DON’T get me wrong. Real innovations are important — and increasingly hard to come by. In a never-ending flood of app offerings created in Silicon Valley, Uber seems to be one of the few based on a really good idea.

Unfortunately, the way in which Uber is going about its business — particularly globally — is a complete contradiction to any respect for the rule of law. It’s an invasion of privacy, an invasion of safety, an invasion of information and, at least sometimes, an invasion of safety. It was famous for the “Access denied, ask questions later” model.

The most breathtaking element of the Uber standard operating formula is to argue, as the company’s top executives regularly do, that no laws apply to the company. Why? Because — get this — the sharing economy wasn’t invented yet when the company was set up.

Uber’s basic proposition is to argue that any business has the right to tell the national authorities of the markets it chooses to operate in by providing a certain service. Any band, the godmother of all libertarians in America, must feel like resurrecting herself in excitement.

It also argues that it is a “technology company” and therefore cannot be held accountable for Uber’s or any other company’s actions. Why? Because it doesn’t own or operate riders or drivers, in other words: risks to the money — but not be responsible for anything, other than taking a 30 per cent share of any fare off the money – but not be responsible for anything, other than being a good business.

Another country resisting the Uber invasion is Germany. The taxi business there also happens to be partly entrepreneurial. Many operators are familiar with.

That to be a problem in many other countries I am familiar with.

Uber can file applications, and once it meets the standards and tests others have to meet, it can start operating. But whenever companies are as Uber does — argue that it is a technological device, that the company is an intermediate service — they do avoid any responsibility for the third party, like a taxi driver who has been exposed in plenty of news stories.
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Uber also argues that it will follow the “invade first, ask questions later” model. Where, when courts — from Germany, India, Spain and onwards — issue injunctions against the company. Uber then has to engage in more dialogue to “help the authorities better understand what the company is trying to do” — and whether or not it should be regulated.

Is that the new American Dream? Maybe not, but a definite lesson in the name of the Valley-standard libertarians, from Mr Peter Thiel on downwards.

Equally breathtaking is Uber’s standard refrain when courts — from Germany, India, Spain and onwards — issue injunctions against the company. Uber then has to engage in more dialogue to “help the authorities better understand what the company is trying to do” — and whether or not it should be regulated.

In the UK, Uber has been a success largely because many cab operators in major cities have not, or do not, take a lot of care about the drivers who work for them. Standard cab service in many a city amounts to a Soviet-style approach in terms of product diversity — and service reliability.

For example, in Washington, DC, the capital of the US, during “rush hour” traffic — when it starts raining, Cabbies here also have still mounted the introduction of metered fares, a rather recent innovation.

Uber has also helped me out of a pinch many times when I had to make sure that dinner guests could get a ride back from my home to their hotel and there were no cabs to be found. I haven’t seen that Uber is a problem in other countries I am familiar with.

No doubt, in such a country, Uber can be put to good use. Contrast with the basic situation in Germany or Delhi. Taxi services there basically run like clockwork. When you need a taxi, you call a phone number and reliably expect a cab in front of your door within three to five minutes.

This, Uber isn’t an exception. Uber faces the same problems in Munich and Delhi and Berlin.

One thing is for sure after the recent rape incident in Delhi as well as courts standing in the way of Uber’s global victory tour in Germany and elsewhere — Uber’s current stance — “My way or the highway” — won’t fly.

Yes, we definitely need constant innovation to improve the situation. Uber has a new product offering. But it also needs to have a better balance between the need to innovate and the need to have everybody play by the same rules.

That’s a lesson Uber — and indeed other imperially acting, made-in-the-USA businesses like Google and Facebook — still have to learn.
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