

External receipts: Google on video, fact-checks, papers

Americans for Non-Profit Transparency · Source pack · External receipts: Google on video, fact-checks, papers
Source file: 05_EXTERNAL_RECEIPTS.md, as it stood on 7 October 2026. Published for checking. Internal cross-references to other files were left as written; private names, non-Latin search strings and local file paths were removed. Google Trends dates in this file are what Google returned at the time stated; Trends redraws its sample.

05 - External receipts: Google on video, forums, fact-checks, papers (merged 2026-10-04)

Full entries (URL, date, speaker or poster, exact quote, confidence) are in inputs\:- ext_A_official.md: Googlers on video plus official docs (A1..A14) - ext_B_forums.md: Product Experts, developers, Reddit, data vendors (B1..B28, plus ITEM 4 on refresh rate) - ext_C_factchecks_academic.md: fact-checks, Google statements to the press, peer-reviewed papers (C1..C15, A1..A11 in its PART 2) - cartoon_guest_list.md: her method applied to our existing fake-name data (no new queries)

Rules for screen use: - Quote only what the source file marks VERIFIED-opened. - The 2015-16 Google News Lab clips (A4-A6) use auto-captions. Play the audio and check it before any text goes on screen. - Speaker on A1 VERIFIED = Daniel Waisberg (not Hadas Jacobi). - The six Reddit comments in B were pulled from an archive API. Check each one live. - The Bondi entries (B6, B8, B13, C10) come from pages that name a country on the banned-terms list. Quote only the lines that don't, and run the packaging banned-terms check.

By v3 segment (EXECUTION_PLAN_v3 numbering)

0-1 Cold open follow-up / WHY THIS MATTERS

- **A1** Google Search Central, "Google Trends walkthrough" (2024-08-14), 4:01-4:43, Daniel Waisberg, Google Search Advocate (VERIFIED, see inputs/google_clips/VERIFIED.md): a chart that keeps dropping to zero means the other points "are likely to be statistical noise ... You should ignore this data." That describes her charts exactly.
- **C1 / B2** Fox News, 18 Feb 2026, Nancy Guthrie case: people claimed Google *image searches* in **Tucson, Arizona**. Google's statement, printed by Fox: "For topics with low or no searches, a Google Trends chart will often mix in random noise to protect people's privacy. That means that a Google Trends chart showing a spike for an uncommon topic is not definitive evidence that a search actually happened."
Same region, same tool, same story. Lead receipt.
- **C2** Newsweek, 19 Feb 2026, Google spokesperson: "may appear to show some search interest even if there were no actual searches due to statistical noise used as a privacy measure."
- **C6** Brian Entin, NewsNation (Mar 2026): "we actually checked with Google and they say that those are not legit."
- **A2** Daniel Waisberg, Google Search Advocate (2024-07-31) 1:46-2:08: "we exclude terms that are searched by very few people, like my full name, or repeated searches from the same person..."

- **A4 / A5** Simon Rogers (2015) and Jen Lee (2016) of Google News Lab: "privacy thresholds ... I can't look at ... one person's ... search" / "if it's a town of one we're not looking at just that one person search." (check audio)
- **C15** Google News Initiative: "Trends eliminates repeated searches from the same user over a short period of time."
- Already in the Bible: FAQ 4365533 "one-off spikes should not be interpreted as real search activity", and ABC 17 Dec 2025.

4 THE SIEVE (her method)

- `cartoon_guest_list.md`: apply her method to 564 fake names and the 3 busiest days become a cartoon "meeting". Her Erika day (Sep 6) **ties for busiest day** in the whole fake dataset (Captain Crunch, Ronald McDonald, Stewie Griffin...).
- **B7** Reddit user typed a fake name and got "a spike to 100 just like the image." (check live)
- **C-A2** Medeiros & Pires (2021): "arbitrary conclusions merely by chance".
- **C-A1** Hölzl, Keusch & Sajons (2025), *Social Science Research*: systematic review; rare terms and small regions are worst.
- **B20** Hacker News on the D.C.-shooting spike: nobody ran the control test.

5 "THEY DELETED IT"

- **B3** Product Expert Celebird (2020): Trends "by design, is never guaranteed to return the exact same data-set."
- **B4** Diamond Product Expert barryhunter (2023): same query giving different results is "noise."
- **B9** Product Expert: there's no way to get the same data twice, and Google doesn't disclose when the sample changes.
- **B10** user report: the graph flips every 3-4 minutes. **B21** Reddit: "hit refresh 5 times, get 5 different answers."
- **A6** Jen Lee (Google News Lab, 2016): real-time and long-range charts are two separate random samples.
- **B17 / B18** Stack Overflow: "sampled nondeterministically"; pull 30-50 times and average.
- **C-A2** Medeiros & Pires: you "will not download the same data tomorrow".
- **C4 / C5 / C9** Distractify, Newsweek, GunsAmerica: viral pre-event spikes (Kirk, the DC Guard shooting) no longer showed up when reporters re-checked them.
- Stew Peters tags her posts "Data Deleted" / "ERASED SEARCHES" (C, flags). In effect that admits her results don't reproduce.
- Refresh rate: Google publishes none. One paper says the sample resets daily at midnight UTC; users report changes within hours or minutes (B ITEM 4). Our own data: 42 blips -> 24 gone / 17 moved / 1 same after ~2 h.

6 REAL VISITORS DON'T SHOW

- `cartoon_guest_list.md`: **May 15 2025** = documented Eifler + Hale visit. The generals: 0 blips that day. SpongeBob, Captain Kirk, Abraham Lincoln: blips that day.

9 FOR THE NERDS

- **A3** FAQ: Trends filters "internal searches made by AI Mode and AI Overviews". Google already strips out its own AI's searches.
- **A7** Search Central: say "approximately"; separate searches each get "a different normalization index".

- **A8** Waisberg on stage: privacy threshold; "drops to zero ... you cannot use it".
 - Papers for an on-screen list: Franzén 2023 (*Acta Sociologica*, "Why scientists should refrain from using Google Trends"), Cebrián & Domènech 2023/2024, Eichenauer et al. 2022, Gummer & Oehrlein 2025, Mellon 2014.
-

Gaps (stated honestly)

- No official Google statement on whether using trends.google.com itself counts as a search.
- No published refresh interval.
- The Google Trends Help Community no longer exists (404), so Googler posts there can't be cited. Product Expert posts from the old threads are in B.
- No independent public reproduction of her Fort Huachuca / "Elizabeth Lane" / "ISRTF-PLTR" charts found, success or failure. One sympathetic Substack doubts the Trends data (C13).
- No AFP / Reuters / Snopes / AP fact-check of the Kirk/Robinson Trends claim exists.

"we dont need to debunk him we just debunk the process through ana and the rest will fall in place." The video stays