1. Google

- 1. Selling data vs data exploitation

1. Selling data vs data exploitation

This is why privacy advocates distinguish between "selling data" (the literal act) and "data exploitation" (the broader practice of profiting from your information without meaningful consent or transparency). Google does the latter, which is why the concern persists even though they don't technically do the former.

"Better results" can become coercive. Once tracking is normalized and search quality degrades without it, you're not really choosing the tradeoff anymore—you're forced into it to function. Privacy advocates worry about a world where opting out of surveillance means accepting worse services, leaving you with no real choice.

Data creates risks beyond convenience. Your search history reveals sensitive things—medical conditions, financial struggles, political beliefs, relationship problems. Even if Google doesn't misuse it, the data could be breached, subpoenaed by government, or used against you in ways you can't foresee. Some people think certain information shouldn't be collected at all, regardless of the benefit.

It normalizes treating people as products. Every time we accept "better service" as payment for surveillance, we reinforce the idea that companies should monitor everything. Privacy advocates see this as a slippery slope—once that becomes the baseline expectation, it's hard to push back.

In short: even if the search results *are* better, some people believe there are values—autonomy, dignity, freedom from surveillance—that shouldn't be traded away for convenience, no matter how useful the convenience is. They're not denying you get something; they're saying the cost shouldn't be paid in the first place.