", and added that YouTube "harnesses the stupidity of crowds as well as its wisdom. Some of the comments on YouTube make you weep for the future of humanity just for the spelling alone, never mind the obscenity and the naked hatred".^[259] *The Guardian* in 2009 described users' comments on YouTube as:

Juvenile, aggressive, misspelled, sexist, homophobic, swinging from raging at the contents of a video to providing a pointlessly detailed description followed by a LOL, YouTube comments are a hotbed of infantile debate and unashamed ignorance – with the occasional burst of wit shining through.^[260]

In September 2008, *The Daily Telegraph* commented that YouTube was "notorious" for "some of the most confrontational and ill-formed comment exchanges on the internet", and reported on YouTube Comment Snob, "a new piece of software that blocks rude and illiterate posts".^[261] *The Huffington Post* noted in April 2012 that finding comments on YouTube that appear "offensive, stupid and crass" to the "vast majority" of the people is hardly difficult.^[262]

On November 6, 2013, Google implemented a new comment system that requires all YouTube users to use a [Google+](#) account to comment on videos, thereby making the comment system Google+-orientated.^[263] The corporation stated that the change is necessary to personalize comment sections for viewers, eliciting an overwhelmingly negative public response—YouTube co-founder [Jawed Karim](#) also expressed disdain by writing on his channel: "why the fuck do I need a Google+ account to comment on a video?".^[264] The official YouTube announcement received over 62,000 "thumbs down" votes and only just over 4,000 "thumbs up" votes, while an online petition demanding Google+'s removal gained more than 230,000 signatures in just over two months.^{[265][266]} Writing in the *Newsday* blog Silicon Island, Chase Melvin noted: "Google+ is nowhere near as popular a social media network as Facebook, but it's essentially being forced upon millions of YouTube users who don't want to lose their ability to comment on videos."^[267] In the same article Melvin adds:

Perhaps user complaints are justified, but the idea of revamping the old system isn't so bad. Think of the crude, misogynistic and racially-charged mudslinging that has transpired over the last eight years on YouTube without any discernible moderation. Isn't any attempt to curb unidentified libelers worth a shot? The system is far from perfect, but Google should be lauded for trying to alleviate some of the damage caused by irate YouTubers hiding behind animosity and anonymity.^[267]

On July 27, 2015, Google announced that Google+ would no longer be required for using various services, including YouTube.^{[268][269]} Users are now able to delete their Google+ profile without losing features or content.^[270]

Zero-rating

Google has supported [net neutrality](#) in the US, while opposing it in India by supporting [zero-rating](#).^[271]

2016 April Fools' joke

On April 1, 2016, the Mic Drop April Fools' joke in Gmail caused damage for users who accidentally clicked the button Google installed on that occasion.^[272]

Think Tank meddling

The New York Times reported that Google has pressured the [New America](#) think tank which is supported by it, to remove a statement supporting the [EU antitrust fine against Google](#). After [Eric Schmidt](#) voiced his displeasure from the statement, the whole research group involved were sidelined in the New America think tank, which gets funding from Google.^{[273][274]} Consequently, the Open Markets research group went to open their own think tank, which will not get any funding from Google.^[274]

ANS patent controversy

Wide attention in Polish media has resulted from Google's attempt to patent video compression application of [ANS coding](#), which is now widely used in products of e.g. Apple, Facebook and Google. Its author has helped Google in this adaptation for three years through public forum, but was not included in the patent application. He was supported in fighting this patent by his employer: [Jagiellonian University](#).^{[275][276][277][278][279]}

Spatial data and the city

Google's huge share of spatial information services, including Google Maps and the Google Places API, has been criticised by activists and academics in terms of the cartographic power it affords Google to map and represent the world's cities.^[280] In addition, given Google and Alphabet Inc.'s increasing involvement with urban planning, particularly through subsidiaries like [Sidewalk Labs](#),^[281] this has resulted in criticism that Google is exerting an increasing power over urban areas that may not be beneficial to democracy in the long term.^{[282][283]} This criticism is also related to wider concerns around democracy and [Smart Cities](#) that has been directed to a number of other large corporations.^{[284][285]}

Breach of court order

On 10 December 2018, a New Zealand court ordered that the name of a man accused of murdering British traveller [Grace Millane](#) be withheld from the public (a [gag order](#)). The next morning, Google named the man in an email it sent people who had subscribed to "what's trending in New Zealand".^[286] Lawyers warned that this could compromise the trial, and Justice Minister Andrew Little said that Google was in contempt of court.^{[287][288]} Google said that it had been unaware of the court order, and that the email had been created by algorithms.

Electronic pop-up books patent

In 2016, Google filed a patent application for interactive pop-up books with electronics.^[289] Jie Qi noticed that the patent resembled work she had shared when she visited [Google ATAP](#) in 2014 as a PhD student at the [MIT Media Lab](#); two of the Google employees listed on the application as inventors had also interviewed her during the same visit. After Qi submitted [prior art](#) to the [USPTO](#), the application was abandoned.^{[290][291]}

Project Nightingale

[Project Nightingale](#) is a health care [data sharing](#) project financed by [Google](#) and [Ascension](#), a Catholic health care system, the second largest in the United States. Ascension owns comprehensive health care information on millions of former and current patients who are part of its system. Google and Ascension have been processing this data, in secret, since sometime in 2018, without the knowledge and consent of patients and doctors. The work they are doing appears to comply with federal health care law which includes "robust protections for patient data."^{[292][293][294]} However, concerns have been voiced whether the transfer really is [HIPAA](#) compliant.^[295] The project is Google's attempt to gain a large scale foothold into the healthcare industry.^[292]

YouTube: ads forced on all videos, without revenue-share

In 2020, Google-owned [YouTube](#) changed its policy so that it could include ads on all videos, regardless of whether the content-creator wanted them or not. Those who were not part of Google's Partner Program would receive no revenue for this. To join the program, creators must have more than 1,000 subscribers and 4,000 hours of viewed content in the last 12 months.^{[296][297]}

Abuse of attorney-client privilege


In March 2022, the Department of Justice and 14 state attorneys general accused Google of misusing [attorney–client privilege](#) to hide emails from subpoenas using an employee policy called 'Communicate with Care,' which instructs employees to [carbon copy](#) (CC) Google's attorneys on emails and flag them as exempt from disclosure. Employees are directed to add a general request for the attorney's advice even when no legal advice is needed or sought. Often Google's lawyers will not respond to such requests, which the Justice Department claimed shows they understand and are participating in the evasion.^[298]

Deletion of inactive accounts

In May 2023, Google announced that deletion of inactive user accounts would occur starting in December 2023, citing security reasons, noting that old and unused accounts are more likely to be compromised. Google claimed that "Forgotten or unattended accounts often rely on old or re-used passwords that may have been compromised, haven't had two factor authentication set up, and receive fewer security checks by the user," while saying that Google "has no plans to delete [YouTube](#) videos".^{[299][300][301]}

The decision to delete inactive accounts has sparked some criticism and backlash. The cited security rationale behind such decision was ridiculed and was compared to a hypothetical scenario where a bank should be burned down if it is not secure against robbers.^[302] Moreover, the [Anonymous hacktivist collective](#) has protested against the decision to delete inactive accounts multiple times, describing them as "harsh" and saying that the decision will "destroy history".^{[303][304][305]}

See also

-  [Internet portal](#)
- [Criticisms of software and websites](#)
- [DeGoogle](#)
- [Don't be evil](#)
- [Filter bubble](#)
- [Google litigation](#)
- [Google Search](#)
- [Googlization](#)
- [High-Tech Employee Antitrust Litigation](#)
- [History of Google](#)
- [Ireland as a tax haven](#)
- [Stochastic parrot](#)
- [Surveillance capitalism](#)
- [The Creepy Line](#)
- [Who Owns the Future?](#)

References

1.
 - Levine, Yasha (December 20, 2018). ["Google's Earth: how the tech giant is helping the state spy on us". *The Guardian*](#).
 -
 - See: [List of Google products](#).
 -
 - ["Financial Tables"](#). Google, Inc. Retrieved July 5, 2010.
 -
 - Vise, David A. (October 21, 2005). ["Online Ads Give Google Huge Gain in Profit". *The Washington Post*](#). Retrieved February 14, 2010.
 -
 - [Google Corporate Page](#), accessed October 17, 2011
 -
 - Ghosh, Shona (March 23, 2019). ["Thousands of Reddit users are trying to delete Google from their lives, but they're finding it impossible because Google is everywhere". *Business Insider*](#). Archived from the original on August 12, 2023.
 -
 - V Siskos, Dimitrios. "How to Reduce the Tax Bill of a Multinational Technology Company?". [SSRN 3254816](#).
 -
 - Drucker, Jesse (October 21, 2010). ["Google 2.4% Rate Shows How \\$60 Billion Lost to Tax Loopholes"](#). Bloomberg. "Google is 'flying a banner of doing no evil, and then they're perpetrating evil under our noses,' said [Abraham J. Briloff](#), a professor emeritus of accounting at [Baruch College](#) in New York who has examined Google's tax disclosures. 'Who is it that paid for the underlying concept on which they built these billions of dollars of revenues?' Briloff said. 'It was paid for by the United States citizenry.'"
 -
 - Metz, Cade (October 22, 2010). ["Google slips \\$3.1bn through 'Double Irish' tax loophole". *The Register*](#). "Basically, Google licenses foreign rights to its intellectual property to an Irish subsidiary known as Google Ireland Holdings, and this outfit owns a separate subsidiary known as Google Ireland Limited. It's Google Ireland Limited – the second subsidiary – that actually sells advertising across the globe. Last year, it accounted for 88 percent of Google's \$12.5 billion in non-U.S. sales."
 -
 - Tang, Paul (September 2017). ["EU Tax Revenue Loss from Google and Facebook"](#) (PDF).
 -
 - Chew, Jonathan (March 11, 2016). ["7 Corporate Giants Accused of Evading Billions in Taxes". *Fortune*](#). Retrieved June 20, 2017.
 -
 - Barford, Vanessa; Holt, Gerry (May 21, 2013). ["Google, Amazon, Starbucks: The rise of 'tax shaming'"](#). BBC News. [BBC](#). Retrieved June 20, 2017.
 -
 - Bowers, Simon; Syal, Rajeev (May 16, 2013). ["MP on Google tax avoidance scheme: 'I think that you do evil'"](#). *The Guardian*. Retrieved June 20, 2017.
 -
 - Staff, Telegraph (December 12, 2012). ["Google's tax avoidance is called 'capitalism', says chairman Eric Schmidt". *The Daily Telegraph*](#). Archived from the original on January 12, 2022. Retrieved June 20, 2017.
 -
 - Kumar, Nikhil; Wright, Oliver (December 13, 2012). ["Google boss: I'm very proud of our tax avoidance scheme". *The Independent*](#). Retrieved June 20, 2017.
 -
 - ["Starbucks, Google and Amazon grilled over tax avoidance"](#). BBC News. November 12, 2012.
 -
 - ["Budget 2015: 'Google Tax' introduction confirmed"](#). BBC News. [BBC](#). March 18, 2015. Retrieved June 20, 2017.
 -
 - ["Google agrees to pay British authorities £130m in back taxes"](#). *The Guardian*. January 20, 2016.
 -
 - ["EU could force Google to pay more UK tax"](#). *The Guardian*. January 20, 2016.
 -

- Kanter, James; Pfanner, Eric (November 30, 2010). ["Europe Opens Antitrust Inquiry Into Google"](#). *The New York Times*. ISSN 0362-4331. Retrieved April 2, 2023.
-
- Lohr, Steve (October 20, 2020). ["What Is Happening With the Antitrust Suit Against Google?"](#). *The New York Times*. ISSN 0362-4331. Retrieved April 2, 2023.
-
- McCabe, David; Grant, Nico (January 24, 2023). ["U.S. Accuses Google of Abusing Monopoly in Ad Technology"](#). *The New York Times*. ISSN 0362-4331. Retrieved April 2, 2023.
-
- Lomas, Natasha (September 14, 2022). ["Google fails to overturn EU's €4BN+ Android antitrust decision"](#). *TechCrunch*. Retrieved April 2, 2023.
-
- McCabe, David; Wakabayashi, Daisuke (July 7, 2021). ["Dozens of States Sue Google Over App Store Fees"](#). *The New York Times*. ISSN 0362-4331. Retrieved April 2, 2023.
-
- Vincent, James (July 1, 2022). ["Google offers small app developers \\$90 million to settle antitrust allegations"](#). *The Verge*. Retrieved April 2, 2023.
-
- ["Google offers to let ad rivals place YouTube ads in EU antitrust probe"](#). *CNBC*. June 13, 2022. Retrieved April 2, 2023.
-
- Robertson, Adi (August 2, 2022). ["Rumble's antitrust lawsuit against Google can proceed, says judge"](#). *The Verge*. Retrieved April 2, 2023.
-
- Sisco, Josh (February 22, 2023). ["DOJ pushes ahead with Google Maps antitrust probe"](#). *POLITICO*. Retrieved April 2, 2023.
-
- Kelion, Leo (June 27, 2017). ["Google hit with record \\$2.7bn EU fine"](#). *BBC News*.
-
- ["Episode 787: Google Is Big. Is That Bad?"](#). *NPR.org*.
-
- ["PRESS RELEASES – Press release – Antitrust: Commission sends Statement of Objections to Google on comparison shopping service: opens separate formal investigation on Android"](#). *European Commission*. Retrieved April 7, 2018.
-
- ["PRESS RELEASES – Press release – Antitrust: Commission takes further steps in investigations alleging Google's comparison shopping and advertising-related practices breach EU rules"](#). *European Commission*. July 14, 2016. Retrieved April 7, 2018.
-
- Satariano, Adam (June 14, 2023). ["Google's Online Advertising Practices Violate Antitrust Laws, E.U. Says"](#). *The New York Times*. ISSN 0362-4331. Retrieved June 14, 2023.
-
- ["Google's Competitors Square Off Against Its Leader"](#). Steve Lohr, *The New York Times*, September 21, 2011
-
- ["Eric Schmidt at Google Hearings: Close to Monopoly, but we've not Cooked Anything"](#). *State of Digital*. September 22, 2011. Retrieved March 15, 2022.
-
- Davies, Chris (September 22, 2011). ["Schmidt: Google Is In Monopoly 'Area' But No Microsoft"](#). *SlashGear.com*. Retrieved March 15, 2022.
-
- ["Drafting Antitrust Case, F.T.C. Raises Pressure on Google"](#). Steve Lohr, *The New York Times*, October 12, 2012. Retrieved October 3, 2013.
-
- Mullins, Brody (March 24, 2015). ["Google Makes Most of Close Ties to White House"](#). *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved March 24, 2015.
-
- McIntyre, Douglas (October 31, 2008). ["Yahoo and Google may dump their deal"](#). *Bloggingstocks.com*. Archived from [the original](#) on October 29, 2013. Retrieved October 26, 2010.
-
- Drummond, David (November 5, 2008). ["Ending our agreement with Yahoo!"](#). *Google, Inc.* Retrieved October 26, 2010.
-
- Fabio, Michelle (September 13, 2011). ["Is Google a Monopoly?"](#). *LegalZoom*.
-
- Harshawn Ratanpal (October 5, 2023). ["Google ramped up federal lobbying ahead of DOJ antitrust showdown"](#). *Open Secrets*. Retrieved October 7, 2023.
-
- ["Justice Department Sues Google for Monopolizing Digital Advertising Technologies"](#). *U.S. Department of Justice*. January 24, 2023. Retrieved February 17, 2023.
-

- Rawlinson, Kevin (April 20, 2016). ["Google faces EU charge over Android 'abuse of dominance'"](#). BBC News. Retrieved April 20, 2016.
-
- ["Google Fined a Record \\$5 Billion by European Antitrust Officials"](#). Variety. July 18, 2018. Retrieved July 21, 2018.
-
- ["Russia fines Google \\$6.75 million for preinstalling apps on Android"](#). The Verge. Vox Media. August 12, 2016. Retrieved March 23, 2017.
-
- ["CCI orders probe into 'Android abuse' by Google"](#). @businessline.
-
- Paxton, Ken (October 22, 2021). ["IN RE: GOOGLE DIGITAL ADVERTISING ANTITRUST LITIGATION"](#) (PDF). United States District Court, Southern District of New York. Retrieved December 10, 2021.
-
- Silverman, Jacob (October 28, 2021). ["Inside Jedi Blue, Facebook's Shady Deal With Google"](#). New York Magazine Intelligencer. Retrieved December 10, 2021.
-
- Wakabayashi, Daisuke; Hsu, Tiffany (January 17, 2021). ["Behind a Secret Deal Between Google and Facebook"](#). The New York Times. Retrieved December 10, 2021.
-
- Fischer, Sara; Dixon, Kristal (December 7, 2021). ["Scoop: Over 200 papers quietly sue Big Tech"](#). Axios. Retrieved December 10, 2021.
-
- Acton, Michael; Swift, Mike (April 7, 2021). ["Google acknowledges it foresaw possibility of probe of 'Jedi Blue' advertising deal with Facebook"](#). mlxmarketinsight.com. Retrieved December 10, 2021.
-
- Joseph, Seb (October 27, 2021). ["Ad execs dismayed, but not surprised, by tactics Google allegedly used"](#). Digiday. Retrieved December 10, 2021.
-
- [Report on dangers and opportunities posed by large search engines, particularly Google Archived](#) December 29, 2009, at the [Wayback Machine](#). H. Maurer (Ed), Graz University of Technology, Austria, September 30, 2007, 187 pp. Retrieved October 3, 2013.
-
- [Google's goal: to organize your daily life](#) Financial Times
-
- [Google and the Search for the Future](#) Wall Street Journal
-
- Levine, Dan (September 1, 2011). ["Google wins antitrust victory in Ohio case"](#). Reuters UK. Retrieved September 14, 2011.
-
- ["Disappearing tycoon Souter blames Google"](#). BBC News. September 12, 2011.
-
- Hansell, Saul; Markoff, John (June 22, 2004). ["Google Edits Its Prospectus to Highlight Risk of Loss"](#). The New York Times.
-
- ["Corrections"](#). The New York Times. June 25, 2004. Retrieved April 30, 2010.
-
- Manjoo, Farhad (August 30, 2002). ["Conspiracy Researcher Says Google's No Good"](#). AlterNet. Archived from [the original](#) on June 8, 2012. Retrieved December 12, 2009.
-
- ["Why Daniel Brandt doesn't like Google PageRank"](#). Chris Beasley, Google Watch Watch, accessed October 18, 2011
-
- McManus, Emily (August 7, 2014). ["No Google, no I didn't.pic.twitter.com/9BtO4lJBTE"](#). @emilymcmc. Retrieved November 11, 2019.
-
- ["Why did this simple Google Search get retweeted 3,500 times?"](#). ideas.ted.com. August 15, 2014. Retrieved November 11, 2019.
-
- jackyjackyjackyjacky (June 28, 2015). ["Google Photos, y'all fucked up. My friend's not a gorilla.pic.twitter.com/SMkMCsNVX4"](#). @jackyalcine. Retrieved November 11, 2019.
-
- Barr, Alistair (July 1, 2015). ["Google Mistakenly Tags Black People as 'Gorillas,' Showing Limits of Algorithms"](#). WSJ. Retrieved November 11, 2019.
-
- ["When It Comes to Gorillas, Google Photos Remains Blind"](#). Wired. ISSN 1059-1028. Retrieved November 11, 2019.
-

- ["Google Commerce: Building a better shopping experience."](#) Googlecommerce.blogspot.com. Retrieved October 30, 2012.
-
- ["Have you been Scroogled Try Bing—we don't limit your shopping choices."](#) scroogled.com.
-
- Depillis, Lydia (February 15, 2013). ["Microsoft's Mark Penn Mistake – The tech giant is treating Google like a political rival"](#). *The New Republic*.
-
- ["Google Shopping Listings Will No Longer be Free to Advertisers | RKG Blog"](#). Rimmkaufman.com. Retrieved October 30, 2012.
-
- Holbrook, Ben (June 20, 2012). ["Paid Google Shopping – Another Step Towards Google's Master Plan"](#). *State of Search*. Retrieved October 30, 2012.
-
- ["France to oppose Google book scheme"](#) Archived July 27, 2011, at the [Wayback Machine](#), Stanley Pignal, *Financial Times*, September 8, 2009
-
- ["Google Print Faces More Opposition"](#) Archived January 21, 2012, at the [Wayback Machine](#), Keith Regan, *E-Commerce Times*, August 30, 2005
-
- ["A Copyright Complaint From China"](#), *Forbes*, October 21, 2009. Retrieved November 17, 2013.
-
- ["Google apologises to Chinese writers over book flap"](#), Agence France-Presse (AFP), January 10, 2010. Retrieved November 17, 2013.
-
- ["Google Pulls P2P Links Over Kazaa Copyright Claims"](#), Jay Lyman, *TechNewsWorld*, September 2, 2003
-
- Gallagher, David F. (April 22, 2002). ["New Economy: A copyright dispute with the Church of Scientology is forcing Google to do some creative linking"](#). *The New York Times*. Retrieved April 30, 2010.
-
- Tew, Chris (September 12, 2006). ["Linking to infringing content is probably illegal in the US"](#). *WebTVWire*. Retrieved October 12, 2006.
-
- See [Perfect 10, Inc. v. Google Inc.](#) (2007) for a ruling that links do not constitute infringement. See [Universal City Studios, Inc. v. Reimerdes](#) (2001), [Intellectual Reserve v. Utah Lighthouse Ministry](#) (1999), and [Comcast of Illinois X, LLC. v. Hightech Electronics, Inc.](#) (2004) for three rulings that links are infringing.
-
- ["Google cache raises copyright concerns"](#) Archived September 11, 2012, at [archive.today](#), Stefanie Olsen, *CNET News*, July 9, 2003
-
- ["Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, Blake A. Field vs. Google, Inc., No. CV-S-04-0413-RCJ-LRL"](#), Judge Robert C. Jones, *United States District Court (District of Nevada)*, January 12, 2006
-
- [Memorandum & Order, Gordon Roy Parker v. Google, Inc., No. 04-CV-3918](#), Judge R. Barclay Surrick, *United States District Court (Eastern District of Pennsylvania)*, March 10, 2006
-
- ["Google and Bing to demote pirate sites in UK web searches"](#). *BBC News*. February 20, 2017. Retrieved February 20, 2017.
-
- ["Google and Bing to deprecate piracy websites"](#). *The Guardian*. Press Association. February 20, 2017. Retrieved February 20, 2017.
-
- ["Google Map Maker"](#). Retrieved February 12, 2015.
-
- ["We Need to Stop Google's Exploitation of Open Communities"](#), Mikel Maron, April 11, 2011.
-
- ["Google Map Maker"](#). Retrieved February 12, 2015.
-
- ["Why Google MapMaker is not Open"](#), Mikel Maron, March 16, 2010.
-
- Lemon, Sumner (April 8, 2007). ["Rival Asks Google to Yank 'Copycat' Application"](#). *PC World*. IDG. Retrieved April 11, 2007.
-
- Tamburro, Paul (February 17, 2016). ["Prominent YouTubers Ask 'Where's the Fair Use?' in Backlash Against Site"](#). *Crave Online*. Retrieved February 17, 2016.

-
- Murrell, Dan (February 16, 2016). "[Dan Murrell on Twitter](#)". *Twitter*. Retrieved February 19, 2016.
-
- "[Note from YouTube's Policy Team – YouTube Community](#)". *support.google.com*. Retrieved July 11, 2022.
-
- "[Edward Snowden: Leaks that exposed US spy programme](#)". *BBC News*. January 17, 2014.
-
- "[Google Privacy Policy](#)". March 1, 2012.
-
- "[Will We Ever Get Strong Internet Privacy Rules?](#)". *Time*. March 5, 2012.
-
- Cade, Metz (December 7, 2009). "[Google chief: Only miscreants worry about net privacy](#)". *The Register*.
-
- "[Google ranked 'worst' on privacy](#)". *BBC News*. June 11, 2007.
-
- "[Consultation Report: Race to the Bottom? 2007](#)" Archived June 12, 2007, at the [Wayback Machine](#). Privacy International, June 9, 2007
-
- Delichatsios, Stefanie Alki; Sonuyi, Temitope, "[Get to Know Google...Because They Know You](#)". MIT, Ethics and Law on the Electronic Frontier, 6.805, December 14, 2005
-
- "[No anonymity on future web says Google CEO](#)". *THINQ.co.uk*. August 5, 2010. Archived from [the original](#) on August 15, 2010. Retrieved August 7, 2010.
-
- *Angwin, Julia* (October 21, 2016). "[Google Has Quietly Dropped Ban on Personally Identifiable Web Tracking](#)". *ProPublica*. Retrieved October 23, 2016.
-
- Harrington, Caitlin (September 9, 2022). "[Google and Amazon Want More Defense Contracts, Despite Worker Protests](#)". *Wired*. Retrieved September 11, 2022. "Opponents of the deal worry the Israeli military could use the technology to expand surveillance of Palestinians living in occupied territories and violate human rights."
-
- Nieva, Richard (September 9, 2022). "[Google And Amazon Workers Protest Their Companies' \\$1.2 Billion AI Contract With Israel](#)". *Forbes*. Retrieved September 11, 2022.
-
- "[Google employee resigns saying company 'silences Palestinians'](#)". *Al Jazeera*. September 1, 2022. Retrieved September 11, 2022.
-
- "[Disha Ravi arrest puts privacy of all Google India users in doubt](#)". *India Today*. February 16, 2021. Retrieved August 23, 2022.
-
- Whittaker, Zack (December 12, 2012). "[Google.com now 'censors' explicit content from image searches](#)". *ZDNet*. Retrieved June 14, 2013.
-
- "[Google Removes 'Bisexual' From Its List of Dirty Words](#)", Michelle Garcia, *Advocate.com*, September 11, 2012. Retrieved March 14, 2014.
-
- "[Google censors itself for China](#)". *BBC*. January 25, 2006. Retrieved January 31, 2008.
-
- [The Great Wall: China Against the World, 1000 BC–AD 2000 Archived](#) March 14, 2015, at the [Wayback Machine](#). Julia Lovell, Grove/Atlantic, March 2007, ISBN 978-0-8021-4297-9
-
- "[Google move 'black day' for China](#)". *BBC News*. January 25, 2006.
-
- "[Google quietly removed search warning message in China in early December 2012](#)". *Engadget*. January 4, 2013
-
- "[Google: Stop participating in China's Propaganda](#)". Students for a Free Tibet, Yahoo! Groups, February 1, 2006
-
- *AFX News* (January 25, 2006). "[Google bows to Chinese censorship with new search site](#)". *Forbes*. Archived from [the original](#) on November 21, 2008.
-
- "[3. Google, Inc.](#)" in *Race to the Bottom: Corporate Complicity in Chinese Internet Censorship, Part IV. How Multinational Internet Companies assist Government Censorship in China*, Human Rights Watch, Vol. 18 No. 8(C), August 2006

-
- ["Google does not censor: take action to defend freedom of information"](#) , Amnesty International, May 10, 2006
-
- ["Google's 'don't be evil' motto becomes a fig leaf \(谷歌"不作恶"口号沦为遮羞布\) \(in Chinese\)"](#). People's Daily. June 19, 2009. Archived from [the original](#) on September 21, 2013. Retrieved June 27, 2009. (English translation)
-
- ["Investigating on Google China's obscene information, the public says "good" \(查处谷歌中国淫秽信息, 公众都叫"好"!\)"](#). People's Daily. June 26, 2009. Archived from [the original](#) on July 30, 2013. Retrieved June 27, 2009. (English translation)
-
- [卫敏丽 \(June 19, 2009\). "Relevant departments punished "Google China"'s dissemination of obscene information by law\(有关部门对"谷歌中国"传播淫秽色情信息行为依法处罚\)". xinhuanet. Archived from the original on June 22, 2009. Retrieved June 26, 2009. \(English translation\)](#)
-
- Scott Shane and Andrew W. Lehren (November 28, 2010). ["Leaked Cables Offer Raw Look at U.S. Diplomacy"](#). The New York Times. Retrieved December 26, 2010.
-
- ["A new approach to China"](#), David Drummond, SVP, Corporate Development and Chief Legal Officer, Official Google Blog, January 12, 2010
-
- ["A new approach to China"](#). Google Inc. January 12, 2010. Retrieved January 17, 2010.
-
- ["Google's strategy in China deserves praise"](#). Kansas City Star. March 28, 2010. Archived from [the original](#) on April 1, 2010. Retrieved September 29, 2012.
-
- [A new approach to China: an update](#). David Drummond, SVP, Corporate Development and Chief Legal Officer, Official Google Blog, March 22, 2010
-
- Carlson, Nicholas (March 22, 2010). ["BREAKING: Google Pulls Search Engine Out Of China"](#). Business Insider.
-
- Womack, Brian (March 23, 2010). ["Google Ends Self-Censorship, Defies China Government \(Update4\)"](#). Bloomberg News.
-
- Gallagher, Ryan (December 11, 2018). ["RIGHTS GROUPS TURN UP PRESSURE ON GOOGLE OVER CHINA CENSORSHIP AHEAD OF CONGRESSIONAL HEARING"](#). [The Intercept](#). Retrieved May 6, 2020.
-
- Hay Newman, Lily (September 17, 2021). ["Apple and Google Go Further Than Ever to Appease Russia"](#). Wired. Retrieved September 18, 2021.
-
- ["Putin's prewar moves against U.S. tech giants laid groundwork for crackdown on free expression"](#). The Washington Post. Archived from [the original](#) on March 15, 2022.
-
- ["Google Somewhat Lifts Oceana Ad Ban"](#). WebProNews. May 17, 2004. Archived from [the original](#) on January 30, 2009.
-
- ["Google AdSense Program Policies"](#). May 27, 2011.
-
- ["Google OKs Religious Groups' Abortion Ads – ABC News"](#). Abcnews.go.com. September 18, 2008. Retrieved October 30, 2012.
-
- ["Google murders second Anonymous AdSense account"](#). Cade Metz, The Register, August 15, 2008
-
- ["Google AdSense Program Policies"](#), AdSense Help, Google Inc.
-
- [Turn Off the Blue Light Archived](#) June 2, 2013, at the [Wayback Machine](#), website
-
- Paterson, Jody (June 24, 2011). ["Google tramples sex workers' rights"](#). Victoria Times-Colonist. Archived from [the original](#) on October 20, 2011.
-
- Cusack, Jim (August 7, 2011). ["Google u-turn on sex worker group's advert"](#). Sunday Independent.
-
- [No Sex Party please, we're Google Sydney Morning Herald](#) September 13, 2012
-
- ["YouTube Community Guidelines"](#). YouTube. Retrieved May 9, 2007.

-
- ["YouTube"](#). www.youtube.com. Archived from [the original](#) on January 7, 2012.
-
- Rosen, Jeffrey (November 30, 2008). ["Google's Gatekeepers"](#). *The New York Times*.
-
- Ribeiro, John (February 25, 2008). ["Pakistan causes worldwide YouTube blackout"](#). *Macworld UK*. Archived from [the original](#) on October 12, 2015. Retrieved December 23, 2010.
-
- ["Pakistan Drops YouTube Ban"](#), CBS News/AP, February 11, 2009
-
- ["Pakistan welcomes back YouTube"](#) Archived October 15, 2008, at the [Wayback Machine](#), Greg Sandoval, CNET News Blogs, February 26, 2008
-
- ["YouTube shuts down Egyptian anti-torture activist's account"](#). *CNN.com*. November 29, 2007. Archived from [the original](#) on May 19, 2011. Retrieved December 23, 2010.
-
- ["YouTube reinstates account of Egyptian human rights activist"](#). *The CNN Wire: Friday, Nov. 30*. *CNN.com*. November 30, 2007.
-
- ["YouTube stops account of Egypt anti-torture activist"](#) Archived February 5, 2015, at the [Wayback Machine](#), Cynthia Johnston, Reuters, November 27, 2007
-
- ["American Life League video yanked by YouTube"](#). *Catholic News Agency*. February 12, 2008.
-
- Beckford, Martin (October 3, 2008). ["YouTube censors comedian's anti-Sharia video called 'Welcome to Saudi Britain'"](#). *The Daily Telegraph*. London. Archived from the original on January 12, 2022.
-
- Rosen, Jeffrey (November 30, 2008). ["Google's Gatekeepers"](#). *The New York Times*.
-
- [The Googlization of Everything \(and Why We Should Worry\)](#), Siva Vaidhyanatan, University of California Press, 2011, page 39, ISBN 978-0-520-25882-2
-
- Spangler, Todd (November 22, 2019). ["YouTube Creators Worried and Confused Over New Kid-Video COPPA Rules. Potential Fines"](#). *Variety*.
-
- ["Protecting Kids Online: Snapchat, TikTok, and YouTube"](#). October 26, 2021.
-
- ["Rivals struggle to distance themselves from Facebook"](#). *Politico*. October 26, 2021.
-
- Fanning, Sean (March 26, 2013). ["Google gets ungoogleable off Sweden's new word list"](#). *BBC News*. *BBC*. Retrieved April 5, 2013.
-
- Williams, Rob (March 26, 2013). ["'Ungoogleable' removed from list of Swedish words after row over definition with Google: California based search engine giant asked Swedish to amend definition"](#). *The Independent*. Retrieved April 5, 2013.
-

Irvine, Chris (March 25, 2013). ["Sweden rows with Google over term 'ungoogleable'"](#). *The Daily Telegraph*. Archived from the original on January 12, 2022. Retrieved April 5, 2013.