Comments to the COPA Commission

I have a question regarding the use of pornography on the Internet. Pornography is something that will not be stopped no matter how hard people try to stop it. I know that COPA has been tasked with making recommendations to congress on how to reduce the chance of minors accessing pornography.

I have dealt with this for some time while working for an Internet service provider. I would get phone calls every day with questions and comments about how to stop adult content from being seen by children. The company I used employed a product called X-Stop, which worked well but there would often be times that it would still let some stuff through. One saying that I remember well is if you build something idiot-proof someone will build a better idiot. That has been seen time and time again. If some sort of technology was implemented it would only be a matter of time before that technology has been broken. My suggestion is to make things easier, is restrict adult content sites to something with a domain of .xxx or something like that. When adult sites are allowed to make use of a .com or a .net or a .org that only makes it easier for children to view adult content and it also allows search engines to display such results because of misleading descriptions of sites. A simple search for dollhouse on any major search engine will bring up more adult sites than actual sites on dollhouses. The same goes for any searches for any famous star such as Britney Spears, Backstreet Boys, and Julia Roberts. More and more sites are going online everyday and they may a killing with the use of banner ads and misleading search descriptions. I think it could be easily avoided if adult sites were restricted to the domains of .xxx. That would not infringe on the rights of those who like to publish that sort of content. In fact it allows it and gives them their own place on the Internet. Cities and towns across the world using zoning rules for residential, industrial, and commercial zones of where company buildings can be built, why not recommend to the domain registration sites that rules of that sort be enforced. If it were legal in the US, then the government could levy fines against the web site operators, or web hosting companies that allow someone to post a adult content site in any area other than a .xxx domain, and to apply that with the use of redirection. Where someone would put a page on a good domain that automatically redirects the surfer to a .xxx page.

These are just my ideas on how to help the online community.

Sincerely yours,

Tee Jay Harrison

You know, if the Commission would analyze the business model of the "Porn" industry, it would be far more successful than the content based approach and the First Amendment issues it raises.

There are 2 points regarding "Porn" and the Internet which the Commission should consider:

First, the Internet will severely dilute earnings for adult image production. Images from all major adult hard copy magazines are available for free on the Net before the magazines even hit the newsstand or very soon thereafter. Ultimately, this will cut into subscription, retail sales, and production of adult material. There appears to be no way to stop the free flow of these images over the Net. This flow of images includes adult movies. The technology to "digitize" and make available on the Net adult images is very inexpensive. At some point the adult industry will feel the monetary loss. When this happens, the industry will attempt to use copyright laws to protect their business.

This is where the second point comes into play. While content and protection of minor laws might still be pursued, copyright laws could be more easily modified to accomplish the same ends. It is a supply rather than a demand approach. The copyright laws could be changed to allow that any adult material intentionally or recklessly or negligently made available to minors would automatically cause a complete loss of any copyrights and make the material public domain at the moment of the offense. This would extend to any licensee or vendor of the material, or any provider in the retail revenue stream. Public policy and protection of minors should have a far greater weight in a copyright analysis than a First Amendment analysis, remembering that this is a novel approach. This would evolve into a equal protection claim based on the copyright standard of scientific and useful arts - a dead on arrival and laughable claim for the adult image industry, but would also leave untouched educational or medical material. Every copyright claim by adult image producers/rights holder would have the specter of an availability to minors infraction hanging over its head. The industry is now forced to either self police the dissemination of the material or lose all copyrights in the material. The copyright modification will also impact even the smallest producer of adult material. This would also provide very high ground in the public relations/ public policy arena. It boils down to thus- while you may have a First Amendment right to produce this material, by making it available to minors you lose your rights to availing public resources to protect copyrights for the material.

In the final analysis, the question becomes- who will produce and disseminate adult material under this proposal without self imposed strict guidelines on its dissemination ? The copyright modification will also have an impact on foreign sources. If the United States will not enforce their

copyright claims in the American market, they must avoid the U.S. markets or risk losing rights to their property. While most attention is being applied to the Net and copyright enforcement, it seems no one is thinking about the Net and loss of copyright protection.

Best Regards
R Allen

I was reading this morning's news and noticed Mr. Telage's comments regarding our needing to get "more bang for the buck" with respect to the goals of curtailing the distribution of materials harmful to youngsters. I could not agree more!

So much misplaced anger and non-productive effort is being spent on bravado and silly enforcement schemes when, as Mr. Telage correctly observes, the secret is in education, not in enforcement. If you will forgive me an analogy:

In the early 1950s, people regularly threw their food containers, Kleenex, pop bottles, and beer cans from their car windows as they drove down our streets and highways. California instituted a $5,000 fine and a 6-month prison term enforcement threat, which it posted on nearly every major street, highway, and biway. Even as a child, I found that to be a silly waste of money. In fact, I never heard of anyone ever being fined anything approaching $5,000 or anyone ever going to jail for a week under the law, let alone 6 months! However, state funds were also allocated toward fashioning a well organized education campaign which helped people realize that they didn't want to live in each other's collective garbage cans. Now we just about never see anyone throwing anything larger than a cigarette butt from their car window. The signs have mostly disappeared; the penalties are still on the books, but it was the educative process that corrected the problem.

So, I applaud Mr. Telage and his wisdom in this matter.

Ken Tennen

The problem of children inadvertently accessing pornography on the Internet could be greatly reduced by designating all sex sites to broadcast under particular domain name, for instance the web extension, [dot]sex. Any address with that extension would indicate a site that could contain sexually explicit material. This would essentially create a sex channel on the net. People who want that content can access the channel, people who don't want the content, and set their Browser to block any such addresses with that extension from loading.

Then browsers would have no problem filtering the data, and anyone who wants to see it, can access it easily.

This is the best type of regulation, it is not a restriction on doing business, but a definition of the playing field designated for that business. It does not block sexual expression, it just regulates it to a specific marketplace.

Regulating sex sites to a specific channel, would provide consumers with a powerful level of control that they currently do not possess. Violations, whether foreign or domestic would be easy to detect, and enforcement centers on whether the content was sexually explicit or not, rather than on free speech issues, a considerably simpler issue for the courts to handle. Violators should be subject to significant fines .[I would suggest fines be based on a percentage of annual revenues, rather than fixed amounts.]

The real issue for society is whether consumers can control what content comes through their browser. The government has a role to play in providing that protection. This type of regulation does not seek control over what is broadcast, that is free speech, it seeks to establish controls over what is received, and allows consumers to implemented that control on an individual basis.

This solution would be a low cost and relatively easily to implement.

That's my 2-cents.

Thanks
Stephen Kennedy

I just saw you article Anti-porn Group To Suggest Online Children's Section on CNET news (news.com). I think you are missing one basic point. We should not have to create a save section for the kids on the Internet, we just need you create an adult section on the Internet. Just like the adult area of town that you can find in most middle to large size city

Think of it like this, you have your neighborhood bookstore the one that everyone can enter and then you have the adult bookstore where you have to be of a curtain age to enter. By setting up the Internet in this fashion you have solved both the privacy and free speech concerns.

One other thing you need to do if you create an adult section, on the Internet then you need to require all search engine to add a section the asked the ask what type of site would you like to search (com, gov, est. or xxx). This way you should not have to worry about the freedom of speech, because if someone wants to go to XXX all they have to do is to check that box.

Well I got to go now I hope this helps.
Bob Callegari

I don't know whom to address this question to, nor do I know what impact my suggestion may have or if it has already been thought of. However, the need for control of adult sites really needs to be managed and monitored to a stricter level. The technologies out right now trying to prohibit children or users from accessing adult content sites is simply not working. Even the login screens for many of the sites are very seductive. I don't think I have to preach to this commission in regards to this matter.

My suggestion is quite simple in explanation. However it may be more difficult to approve and execute. For all sites containing adult matter, there should be an ".adu" extension. There is already tight control on the use of ".gov" or ".us" extensions. Why can there not be a mandatory ".adu" extension for all adult related sites. This way you could have an option in the securities of the browser to not allow access to any ".adu" URLs. I will be very happy to assist in creating a requirements document or help in lobbying the issue.

Feel free to contact me,

Anthony Schmidt

Let me say that I am a rather average college student in the middle of the bible belt, the most conservative section of the USA. I attend media class after media class every day, and spend my time writing papers about such subjects.

Let me also say that I am also an artist, filmmaker, writer, and reviewer. I deal constantly with the purported 'cleansing of materials for public consumption to prevent harm to the general populace'... in other words, censorship.

I fail to understand why of all first World nations we in the USA are the most backward progressing nation in the area of personal moral perception. The basic idea being that what one person and or group perceives as god and or bad morally, is not what another group and or person perceives as moral. It is a basic idea of personal liberties, to decide without a dictatorial commission what an individual considers to be moral.

Progressing to the crux of the matter, under what purported moral dictum does the Commission see it necessary to imprison owners of Internet Smut sites? Or for that matter to censure a closure of site? Is it a fun game to ruin peoples business? Yes, to select groups their sites are offensive and immoral, but like all those sites say, "Do not proceed."

There are cases where people would find a commission that decides to dictate morals to others to be in and of itself criminal, and repugnant to society. As the great man Jean-Jacques Rousseau once said, "Censorship may be useful for preservation of morality, but can never be so for its restoration." Watch upon who's toes you tread for a step too far has irreversible and often undesired repercussions.

Censor, I mean, Protect the populace with ignorance, all you will... I know my words fall upon deaf ears. I've written organizations before and found that they live in tiny closed off little worlds that cannot, nay will not, admit new thought provoking ideas in.

Signed
Grey Jedi

In addition, software blocking of internet sites is unnecessary, any computer savvy parent should already know how to access the appropriate files to discover where their child has gone. That and many parents falsify accounts for their children now because of the annoying privacy invading methods used to block 'questionable sites.

To The Commissioners:

I would like to express my concern regarding the Children's Online Protection Act. The bill does not identify or define what an "adult identification number" is, nor does it identify by what authority these adult identification numbers will be assigned. The bill's use of the Miller 3-prong test to determine what material is "harmful to minors," is not applicable to the Internet as a broadcast medium. The "contemporary community standards" of what is acceptable and what is not are not applicable to a medium that is broadcast world-wide. The use of the term "average person" is not useful when applying it to judgements that are inherently personal and not in any way objective.

The bill leads me to believe that its enforcement will lead to an erosion of adult privacy by making it possible to track adults who are accessing information that is "unacceptable." While I am sure the government has not intention of tracking people who engage in such behavior, this legislation's use of "any adult identification number" suggests that this sort of surveillance will be done later, as do the other two means of ensuring that adults only are accessing the information via the Internet.

I understand the Government's conviction that there is information that is inappropriate for children that is made accessible to them via the Internet, however it is not in the Government's best interests to attempt to subvert parental authority by removing a child's access to this information through legislation.

Signed,

Christie Robbins

To whom it may concern,

It is my understanding your commission is currently meeting to discuss ways to prevent children from accessing web sites with inappropriate material. One possibility you're currently exploring is new domain names for adult material. While this might have some minor positive effect, I feel this is the wrong approach. First of all, pornography is like any other business and will decline to disassociate itself from other .com businesses. Secondly, there will always be those sites that will try to gain the underage audience back by associating with the .com domain name. And as the Internet has repeatedly shown there are just too many to keep track of and enforce legalities upon.

In this light, allow me to propose a suggestion. The <HTML> standard is still young enough to install a new <tag> within the a document code, this tag could be used as a site rating. The web designer could then assign the site a material rating that reflects its content. This would be similar to a movie rating, an example entry could be <rating>G</rating> or more importantly <rating>MA</rating>.

Allow me to explain what I feel are the benefits of this method. Firstly, this offers the potential for total child access prevention, for web-browsers need merely to offer parental passwords that toggle the browser's own access to adult content sites. If the browser lock is on, the browser simply refuses to access a site whose HTML document includes a bad rating. You're probably thinking of the situation were sites purposely give their content low ratings so that all might access, or even no rating at all? As far as a low rating for adult content, that is something that could be informed by law, if sites are to use the rating system, obviously some legalities must be imposed to prevent the systems abuse. As for no rating, freedom of speech demands this be acceptable and I too believe it should be, but again browsers could EASILY be established that simply do not access sites without a rating, leaving it in the parents control to acquire these browsers.

That is my suggestion, I feel it is one of the only true alternatives without compromising our rights to freedom of speech. If the commission could swiftly consider this option, the rating tag could be soon on its way to standardization. Thank you for your time and consideration, I look forward to the day our children may browse the web safely without compromising their liberties.

Sincerely,
James Gilbert

Dear Members & Staff:

Let me first take this opportunity to congratulate you on the success of your hearings June 8 on protecting children in the online environment. The wide scope of subject matter and opinions expressed will help frame the policy discussions that we hope will bring about a more safe and enriching online experience for young people in a wired world.

My concern is child pornography being traded one the internet. In the chat rooms of MSN.COM there are chat rooms dedicated to the trading of child pornography. These chat rooms can be found grouped with the chat rooms for teens.

The online chat rooms at MSN.com are infested with pedophiles. There are no sysops to supervise young people as there are at AOL. I visited the "1_preteen_pics_trader 1" chat room where I observed commercial web site operators enter and solicit what was purported to be child pornography. Rape photos of girls under 12 were in particularly high demand. This goes on as a commercial enterprise daily. As there is inadequate supervision minors are also in these chat rooms, sometimes offering "self pics" of themselves.

These matters have been reported to MSN, which took 28 days to respond, as well as to media outlets. I have left a message at Cyberangles as well, but to date, this activity continues unabated. The material being openly traded is of the most graphic sort with minors.

I oppose censorship but children must be protected. Microsoft has done nothing to prevent this activity.

James E. Morrow

To whom it may concern;
As a uncle of three,and computer operator,which my software is Microsoft Windows'98 second edition I'd like to suggest the followin ways to prehibit non viewing of non-juvenile oriented websites.

1.If the adult never visits the websites,nor bookmarks them by control"D" the website addresses are not as obvious to the kids.

2. I also have all Microsoft security updates within my computer,including that of June 02,2000,You can download these by left clicking on "tools" in your internet browser,go down to windows updates right click that,then view,check,and download.you can check your security @www.grc.com

3.NetNanny from cnetdownloads.com click on browser software,find netnanny,and download.

However this will not stop these cites from sending e-mail if before installation of above the operator has already visited these non-juvenile oriented sites,example Gaytradition.com,and others.I also have a firewall from mcafee.com,and if I even think that one of thes websites have been visited I check my computer browser favories,if found delete them,and go to mcafee.com cleaning them off the harddrive.Lastly,If I get an invitation email I click on reply in my email browser telling them I'm Not interest and direct them to block it in the future.
Per your Times-News story this Monday,June 12,2000.
Willie Ray Bowen

I have long stated that we need the designation:

.prn

for porn sites. There is no need for mistakes when searching/surfing/browsing the web. Since everyone has the RIGHT to do as they wish, then let there be a category for those who choose "adult" information.

Linda Phifer,

The following was sent to Senator McCain germane to his attempt to require libraries to install filtering software in order to continue receiving federal funds. Most of my comments to this commission are covered in the e-mail to Senator McCain:

[Senator McCain] I'm writing to encourage you to rescind your amendment to H.R. 4577 (No.
3610). I have sent my two senators a request to vote against your amendment. Although I believe your intentions are in the right place, that you really want to protect children, this amendment is not the correct approach and, possibly, even counter productive:

1. It's unnecessary in most instances [to require filtering software], for example here in Allegan.
Consequently it is an unnecessary intrusion by federal government into what should be a local decision. Contrary to popular perception perpetrated by the media, many libraries do not have a problem with internet usage.

2. As recently demonstrated, many filtering companies filter out or are capable of filtering out business competition, political beliefs that go against corportate policy, medical information, or social beliefs in addition to pornography. With the rate of change on the internet, how do we expect libraries, especially small poor libraries, to keep up with this filtering requirement? This amendment will force these same poor libraries to forever allocate funds to keep up with these changes. Will Congress provide the financial support? Is Congress willing to provide the funds to ongoing monitoring of the filter companies? Quis custodiet ipsos custodios?

3. There are better methods for dealing with inappropriate use than mandatory filtering which, in reality, only provides the illusion of protection. It is my guess that the business people involved in pornography could care less whether libraries filter or not and, perhaps, may do better if filtering legislation passes because circumventing the **protection** provided by filtering is no big deal. Whereas the honest local citizen may never know what additional information was withheld by the filtering company that, perhaps on a whim, decides to block all Michigan information for a day (example exaggerated to make a point).

Please do what is right and withdraw this amendment which will hurt most those libraries most in need of E-rate discounts. This intrusion by the federal government is not necessary nor appropriate. Ironically, a vote for this amendment will do nothing to protect children and will only provide an illusion of protection. Trust local communities to take the

action required for their specific needs. One size does not fit all. I hope that you also reconsider the Children's Internet Protection Act; I suggest that this issue is best left to local communities, many of which have dealt with eliminating internet pornography use in intelligent, thoughtful, and effective ways that really do help and protect children.

Ed Spicer

I am an Adult Librarian in a public library in the Richmond, VA area. I am continually concerned about unsupervised minor children using our Internet machines. The Internet in our Children's section is filtered. However, few self-respecting children over the age of 10 or 11 want to go to the Children's Room . It is for babies. Children come after school, completely unsupervised, and spend hours on the Internet in the Adult Room. We have no time limits or sign-ins. Other than simply asking the child how old he or she is, we have no way to determine how old they are. We try to send younger ones to the Children's Room. They don't want to go. I think parents erroneously assume that their children are safe in a public library. Parents have no idea what their children are viewing on these Internet workstations. The names the kids use in chat rooms are frightening. Thirteen and fourteen year old children are calling themselves "Hotstuff," "Sweet Lips," "DeadSexy" ad nauseum. Many nights all 17 Internet workstations are being used exclusively by adolescents. With one person staffing a large room with 3 telephone lines, there is no way we can adequately supervise what these kids are doing. They are definitely not using the public library for its intended purpose.

While it is good to see your commission studying this difficult and important question, it is an unpleasant surprise that public and school librarians are not included to and significant degree in the commission or in the list of witnesses. Librarians have more experience working with children, the Internet, and filtering issues than anyone. In Virginia in particular public libraries have managed to provide children access to the Internet in the manner dictated by their communities. The Loudoun County case drew national attention, but numerous other library systems have chosen to filter or not to filter and lived with those decisions. I hope you will consider consulting some of us who work on the front lines of this social battle.

Cy Dillon

Dear Commisioners,

   I am one of many youth who have un-knowingly accessed as site with pornographic material. As a victim of deception, i clicked on a link.
If i were to start a petition against this, you would find that millions of under age teenagers have stumbled upon sites with pornographic material.

   Many times youth go out looking for it. This is something that comes with harmones and maturity level. This is something that young children could easily acess just by mistake. I hope you to take this into consideration.

   If willing, i would ask that you let me start a petition going against this, just for teenagers and children under the age of 18 that have stumbled on or found web sites with pornographic material. Thank you and God bless,

Justin Johnston

My company, InForAll, Inc. has taken the technology you are discussing to the next level. We recently introduce a product called iForAll that uses peer to peer technology. This technology allows apparent to view exactly what the child sees on the child's computer. Yes, we incorporate RASi, provide blocking and key word filtering, but the advantage of iForAll is its real-time remote monitoring capability. A parent can be anywhere and be connected with their child. IForAll can see all Internet activities (web, chat, email and ftp). This is only part of the program. iForAll also allows the parent to have either a one-way or two-way conversation with the child. The parent can even disable the child's computer. As a final family feature, iForAll also includes a family communication center that includes a family calendar, address book and a personal information page.

We feel this technology is the future of child Internet management software. Passive program do not work because they need to keep updating themselves. These updates are never 100%. Passive software solutions also allow parents to abdicate their responsibility of being the protector of their children and moral lighthouse for their children. iForAll keeps parents involved. Passive software and government regulation does just the opposite.

As you can see by our address we are located in the DC suburbs. If you would like a demonstration of iForAll or if you would like a copy delivered to your office, just call.

Safe Surfing!

Tom O'Connor
InForAll, Inc.
Silver Spring, MD 20904

Hello, I was wondering: How can one group of people decide what is "inappropriate" for another group? It's obviously wrong to judge someone by their age let alone treat them like others in their age group.

I admit it, I "consume material" that most everyone at the COPA deems "inappropriate", but I also "consume" other material most would find intelligent and moral like Oprah. In my view, from a 15-year old whom you are trying oh so hard to "protect", it would become much more benificial recommending minors to use their heads, rather than preventing them from not using their heads.

Now it comes down to this:

I'm not a porn addict,
I'm not a child offender,
I'm not a "pervert",

Are you going to tell me that I'm wrong, only because I'm 15? That would be really prejudice and insulting if you were to do so. Thank You.

As a computer store owner and computer hobbyist, software filtering is not as preferential as ISP filtering due to the ease with which it can be circumvented, the incompatibilites with other software, and that its not updated easily. If all ISP's offered filtering that would be immensly helpful but larger providers like @home cable services don't, and, the software filtering they offer doesn't work very well.

I really like the idea of designating a series of IP addresses to the porn industry, though not sure how practical it would be to implement. Not sure if implementing the idea would be easy as ISP's have an IP address associated to them and the x-rated sites they host would be associated to their IP address along with all the non-sex related sites they host.

So, due to its ease of implementation, the .xxx or .sex extension is preferable in that its implementation is easiest to do. Internic should be persuaded to implement this extension for each country to determine if they want to use it. Sure some countries may not, but its a step in the right direction toward simplier means of filtering porn by password protecting access via the browser.

Another reason to go with a red-light alternative to a green light is that most adults do not frequent x-rated sights, and, more importantly some do because of its easy access but would not if the temptation wasn't so available - like myself!

There are now reports about growing sexual addiction based around net-porn that could be curtailed by some simple changes. The internet with broadband cable is easier to use than going to your public library. However, imagine the outrage if the library provided porn and it was mixed in all catagories from fantasy to fiction to children's books where children could very easily check out the books.
Or imagine T.V. with smut intermixed on various channels at all hours every day where all you had to do is to on the t.v., flip through some channels and your kids can easily watch porn. The internet is almost that easy and porn movie clips are available free to watch now on the net.

If some regulatory agency can keep porn from public airways, why can't the same be true for the internet. I pray that an easy-to-use realistic approach becomes available shortly!

Patrick Ewing

To whom it may concern (Child Online Protection Act Commission):

  I have recently read, with interest, the proposals for Internet
Protocol address-based content delegation discussed on the August 4
commission hearings. I wish to raise some serious concerns about these
proposals, which I think are technically misguided and very probably
infeasible.

  It is unfortunate that there do not appear to be many (if any?) people
associated with the commission who have direct experience with the
technical management of large Internet or IP-based networks.

  While the recent proposal to allocate a "small portion" of IP address
space for specifically content-based "child protection" schemes -
whether
by allocating certain addresses specifically to X-rated sites, by
allocating certain addresses specifically to "kid safe" sites, or by
doing both - may sound appealing simple, it would likely prove
disastrously
difficult to implement.

  The Internet has long been suffering from an ever-increasing
Complexity f routing tables - the critical "maps" which specify how to get from
point A to point B, given that those points are known only via their
Internet addresses. Because of the complex and cooperative way in which
these routing tables are calculated on a minute-to-minute bases, the
present need to redistribute or "carve up" some very large blocks of
addresses which were originally intended to be contiguous, and the
need for each provider to filter invalid route announcements, there
are already real problems in reaching certain addresses by way of
certain Internet providers. (I am drastically oversimplifying here, as should
be bvious.)

  At any rate, the Internet Protocol addressing scheme was designed
on the assumption that blocks of addresses would be roughly correlated
with geographical location, and be specifically and closely correlated
with network connectivity. A current biggest problem is generally
assuring the reachability of small blocks of IP addresses, especially
those which have been suballocated from large original blocks of
addresses. (For technical reference, I am referring to the ongoing
subdivision of unused "Class A" address space.) Any group of less than
256 contiguous addresses (a "Class C" in old terminology) from any
source is nearly guaranteed to be unreachable from other Internet sites;
in some cases, blocks of less than *4000* contiguous addresses (a "/20"
in current terminology) may not be reached from all providers if they
were subdivided from a former Class A block.

Do you begin to see the problem in adapting your IP-address based
proposal to the Internet and web?

First of all, it would have to pass the approval of the various
international boards which administer the allocation of IP address
space,
which currently work on largely technical grounds and have mostly
avoided
political involvement.

Second, if implemented, it would require some party to take over
management of some IP address space - a highly technical process - and
dole it out to applicants while satisfying itself of both their
technical
competence to manage the space, and their intent to comply with the
content guidelines.

It would also probably require individual IP address assignment to
each
individual web site, which is against current policy for IP address
management in the Americas. (In the future, it is expected that most
web sites will not even *have* a unique IP address but may exist as what
is called a "hostname-based virtual web server".)

Moreover, due to the shortage of current IP address space (which will
not be alleviated any time soon) it would not be feasible to give any
applicant much more than they actually needed or proposed to use in the
near-term. You can see that this conflicts very badly with the need
mentioned above to allocate space to Internet providers or sites in a
minimum of 256 address "quanta" as listed above.

Finally, given all the issues in management of route maps that I have
alluded to above: the end result of this proposal, if it were
implemented, might very well have the effect of guaranteeing that most
of
the sites which wished to be identified as "kid-friendly" or "kid-safe"
end up "dropping off the Internet" and becoming inaccessible to *anyone*
due to the difficulty of getting routes to them accepted, once these
addresses are subdivided into tiny blocks scattered around the whole
Internet.

In short, I think this proposal would be disastrous for purely
technical reasons, however well-intentioned, and whether or not it is
legally
viable. I strongly urge you to reconsider.

Should you wish to consult technical experts, I suggest you consult some authorities on current Internet Protocol routing policies and Internet Protocol address allocation. One such group you may wish to contact is the North American Registry for Internet Numbers (ARIN). See <http://www.arin.net/> or contact hostmaster@arin.net for more information on finding an appropriate contact person for further technical discussions.

Yours sincerely,
Clifton Royston

Commissioners,

Perhaps it would be better to let the problem of control of children's access to the web be solved by the private sector. Given the demand for this control, as evidenced by the existence of your commission, it shouldn't be long before kid-safe ISP services are offered. Connection to uncensored ISPs can be controlled in the home by simply not saving the password to the uncensored ISP in the browser or connect software. Kid-safe ISPs can offer browsing of approved web sites by selected keywords or hypertext, as AOL does, and not allow general access by URL. They may even be able to charge a premium for this service.

Chat rooms are another issue, but perhaps a kid-safe ISP could charge customers to have people monitor chat rooms under its control, thus providing some protection and making some money in the process.

I think government intervention in the Internet domain should be *very* carefully considered, and should be a last resort. Perhaps one way government could be helpful is to certify an ISP as meeting "kid-safe" requirements. The development of these requirements and the certification of ISPs would be a great service to the Internet Community.

Yours truly,
Robin Uyeshiro

Hello,
I am an adult webmistress. I have been following the
COPA in the news and I have not seen this particular
problem addressed by COPA or anyone else for that
matter: newsgroups. Anyone possessing MSIE or Netscape
and a dialup connection can have access to thousands
of hardcore porn and bestiality photos delivered right
to their PC every day-free. No credit cards needed.
There's no age check/verifier or password protection
involved. And the same can be said for egroups.com .
Underage individuals can access all this material, and
the proposed 'red light district' for porn sites would
do nothing to stop the underaged from access all this
material free from news servers or egroups.
Personally, I believe all newsgroups should be
prohibited from posting binaries. But it may not be
feasible. It is one solution anyhow.

Thank you.

Sincerely,
Webmaster

Article in regards to:
(ZDNET)
A government office on sexy sites?
A federal panel examines how to protect youngsters from online pornography.
Is a government rating office the answer?
By Ben Charny, ZDNet News
August 3, 2000 3:34 PM PT
http://www.zdnet.com/zdnn/stories/news/0,4586,2611649,00.html
SAN JOSE, Calif. -- Librarian Jean Armour Polly was able to find what she
wanted when searching for filtering software to put on her school's
computers. But she never found what she really needed.

___What the gov't SHOULD have done in the first place. was say that Porn
webmasters/sites had to put; perhaps a certain snippet of [HTML] code in the
header of the HTML document so that filtering software could block that out
from youngsters... Webmaster's that didn't include that code could have been
liable for showing porn to minors. If, and when that happened. But since
the filter would only block minors. It would

1) Protect minors and;
2) Protect webmasters from liability without having to go through the hassle
of dealing with AVS's (Age Verification Systems... Which do the credit card
checks...)

This thing I talk about, would be simply how the rating system is on TV..
When the New TV's come out with the V-chip... I think you can block all the
TV shows that are above a certain rating.. Well this STANDARD would work the
same way... All sites would put this coding, so filters can pick up on it...
And this would ***ONLY*** block sites kids which have no business at the
site... But this code wouldn't infringe on the web site's paying
customers...
--

And it wont cost webmaster ~$70 for having to switch from a perfectly fine
[Dot]Com to a [Dot] XXX or whatever the new domains are.

If you try to force webmasters to move they will kick their heels in the
sand and say that it's censorship for making them buy new domains. Last
time I checked also ICANN or Register.com and the like would NOT give away
the .XXX domain names either because porn site's aren't non-profit they are
businesses... Thus will be charged accordingly...

2nd post:
Does the Net need a 'red-light district'?

A red zone for porn and a green one for kids were among the ideas tossed
about at a Child Online Protection Act hearing.
By Ben Charny, ZDNet News
August 4, 2000 2:39 PM PT
http://www.zdnet.com/zdnn/stories/news/0,4586,2612074,00.html

SAN JOSE, Calif. -- Zoning rules and regulations like the ones used to carve
up cities could soon be making their way onto the Internet.
--
__ People in here have used newsgroups right? Have you seen something like
this?

"x-no-archive: yes" In the first few lines of a post? Which is supposedly to
have your post not "cached" on sites like Deja.com etc... Well use a variant
of that.. That Filters and browsers can be trained to see something like
"x-check-adultsite: yes" or something like that.... No need to infringe on
someone's freedom of speech making them have to **buy** a new domain name
because you don't want to see their content. Thus you move them to the far
reaches of the Internet (Censorship)

With this simple HTML tag fix, webmasters can stay right where they are, and
will require minimum effort to change from non-compliant against minors...
To against minors, and compliant... Filtering companies can stop trying to
keep databases of sites, to stay away from... etc. There's no need for that
and that would be a never ending task.

[Dot]Kids I don't think will be a good idea. That just gives
Stalkers/Pedaphiles someplace to hunt down.

The Internet is not a playground... Just like you can't censor what's
outside your door what makes the government think they can censor the
Internet to infringe on someone because of disaprovment with their content.
If government doesn't cost webmasters a lot of money and heartache like the
.xxx extenstion then they may help instead of rally against everyone.
Example: You take the thousands of adult side domain names and channel them
in .xxx or .adt And I bet After sex.xxx or sex.adt or the other 'common
names are taken' you WILL hear someone saying they don't have any good
pickings thus want this law overturned... The gov't needs to stop making
laws that are made to be overturned because sooner or later when they *do*
want to make *MEANINGFUL* legislation to "protect" minors. It would have
been already ruled out from a prior case. Make laws as simple as possible
don't complicate things... Just like the US got the cybersquating law upheld
in more international places they could get something like the proposal I
outlined supported... As far as I know a few of the Asian countries want
to/have put in their own legislation... This proposal could help them too...

I must admit... This idea for the "x-check-adultsite: yes" isn't completely mine... I thought it through mostly based on the FCC's proposed V-chip which will block programming over a certain level should parents use the chip...

It has been stated repeatedly by the government that, they want little involvement with regulating the Internet. While attempting to not interfere in the everyday operations, we find a commendable effort, it is near impossible to not take some sort of role. If individuals and companies (In this case webmasters and surfers) where able to deal with those that "cross lines" or break laws, then we wouldn't need police. Just not going to happen, there will always be those who do a poor attempt of thinking they are beyond whatever rules that are in place. No matter how hard many of us try, we do not have the power or authority to prevent it.

The only downside to Government interaction is many times, they are not fully aware of what they are regulating. The COPA law has many positive attributes but several negative ones as well. There needs to be almost a sub-government working on the Internet as a team to ensure things work smoothly together. In the paragraphs that follow, I will explain who I am followed by what is both strong and week about the current laws. I hope the information will be able to help you with your final report in the later half of October. I apologize for not providing this information sooner, but as you know it takes time to gather information and layout a resolution. If anything needs clarified or re-stated, I will be more then happy to respond and assist any way needed.

My actual name is Steve Dickson, I reside in Indiana and a father of four girls between 5-11 years of age. While working on-line over eight hours a day, I have seen pretty much every aspect of the internet. Everything from <http://www.yahooligans.com/>http://www.yahooligans.com/ which is a great children's search engine, to a site I just reported for child porn. I "talk" to people on the ICQ chat program all the time and have no problem asking them for their impute on any given topic. All this combined has led me to the information to follow

It's been proven time and time again that Child Protection programs (CyberPatrol, NetNanny) are not as effective as the should be. Letting parents depend on these programs alone in negligent. For example, all my children have been on computers for years, my youngest (Age 5) is on our other machine as I type this and has computer lab in school every week. Many parents just don't have the knowledge our children do. I was self taught just like millions of others, I managed to get into computers in the very early 90's so have had a long time to study. Over the years now I have heard things as simple as "How do I find _____ on the internet". I look at the message dumbfounded for a moment then reply "Have you tried a search engine?". Most times they haven't. Now add that to the concerned parent "Protecting their children".

While the government is going to have to make things over complicated so that there are loop-holes (Such as posting nude pictures of children for adults to spend money to

see isn't illegal. As long as it isn't hard-core! That's truly repulsive, but it's "The law") The answers are all very simple.

1. AVS (Adult Verification Systems) Some of these need regulated do to, it can be easy to acquire a password for them. This does tend to be the most viable solution. No content over PG13 without it. Doing so would constitute the violation. This would drastically reduce children's exposure, while focusing on how exactly to help cut down on things like false meta tags (Used in web pages to help search engines index a site) Example: I did a search for Comicbooks. the third link was nude pictures of Pamela Anderson.

2. It was recently stated in a news article that "It doesn't take a rocket scientist to make current laws work on the internet". 100% correct! Adult Magazines arrive in a black bag or is behind a counter. Adult videos have signs have "Must be 18/21 to enter", this is done on adult web sites, the problem is who is at the counter making sure they at least look old enough?

Think about it for a moment, the site above not only broke the law by exposing the site to children, he used false advertising to do it.

3. It can't be just that simple, it will prove an ineffective as everything else done to date. Major crackdowns have to be made over the entire internet and the best place to start is by working with willing Adult Webmasters and cracking down fast and hard on illegal sites.

Defined: I have a database of over 1100 webmasters, all of which can have an AVS system in place on their sites in less then a week. Many "Mega pay sites" have edited tours and openly promote various AVS services to the webmasters who promote them. I have studied "Partnership programs" from many industries on the internet, the "Adult" programs beat anything else hands down. Better user access, for more detailed and extremely easy to use. While the government allows people to post nude children on the internet, Adult programs are repulsed by it. Free ISP's, affiliate programs and even TGP's (Thumbnail Gallery Posts. 1,000's of hard-core pics for anyone to see updated everyday). Many won't allow over use of the name Lolita, which is the name of a book about a man who "Fell in love" with a 12 year old little girl named Lolita.

It's all really simple to compile together, while complex to maintain to an efficient level.
I. All sites with Content deemed over PG13 must be AVS protected.
a. This includes "Free servers" who have the banner position at the top and bottom of pages.
1. Free servers must provide a "Secured" folder for webmasters to place their protected content. This is very simple process to do, so no one can complain about "resources and time". That's just smoke and mirrors.
2. All webmasters will be able to be properly identified with ease due to they have to give their personal information to the AVS system in order to be paid
II. Currently non-compliant sites would be fined up to $50,000 per day and up to six months in jail. That's not overly viable "As is"
a. Not all webmasters are on-line everyday; thus, may not get their e-mail everyday. They should receive the first fine just because the did break the law, but should have a "Grace period" before it constitutes a repeat offense.

b. Many webmasters on free servers will never be able to come up with the first $50,000 so forget about any additional.

1. As stated above, the adult industry has the best cgi-scripts for tracking and reporting then any where else on the internet. With this in mind, all should be held accountable. With several programs I have studied, it is VERY possible to track exactly where hits came from for affiliate programs and web servers have total access to things on their servers.

c. The webmaster is the single largest entity responsible for the content they post and where. They should receive the full amount of any jail time issued. In addition, there will be records of how much they have earned and that will estimate how much of the fines they should pay.

1. The servers be it a free or paid hosting is aware of how many hits a site gets and to what pages, they have the ability to terminate any account with ease. I see no reason why they can't police sites for wrongful activities.

2. Affiliate programs also have full access to where hits come from. It is far more difficult for them to regulate due to webmasters are on many different servers. Most of those servers are not regulated by them and they would have to contact both the offending webmasters and the server they are hosted on.

3. Many webmasters will quickly become compliant upon receiving the knowledge that they can and will be charged. The servers should be the primary target for cash fines, and affiliate programs to a lesser degree. None can complain about "Additional costs" of operating. Most brick and motor stores have loss prevention, expensive surveillance equipment and other things to do similar jobs. While it will be more costly for affiliates to regulate that many webmasters, they almost all have the same clause. Violate the terms of service and the account is canceled without payment. That
could be nothing or in some cases $1000.00's.

d. There are a good number of webmasters who would like to be more compliant, but thanks to no law enforcement of any kind, it is difficult for them to do so and still "compete" It's easy to just blame one sector of a problem, but that is both unfair and not effective.

1. The Adult industry as a whole can be compliant and strive to obey the laws and it will do a lot of good. They can't do it alone. What is needed is a central location for the adult industry to help each other. This happens all the time, I can provide countless links to web sites ran by multiple sites for a common reason. If sites, surfers, webmasters and such could log in and provide violators web address then, many sites could ease the strain of finding them all.

2. There are plenty of "outside" factors that will effect the efficiency of any law. The current joke with Napster is a prime example. Many servers won't allow "Complete" MP3 files. Affiliate programs like Amazon.com will cancel an account if they discover a site makes complete songs available. ITS THEFT. There is the argument that people have been sharing files with friends for years. Very true! None of us have ever shared them with 30 million of our "Closest friends". If Napster isn't shut down, then why not make Warez legal? If you can steal music, steal programs. That leaves the door open for password trader sites, which is stealing services and directly allows children to get passwords to porn sites.

3. Mistakes happen, with any medium, so should not be treated in an over zealous

fashion. A blind link. tricks a person from leaving where they are in order to go to a site they had little or no interest in. Upon reading documentation on false advertising, you will see this fills many of the "requirements".
<http://www.lawnotes.com/false_advertising.htm>http://www.lawnotes.com/false_advertising.htm
4. Hacking a computer requires entering a home or business threw the phone lines and proceeding to read or destroy private property.
<http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/18/1030.html>http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/18/1030.html
5. The Internet is like no other technology in the history of mankind. The United States Government should be in charge of all laws governing the Internet in the United States. Allowing individual states to regulate them selves while have the sovereignty of the union is a great factor in what has propelled our country to where it is today.
There are federal laws that supersede the individual states and this should be true in dealing with the internet. More work, complicated laws and other things can be avoided if there is only one version of a law. Gambling, Adult content, taxes or anything else. Example: Texas banned Ford from selling used cars on-line to consumers. The car want to retailers in the area and all inspections and taxes had to be paid. I would be upset if the congress from Indiana pulled such a stunt.
6. The standing law in regards to "Adult content" while using children needs revised.
<http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/18/2256.html>http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/18/2256.html Just paying by credit card to see nude children, "Hardcore" or not, should send up red flags.
7. Credit Card companies are multi-billion dollor ego maniacs. Their sole concern is making money, with little to no regard for their clients. They impose stiff fines for excessive charge backs. The leading industry for this is Adult Websites because a portion of consumers find it easy to do. IBill and others have software installed to detect card numbers that make a habit of charging back and refuse to except them with their clients. Credit Card Companies should be forced to use similar software, fine the companies that are at fault, but repeated service thiefs shouldn't be allowed to "refund" every other day. There is a lot less profit not fining innosent companies so to date have no interest in being honest about it.

Without all of the above working together any individual law will be substantially less effective then it could be. There are of course much more in-depth factors, but they are impossible to portray is a single e-mail. As stated in the opening lines of this message, Myself and many others are more than willing to contribute in anyway we can. We do not represent any one company or industry, so can remain neutral, while wanting to protect children and the rights of legal adults. A great deal of us understand the workings of the internet, but more importantly can provide the perspective of what "Actually" goes on around the internet.

Sincerely,
Steven G. Dickson
(219) 389-9805

Dear sir of madam,

Thank goodness for your committee. I support restrictions on children's access to porn on the Internet.

I have a method that will help reduce access by minors to material that is harmful to minors on the Internet. Maybe we should make computers cost more than $200. I can't think of any kid that has $200 for a computer so this would keep most of the kids off the net.

Or the children could impldment "parent" version 1.0. This is a program that is rarely used these days and once activated would rid children from viewing material that is harmful to minors on the Internet. It appears that most the "parent" programs are still in beta and require millions of plug-ins to keep children from viewing material that is harmful to minors on the Internet. It seems easier to fix the ONE "parent" program than it is to fix the MILLIONS of plug-ins to rid children from viewing material that is harmful to minors on the Internet.

I was just reading a news report about more police on the web has any thought been given to retired P.O. I am a retired New York City Police Office that has time to spend on the web you could make these retired officer marshal and you could have a lot of experience to help in this fight

it just a idea but with some merit I think

Craig V Hewitt   prophecy@ispchannel.com

In the report, the commission cautioned that governments need to "pay competitive salaries and benefits" to retain Web-savvy cops in an era where technical skills command high dollars.

Since it sounds like high paid web savvy cops are wanted, why not hire a minimum number of cops to serf the net for child porno and let them check up on sites which are turned in by ordinary web serfers who are paid rewards when a conviction occurs. This seems to me to be a more cost effective way to spend money for salaries.

Thank you,
Gerald Erikson
sgminer@gci.net

As I'm sure you've heard in testimony, biometrics, will be the future of online authentication.
I own a company called Age Protector who has two partners that will allow us to age authenticate on the Internet using a biometric voice sample and Driver License records. This web-based service will allow adult oriented sites to keep minors off, very simply, and across all platforms.

I'd very much like to talk to someone at COPA about this service. The vendor downloads were specifically about filtering, ISP's and Labeling technologys and don't really apply to this service.

The voice service is up and running and the commerce beta test is going on as we speak.

Who would be a good contact to follow with or submit a vendor proposal?

thanks

The solution is so easy it is a wonder that it has been overlooked:

Move all the pornography to a new domain called .porn

Credit card the access for age verification and that's the end of it.

Hi,
I have a terrible problem that I don't know how to handle. Please help me! My son, who is a minor, keeps getting porn e-mail, of course they say he can't get into the "hardcore" stuff without a credit card. (If what they show isn't hardcore, I'd hate to see the hardcore stuff!). His e-mail is through hotmail and they have a feature that you can "block the sender". Unfortunately, tho, it is a different sender each time, but everytime it is from an earthlink address. Here are examples:
from e-mail - twinkieman@uit.no
web site -
ction=http%3a%2f%2fhome%2eearthlink%2enet%2f%7ejmcquire627%2fsexy%2ehtm
web site - http://home.earthlink.net/~jmcquire627/relo/sexy.htm
from e-mail - nsuthe@weintl.com
_action=http%3a%2f%2fhome%2eearthlink%2enet%2f%7ettucker60%2fsixy%2ehtm
There are several more, but I e-mailed them to report@internet-police.co.uk and them blocked them and threw them away/deleted them. But the internet police never let me know that they are doing anything about it and my son is still getting them.
And did you notice that all the addresses have "earthlink" in there somewhere. That should tell us something, hey?
And I noticed that all the addresses I have to copy down by hand and then come to either you or the internet police and copy it by hand into the e-mail I send you because it doesn't forward on it's own. That tells me they are ashamed of their actions.
O.K. , well... enough said. Please get back with me and tell me what to do.
Thanks
Rachel

I've read the COPA law in full detail and have reached the same conclusion as the one I had before I had read it. It's too broad. I am 15 years old and I'm outraged by the fact that an online community I used to visit has been completely changed around to some pathetic excuse of a website because of the COPA law. The community was simply an area for children of all ages to submit drawings and comics to the website... the website reviewed all of the comics they received to make sure they weren't offensive or harmful in any way... and they also had a message board, where children could interact with eachother and post comments on their comics. This board was also monitored, and not once in my 7 years at the community have I seen ONE harmful post. Now, because of some law that's supposed to keep me from viewing porno sites has kept me from viewing a CHILDRENS ART FORUM. I'm not even sure if it's necassary, but I've known the people who run this community not to be threatened with 6 months in jail and/or 50,000 dollars for every day they don't comply with a law that wasn't even made for them. Because of COPA, before you send a comic, you must get your parent to e-mail them with permission. Afterwards, they review the comic and put it up without your "screen name" (an AOL thing, like a nick name that you go under. Example; my real name most definately isn't "Metemphere")... why would I want to put up a drawing, if I'm not going to be acknowledged for the work I've done? Also, the message boards were changed... now, when we post a message, they review the post before we post it (which means the 100s of posts that go in don't actually get seen until 3 days later, which is highly neanderthal). Also, when they do review it and post it, OUR SCREEN NAMES AREN'T BY THE TOPIC. This means it's an anonymous message board! Once again, I ask you... why would I post a message when I won't even be recognized for it? Thanks for bringing interaction to a new level. The nonexistant one.

Metemphere
"Sooner or later, your legs get weak; you'll hit the ground...
Save it for later, don't run away and let me down..." - Harvey Danger

The COPA Commission is doing a fine job but is too lenient using the same weak laws that are allowing strip club billboards on our highways and roadways with no resource to filter or block them out. These billboards glorifying the sex trade industry are deliberately aimed to have young boys grow up thinking of girls as sex objects, and to coerce young girls toward perverted behavior The sex trade industry is not stupid; they know exactly what they are doing and are succeeding with their goals to be in control. They frustrate and eliminate parental supervision by forcing children to read age inappropriate material. Please don't let that happen on the internet. This is not a time to be introducing more lenient laws with a business marketing sex to minors.
Most Sincerely, Lynn Sweet

There is only one answer to the question 'How to keep children safe from sex sites on the Internet.
Make it the responsibility of the origination and not the reception to limit pornography to adults.
How to do this. ADULT CHECKS and confirmation BY POST of someone wanting to join such
a site. <u>NO titbits for children to look at</u>.

Without any requirement of age (except my own guarantee that I was of age!) I was able to see and read examples of ROLE PLAY RAPE, ROLE PLAY ABDUCTION, BONDAGE, with uncontrolled links to MOCK EXECUTION and SODOMY. (The site was
http:\\www.abduction.com\redsrealm\ - but there are plenty more). The URL says it all doesn't it?

What about protection programs like NetNanny - in computer matters children are mostly more educated than their parents and the computer is often assigned to the child's bedroom - formatting and re-installation of OS - by-passes ALL safety protacols!

No one wants their children to see PORNOGRAPHY so lets not be cowards lets have the guts to do something NOW!

John Spooner UK

Hello,

If in any way possible, I'd like Commissioner Donna Rice Hughes to read my opinion on the matter debated by the COPA Commission at http://www.copacommission.org/

I don't have any link to porn websites in any way whatsoever -- I want to make that point very clear. It appears a lot is being done to sue porn sites using children as models and I believe those site operators need to be caught and dealt with on a very severe basis. As for the "adult models" porn sites, it seems all models are very much willing to pose. Such a point can be demonstrated by the massive number of personal "amateur" Web sites which goes to prove that sex can be a means of public expression for some people rather than an individual's or that of a couple. Trying to stop them would be violent breach to freedom of expression.

In the end, a human body isn't something we should shed shame on. It should be an element of pride and if appreciating that pride means showing nude pics of your body to total strangers on the Net, then be it! Who are we to judge them? If it's done right, this can help society as a whole be more relax about the matter and it may be very theraputic for everybody who's at ease with who he or she is.

I hope I didn't take too much of your time and I thank you very much for reading me since I think the future will appeal to each individuals sense of what's right and what is wrong (such as violence, domination, humiliation or abuse).

My best wishes to your work,

--
Claude Gelinas

I am Internet professional. I have been involved in building and deploying Web sites since 1996. I knew then that pornography on the Internet was going to be a problem but I never anticipated that my industry would become a sewer that empties into my own home.

I have two young girls ages 11 and 14. Any child who can spell the word "Dick" or "pussy" can get access to some of the most hard-core content imaginable. Just click, two words above, don't worry, they won't take you to pornographic Web sites but they do take you to a search results page which is one click away from pictures that display hard-core sexual content. And don't kid yourself, that nonsense

> **"This is a site designed and intended SOLELY for ADULTS -- people who are at least 18 years old -- who are interested in and wish to have access to visual images, verbal description and audio sounds of a sexually oriented, frankly erotic nature. ....**

> **If you are not accepting all the above Statements, click the link EXIT below or click BACK on your browser now to LEAVE this Adult Site."**

is just that, nonsense. Because for the most part you don't have to click beyond the opening page. There are more often than not pictures on the home pages right in the advertising banners that are so explicit as to show oral and anal sex, animated!!!

I am not naive enough to believe that pornography can be "banned" from the Internet. But asking the smut industry to regulate itself and allow it to hide behind the self-serving disclaimers as to the "adult content" and you are "free to leave the site " warnings is absurd. As is the notion that parental controls in the form of ineffective software filters or "just say no" is an effective means of keeping this out of ones home.

I would be surprised if you're esteemed commission of legal experts, Internet pundits and "freedom of speech" wonks has any real interest in doing what has to be done.

These X-rated storefronts need to be put in their own brown paper bags, if we can hope to protect what little of our children's innocence remains.

Joe Berger

The solution is so easy it is a wonder that it has been overlooked:

Move all the pornography to a new domain called .porn

Credit card the access for age verification and that's the end of it.

As I'm sure you've heard in testimony, biometrics, will be the future
of online authentication.
I own a company called Age Protector who has two partners that will
allow us to age authenticate on the Internet using a biometric voice
sample and Driver License records. This web-based service will allow
adult oriented sites to keep minors off, very simply, and across all
platforms.

I'd very much like to talk to someone at COPA about this service.
The vendor downloads were specifically about filtering, ISP's and
Labeling technologys and don't really apply to this service.

The voice service is up and running and the commerce beta test is
going on as we speak.

Who would be a good contact to follow with or submit a vendor proposal?

thanks

Hope the current meeting is going well. Page Howe asked that I pass on to you the overview for .KIDS Domains, Inc that was included in our application to ICANN for a new TLD. We have posted the bulk of our application as well at, http://www.kidstld.com/application/index.htm

I know that Page has had contact with Mr. Telage and we wanted to have this information at your disposal in the event it could be useful in the next 2 days.

Please call me with any questions or if I can be of any assistance.

Matt Hayes
.KIDS Domains, Inc.

It has been stated repeatedly by the government that, they want little involvement with regulating the Internet. While attempting to not interfere in the everyday operations, we find a commendable effort, it is near impossible to not take some sort of role. If individuals and companies (In this case webmasters and surfers) where able to deal with those that "cross lines" or break laws, then we wouldn't need police. Just not going to happen, there will always be those who do a poor attempt of thinking they are beyond whatever rules that are in place. No matter how hard many of us try, we do not have the power or authority to prevent it.

The only downside to Government interaction is many times, they are not fully aware of what they are regulating. The COPA law has many positive attributes but several negative ones as well. There needs to be almost a sub-government working on the Internet as a team to ensure things work smoothly together. In the paragraphs that follow, I will explain who I am followed by what is both strong and week about the current laws. I hope the information will be able to help you with your final report in the later half of October. I apologize for not providing this information sooner, but as you know it takes time to gather information and layout a resolution. If anything needs clarified or re-stated, I will be more then happy to respond and assist any way needed.

My actual name is Steve Dickson, I reside in Indiana and a father of four girls between 5-11 years of age. While working on-line over eight hours a day, I have seen pretty much every aspect of the internet. Everything from <http://www.yahooligans.com/>http://www.yahooligans.com/ which is a great children's search engine, to a site I just reported for child porn. I "talk" to people on the ICQ chat program all the time and have no problem asking them for their impute on any given topic. All this combined has led me to the information to follow

It's been proven time and time again that Child Protection programs (CyberPatrol, NetNanny) are not as effective as the should be. Letting parents depend on these programs alone in negligent. For example, all my children have been on computers for years, my youngest (Age 5) is on our other machine as I type this and has computer lab in school every week. Many parents just don't have the knowledge our children do. I was self taught just like millions of others, I managed to get into computers in the very early 90's so have had a long time to study. Over the years now I have heard things as simple as "How do I find _____ on the internet". I look at the message dumbfounded for a moment then reply "Have you tried a search engine?". Most times they haven't. Now add that to the concerned parent "Protecting their children".

While the government is going to have to make things over complicated so that there are loop-holes (Such as posting nude pictures of children for

adults to spend money to see isn't illegal. As long as it isn't hard-core! That's truly repulsive, but it's "The law") The answers are all very simple.
1. AVS (Adult Verification Systems) Some of these need regulated do to, it can be easy to acquire a password for them. This does tend to be the most viable solution. No content over PG13 without it. Doing so would constitute the violation. This would drastically reduce children's exposure, while focusing on how exactly to help cut down on things like false meta tags (Used in web pages to help search engines index a site)
Example: I did a search for Comicbooks. the third link was nude pictures of Pamela Anderson.

2. It was recently stated in a news article that "It doesn't take a rocket scientist to make current laws work on the internet". 100% correct! Adult Magazines arrive in a black bag or is behind a counter. Adult videos have signs have "Must be 18/21 to enter", this is done on adult web sites, the problem is who is at the counter making sure they at least look old enough?
Think about it for a moment, the site above not only broke the law by exposing the site to children, he used false advertising to do it.
3. It can't be just that simple, it will prove an ineffective as everything else done to date. Major crackdowns have to be made over the entire internet and the best place to start is by working with willing Adult Webmasters and cracking down fast and hard on illegal sites.
Defined: I have a database of over 1100 webmasters, all of which can have an AVS system in place on their sites in less then a week. Many "Mega pay sites" have edited tours and openly promote various AVS services to the webmasters who promote them. I have studied "Partnership programs" from many industries on the internet, the "Adult" programs beat anything else hands down. Better user access, for more detailed and extremely easy to use. While the government allows people to post nude children on the internet, Adult programs are repulsed by it. Free ISP's, affiliate programs and even TGP's (Thumbnail Gallery Posts. 1,000's of hard-core pics for anyone to see updated everyday). Many won't allow over use of the name Lolita, which is the name of a book about a man who "Fell in love" with a 12 year old little girl named Lolita.

It's all really simple to compile together, while complex to maintain to an efficient level.
I. All sites with Content deemed over PG13 must be AVS protected.
a. This includes "Free servers" who have the banner position at the top and bottom of pages.
1. Free servers must provide a "Secured" folder for webmasters to place their protected content. This is very simple process to do, so no one can complain about "resources and time". That's just smoke and mirrors.
2. All webmasters will be able to be properly identified with ease due to they have to give their personal information to the AVS system in order to

be paid

II. Currently non-compliant sites would be fined up to $50,000 per day and up to six months in jail. That's not overly viable "As is"

a. Not all webmasters are on-line everyday; thus, may not get their e-mail everyday. They should receive the first fine just because the did break the law, but should have a "Grace period" before it constitutes a repeat offense.

b. Many webmasters on free servers will never be able to come up with the first $50,000 so forget about any additional.

1. As stated above, the adult industry has the best cgi-scripts for tracking and reporting then any where else on the internet. With this in mind, all should be held accountable. With several programs I have studied, it is VERY possible to track exactly where hits came from for affiliate programs and web servers have total access to things on their servers.

c. The webmaster is the single largest entity responsible for the content they post and where. They should receive the full amount of any jail time issued. In addition, there will be records of how much they have earned and that will estimate how much of the fines they should pay.

1. The servers be it a free or paid hosting is aware of how many hits a site gets and to what pages, they have the ability to terminate any account with ease. I see no reason why they can't police sites for wrongful activities.

2. Affiliate programs also have full access to where hits come from. It is far more difficult for them to regulate due to webmasters are on many different servers. Most of those servers are not regulated by them and they would have to contact both the offending webmasters and the server they are hosted on.

3. Many webmasters will quickly become compliant upon receiving the knowledge that they can and will be charged. The servers should be the primary target for cash fines, and affiliate programs to a lesser degree. None can complain about "Additional costs" of operating. Most brick and motor stores have loss prevention, expensive surveillance equipment and other things to do similar jobs. While it will be more costly for affiliates to regulate that many webmasters, they almost all have the same clause. Violate the terms of service and the account is canceled without payment. That

could be nothing or in some cases $1000.00's.

d. There are a good number of webmasters who would like to be more compliant, but thanks to no law enforcement of any kind, it is difficult for them to do so and still "compete" It's easy to just blame one sector of a problem, but that is both unfair and not effective.

1. The Adult industry as a whole can be compliant and strive to obey the laws and it will do a lot of good. They can't do it alone. What is needed is a central location for the adult industry to help each other. This happens all the time, I can provide countless links to web sites ran by multiple sites for a common reason. If sites, surfers, webmasters and such could log in and

provide violators web address then, many sites could ease the strain of finding them all.

2. There are plenty of "outside" factors that will effect the efficiency of any law. The current joke with Napster is a prime example. Many servers won't allow "Complete" MP3 files. Affiliate programs like Amazon.com will cancel an account if they discover a site makes complete songs available. ITS THEFT. There is the argument that people have been sharing files with friends for years. Very true! None of us have ever shared them with 30 million of our "Closest friends". If Napster isn't shut down, then why not make Warez legal? If you can steal music, steal programs. That leaves the door open for password trader sites, which is stealing services and directly allows children to get passwords to porn sites.

3. Mistakes happen, with any medium, so should not be treated in an over zealous fashion. A blind link. tricks a person from leaving where they are in order to go to a site they had little or no interest in. Upon reading documentation on false advertising, you will see this fills many of the "requirements".
<http://www.lawnotes.com/false_advertising.htm>http://www.lawnotes.com/false_advertising.htm

4. Hacking a computer requires entering a home or business threw the phone lines and proceeding to read or destroy private property.
<http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/18/1030.html>http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/18/1030.html

5. The Internet is like no other technology in the history of mankind. The United States Government should be in charge of all laws governing the Internet in the United States. Allowing individual states to regulate them selves while have the sovereignty of the union is a great factor in what has propelled our country to where it is today.

There are federal laws that supersede the individual states and this should be true in dealing with the internet. More work, complicated laws and other things can be avoided if there is only one version of a law. Gambling, Adult content, taxes or anything else.

Example: Texas banned Ford from selling used cars on-line to consumers. The car want to retailers in the area and all inspections and taxes had to be paid. I would be upset if the congress from Indiana pulled such a stunt.

6. The standing law in regards to "Adult content" while using children needs revised.
<http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/18/2256.html>http://www4.law.cornell.edu/uscode/18/2256.html Just paying by credit card to see nude children, "Hardcore" or not, should send up red flags.

7. Credit Card companies are multi-billion dollor ego maniacs. Their sole concern is making money, with little to no regard for their clients. They impose stiff fines for excessive charge backs. The leading industry for this is Adult Websites because a portion of consumers find it easy to do. IBill and others have software installed to detect card numbers that make a habit of charging back and refuse to except them with their clients. Credit

Card Companies should be forced to use similar software, fine the companies that are at fault, but repeated service thiefs shouldn't be allowed to "refund" every other day. There is a lot less profit not fining innosent companies so to date have no interest in being honest about it.

Without all of the above working together any individual law will be substantially less effective then it could be. There are of course much more in-depth factors, but they are impossible to portray is a single e-mail. As stated in the opening lines of this message, Myself and many others are more than willing to contribute in anyway we can. We do not represent any one company or industry, so can remain neutral, while wanting to protect children and the rights of legal adults. A great deal of us understand the workings of the internet, but more importantly can provide the perspective of what "Actually" goes on around the internet.

Sincerely,
Steven G. Dickson

Dear sir of madam,

Thank goodness for your committee. I support restrictions on children's access to porn on the Internet.

I have a method that will help reduce access by minors to material that is harmful to minors on the Internet. Maybe we should make computers cost more than $200. I can't think of any kid that has $200 for a computer so this would keep most of the kids off the net.

Or the children could impldment "parent" version 1.0. This is a program that is rarely used these days and once activated would rid children from viewing material that is harmful to minors on the Internet. It appears that most the "parent" programs are still in beta and require millions of plug-ins to keep children from viewing material that is harmful to minors on the Internet. It seems easier to fix the ONE "parent" program than it is to fix the MILLIONS of plug-ins to rid children from viewing material that is harmful to minors on the Internet.

I was just reading a news report about more police on the web has any thought been given to retired P.O. I am a retired New York City Police Office that has time to spend on the web you could make these retired officer marshal and you could have a lot of experience to help in this fight
it just a idea but with some merit I think
Craig V Hewitt

In the report, the commission cautioned that governments need to "pay competitive salaries and benefits" to retain Web-savvy cops in an era where technical skills command high dollars.

Since it sounds like high paid web savvy cops are wanted, why not hire a minimum number of cops to serf the net for child porno and let them check up on sites which are turned in by ordinary web serfers who are paid rewards when a conviction occurs. This seems to me to be a more cost effective way to spend money for salaries.

Thank you,
Gerald Erikson