



January 27, 2006

Ms. Irene Khan
Secretary General
Amnesty International
Peter Benenson House
1 Easton Street
London WC1X 0DW
United Kingdom

Dear Ms. Khan:

Thank you for your letter of December 17, 2005 expressing concern and inquiring about the facts surrounding the Shi Tao case.

At the outset, let me make clear that the facts surrounding the Shi Tao case are distressing to me and my colleagues at Yahoo!. Yahoo! prides itself on helping citizens around the world communicate with each other, search and access independent sources of news and information and participate in e-commerce. We are proud of our role in expanding opportunities for Chinese citizens to enjoy the significant benefits of the Internet. Yahoo! Search gives Chinese users an ability to access various independent, non-government sponsored sources of information of interest to them, fostering a more outward-looking population.

Let me clarify an important fact that you raise in your letter and that has been misreported in the press: Yahoo! Hong Kong, our subsidiary in Hong Kong, was not involved in any way in the disclosure of Shi Tao's information to the PRC authorities. In this specific case, the PRC government ordered Yahoo! China to provide user information and Yahoo! China complied with applicable PRC law. Neither Yahoo! Hong Kong nor any other Yahoo! subsidiary would respond to a PRC law enforcement request, other than in accordance with their own applicable laws. In this case, our domain names in China were registered to Yahoo! Holdings (Hong Kong) Limited, which was also the holding company for our China operations, however, as indicated above, Yahoo! Hong Kong was not involved in any way in this matter.

Yahoo! China received a valid and legal demand for information from PRC law enforcement authorities according to applicable PRC laws and the procedures we had established with Chinese law enforcement officials. As in most jurisdictions, including the United States, the Government of China is not required to inform service providers why they are seeking certain information and typically does not do so. In other words, we did not know whether the demand for information focused on murder, kidnapping, embezzlement or another crime. Yahoo! China responded to the information demand, as required by PRC law. Until we read the distressing facts about Shi Tao in the news, we did not know the particular information about which Chinese authorities issued a lawful demand for information from Yahoo! China.



As a business that had been operating inside China, Yahoo! China was legally obligated to comply with Chinese law enforcement's requirements, just as each of the other Yahoo! subsidiaries must comply with the laws of the countries in which they do business and just as foreign companies must do in the United States.

The choice in China or other countries is not whether to comply with law enforcement demands for information. Rather, the choice is whether or not to remain in a country. We balance the requirement to comply with laws that are not necessarily consistent with our own values against our strong belief that active involvement in China contributes to the continued modernization of the country — as well as a benefit to Chinese citizens — through the advancement of communications, commerce and access to information. The Internet is a positive force in China and a growing Chinese middle class is benefiting greatly from more education, communication, technology, and independent sources of information.

Let me assure you that this issue is very important to Yahoo!, including Yahoo!'s senior management. Please contact us if you have further questions.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'M. Callahan', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Michael Callahan
Senior Vice President and General Counsel