

**icuk.net**

**White Paper on ISPs and Default-On Filters for Home Internet Use**

**Published September 2013**

## **i. Introduction**

In July 2013, the UK Government announced plans to enforce a 'family-friendly' filter across Internet Service Providers, with the aim of preventing children from inadvertently seeing pornographic images or content, and also draining the market of illegal images of child abuse and paedophilia<sup>1</sup>. The policy announcement followed two years worth of government research, conducted by MP Claire Perry and MP Sarah Teather and a report published by Reg Bailey into the sexualisation of childhood<sup>2</sup>. Whilst the intention is honourable, the method and process is confused and lacks the necessary clarity to enable small and large ISPs to put anything into practice. This white paper seeks to understand some of the issues surrounding the Default-On filters, why they are so impractical and what should be done to better safeguard our children against the 'dark corners of the internet'.

## **ii. The Issue of Pornography**

Pornography is not a new trade, but the internet has made it more accessible and anonymous. There is no longer a need to worry about being caught walking into a sex shop - you can have a world of pornography at your fingertips and all trace of it can be vanished with one click of 'clear history'. Pornography has always been an industry which was created by adults and for adults, and that was far easier to regulate before the dawn of the internet. Now, many parents seem to be unaware of what children are viewing on a regular basis. This is the area of Cameron's policy which is somewhat manageable. Tighter age verification and suitable blocks can help those who are trying to view hardcore pornography at home find it a challenge. But what about mobile phones and tablets? Filters on these devices are notoriously difficult, and the majority of teenage internet access comes from these rather than a home desktop.

Reg Bailey's report 'Letting Children Be Children'<sup>3</sup> calls on the internet industry to develop and introduce effective parental controls, and whether by law or company policy, have age verification controls in place. They note that it is not fair for parents alone to be responsible for content which their children see online, and that the ISPs must accept some responsibility just as cinemas and DVD retailers take for age verification. The report seems to allude to a standardising of the industries, so that parents are better able to trust the internet as they would a cinema, for protecting their children.

The report also references Professor Tanya Byron's 2008 report<sup>4</sup> for the then Labour government, where she warned that a default-on content filter would lull parents into a false sense of security, and wouldn't encourage an active role in online use, a concern which has been echoed across the media since the policy announcement. She has also recommended the government consider it if other schemes fail. The report acknowledges that as the filters are not completely effective, there should still be an emphasis on parental supervision when a child is using the internet.

## **iii. The Issue of Child Abuse**

The other side of David Cameron's filtering policy is child abuse images and paedophilia. Cameron intends to 'drain the market' of content which encourages child abuse and paedophilia by calling on search engines to block certain search terms, some of which he deemed too gruesome to repeat<sup>5</sup>. Unfortunately, his understanding of Google images is limited, and his solution fails to actually hit the root of this content. The majority of this content is shared on another layer of the internet, across peer to peer networks which are far from the prying eyes and crawling of search engines<sup>6</sup>. Asking search engines to block certain search terms does very little extra than the current work of reporting and removal that they already do.

---

<sup>1</sup> David Cameron, Speech to NSPCC, accessed online here: [http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2013/07/The\\_Prime\\_Ministers\\_speech\\_on\\_protecting\\_our\\_children\\_online.aspx](http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2013/07/The_Prime_Ministers_speech_on_protecting_our_children_online.aspx)

<sup>2</sup> Reg Bailey, Report, accessed online here: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/175418/Bailey\\_Review.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/175418/Bailey_Review.pdf)

<sup>3</sup> Ibid.

<sup>4</sup> Professor Byron, the Byron Review, 2008. Accessed online here: <https://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/s/safer%20children%20in%20a%20digital%20world%20the%202008%20byron%20review.pdf>

<sup>5</sup> Jemima Kiss, The Guardian, Accessed online here: <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2013/jul/22/uk-government-online-child-sex-abuse>

<sup>6</sup> Mic Wright, Telegraph Blogs, accessed online here: <http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/technology/micwright/100009396/david-cameron-cant-protect-us-from-child-porn-because-he-doesnt-understand-the-internet/>

Trying to address pornography and child abuse rings is an unrealistic attempt and muddies the waters of the issues. Much of the pornography which is viewed, though perhaps distasteful to some, is by and large legal, and performed between two consenting adults who are making a living. This is of vast difference to the sharing of images depicting children being subject to sexual abuse by adults.

The Internet Watch Foundation found that the demographic most likely to see child abuse images by accident and not report them are men between the ages of 18 and 34<sup>7</sup>. It is vital that a campaign to encourage people to report images such as these is run to make people aware that it can be done anonymously, and that the information is of genuine help to the police. The proposed filters do nothing to prevent these images existing and being shared, as they go across peer to peer networks, not via search engines, but if and when they are seen, to leave them unreported could leave a child in abuse. We mustn't criminalise everyone in the quest to break up child abuse rings.

#### **iv. The Effect on our Children**

A recent article from TES by teacher Chloe Combi<sup>8</sup> highlighted some of the dangerous issues which teenagers face in this new world of easy access pornography. Emulating what they see on screen has led to a rise in graphic sexting, and sexual bullying. Teenage girls have been expelled for inappropriate behaviour in school toilets and on school property during lunch breaks. This also means that a large amount of graphic and often sexual content online, is actually self-generated by under-16s. The images may not have ended up where they were intended, but they do not necessarily involve adults<sup>9</sup>.

Reg Bailey's report also states that 22 per cent of girls and 26 per cent of boys aged between 9 and 16 had seen sexual images on or offline in the previous 12 months. What's interesting is that of these children who had viewed the images, 41 per cent of their parents believed they had not seen any images like that. There seems to be a concern that the gap between what children do and what parents know is growing<sup>10</sup>.

In a further study by the UK Safer Internet Centre, groups of children in school years six and nine were interviewed about their relationship with and knowledge of pornography. The study found that boys aged 13-14 (year nine) were more likely to have viewed pornography than their female peers, who often believed pornography was something that boys watched, and treated it with an element of distaste. The boys were in turn, also more likely to self-generate images, and to request images from girls (though these were not necessarily given purely on the basis that they were asked for). Further, in both gender groups, the children said they'd been affected by the case of Amanda Todd, who killed herself after dealing with years of bullying both on and offline. The year six groups were far less likely to have dealt with content of a sexual nature, but they were learning how to cope with abuse faced across social media or on multi-player gaming sites.

There is evidence from this report to show that all sets of children interviewed from across the age groups, were open to talking about their online lives in trusted groups, and that they were using common sense when it came to dealing with tricky situations. Cases broadcast by the media, such as Amanda Todd, though tragic, were helping pupils to understand potential consequences of being online<sup>11</sup>.

---

<sup>7</sup> Internet Watch Foundation, accessed online here: <https://www.iwf.org.uk/about-iwf/iwf-blog/post/351-teenagers-the-new-front-in-the-fight-against-online-child-sexual-abuse-images>

<sup>8</sup> Chloe Combi, Times Education Supplement, accessed online here: <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6294001>

<sup>9</sup> Internet Watch Foundation, accessed here: <http://www.iwf.org.uk/about-iwf/news/post/334-young-people-are-warned-they-may-lose-control-over-their-images-and-videos-once-they-are-uploaded-online>

<sup>10</sup> Reg Bailey, Report, accessed online here: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/175418/Bailey\\_Review.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/175418/Bailey_Review.pdf)

<sup>11</sup> Prof Andy Phippen, Safer Internet Centre, report accessed here: [http://www.saferinternet.org.uk/downloads/News/Sexting\\_An\\_Exploration\\_of\\_Practices\\_Attitudes\\_and\\_Influences\\_.pdf](http://www.saferinternet.org.uk/downloads/News/Sexting_An_Exploration_of_Practices_Attitudes_and_Influences_.pdf)

## **v. The Problems for ISPs**

For smaller Internet Service Providers, offering a content filter is an expensive task. Redirecting money and time from current projects and developments in order to purchase the equipment or set up a filtering system is not an easy feat for a small company - the sort that Cameron praised as the key to restoring the economy not so long ago. Further, it forces them to act as judge and jury - where will the list of block hosts and websites come from? If each ISP is to decide themselves what is inappropriate, the consumer is left with a potentially huge disparity between providers, and the ISP leaves themselves open to consumer criticism for blocking or not blocking certain content. Cameron has called on the minds of our time to come up with this solution, though they know full well it will be imperfect. Terms and Conditions will have to be drawn up by the legal minds of our time to escape the potential pitfalls and lawsuits of the parents who discover their children can still work out how to get around the filtering systems.

In her 2008 study, Professor Tanya Byron touched on the issues of filtering internet services, from the difficulties in deciding what constitutes inappropriate content to the risks of websites which are perfectly legal getting caught up in a filter (e.g. Websites with recipes for chicken breasts). She concludes that actually, there should not be a policy of blocking non-illegal content at ISP level, unless there has been a clear failure of the other suggestions in the report. She also notes that filters are no substitute for good education about staying safe online<sup>12</sup>.

## **vi. The need for International Involvement**

Further, there is a real need for international involvement when tackling such an issue. There is no use in purely regulating UK users - this criminal network extends beyond our own borders, and without cooperation of international bodies and overseas governments, we just won't be able to eradicate the issue. The government must extend relationships with the communications departments across the world and develop a real method for finding and catching those criminals who are creating and sharing this violent and despicable content of child abuse.

When the Internet Watch Foundation began, the UK accounted for 18% of content online. Now, the UK accounts for just 1% of the illegal content<sup>13</sup> - which means the rest of the world must be monitored too before we stand any chance of abolishing the 99% which remains. In addition, they have compiled a list of around 450 search terms which are blocked from generic search engines. With this decidedly concerted and thorough effort in place, why is there such an emphasis on further law within the UK? It seems that there is a need for greater cooperation from the rest of the world, particularly those countries with the higher percentages of image collection and storage. If the UK is expected to make significant moves forward, it cannot do so alone.

## **vii. The Thin End of the Wedge**

Cameron often spoke in Parliament against Blair and Brown's Nanny State. Police Surveillance, stop and search laws, were all key issues of the Labour years, which were deeply concerning to average UK Citizens. It may seem to be a thin end of the wedge argument, but the truth remains - once there is a filter in place, there is scope to expand what will be controlled and blocked through it. If a government list is created to regulate inappropriate content, then who will regulate the government's decisions as to what is on that list? In extreme circumstances, and admittedly years down the line, we could be facing genuine concerns around political websites being filtered and censored, or what the real meaning of inappropriate is. As future governments are unlikely to reverse policy, we could be subject to the changing temperaments and definitions of those in power.

It is also worth remembering that there is a scheme in place already which offers these services. Many of the UK's ISPs offer 'cleanfeed' which automatically blocks certain websites which have been deemed illegal<sup>14</sup>. In addition, all of the four major ISPs have systems which parents can choose to download in order to regulate and filters websites and browsing. At least half of these use McAfee, while the other two appear to use their own systems<sup>15</sup>. None of these filtering systems are hidden from parental knowledge, and all can be accessed and implemented by simple control panel features when a parent or guardian logs in. There could be reasonable cause for concern over why so few parents appear to implement it when it is so easy, but this is not necessarily a justification for default-on.

---

<sup>12</sup> Professor Byron, the Byron Review, 2008. Accessed online here: <https://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/s/safer%20children%20in%20a%20digital%20world%20the%202008%20byron%20review.pdf>

<sup>13</sup> Internet Watch Foundation, response to Cameron's speech. Accessed here: <http://www.iwf.org.uk/about-iwf/news/post/366-iwf-response-to-prime-ministers-statement>

<sup>14</sup> Wiki, Open Rights Group, accessed here: <http://wiki.openrightsgroup.org/wiki/Cleanfeed>

<sup>15</sup> UK Safer Internet Centre, accessed here: <http://www.saferinternet.org.uk/advice-and-resources/parents-and-carers/parental-controls>

### **viii. Case Studies One: Australia and Russia**

In 2011, the Australian government implemented a similar scheme of ISP level filtering<sup>16</sup>. Initially, the process was voluntary, with the intention of a law to back up the work which ISPs would take on in the block. The plan was widely criticised for leading on to censorship, as well as because there was no appeals scheme for any website which found itself caught up in a block incorrectly. In the end, the law never materialised, which perhaps suggests the end for this will be similar. It is worth noting when discussing the plans that they have already been unsuccessful in another country. It is also interesting that the IWF came under scrutiny as one of the organisations which may be in charge of the filters - thanks to blocking a wikipedia page because of an inappropriate album cover<sup>17</sup>.

Australia's law-making considerations were not the first time they had tackled this issue. Several reports have been written since 1998 regarding the idea of ISP filtering, and notably, the report compiled in 2008<sup>18</sup> by the Australian Communications and Media Authority did a pretty sound job of evaluating the filters. Following the tech developments since the 2005 version of the report, the writers sought to test different types of filters, (software, hardware and hybrids) and measure their effectiveness across aspects like scope, performance and adaptability. The report notes that there was little significant disruption to internet speed or network service. Comparatively, the problem of over blocking (sites mistakenly caught in a filter) was down from over 60% to less than 10% over the three years. Unfortunately, this report fails to account for cost, which is one of the biggest obstacles for small ISPs, so the results can't be converted into pure evidence to bring in the filters, but they are a helpful indicator in the developments of network level filtering.

In July 2013, the Pirate Party of Russia launched a specialised web host for companies which found their innocent website blocked because it shared the same IP address as a genuinely harmful site<sup>19</sup>. They state they will uphold their own code of web ethics, including a ban on phishing, spamming and child pornography, which indicates they have just appointed themselves as moral arbiters of the internet instead of the government. They've also protested the government's current policy that any site which does not rectify itself when they host illegal content, will be subject to closure within three days of notice. A party leader stated that they believed the law still needed work, for example, the copyright staying with the holder for five years after death, not the 70 currently, is reasonable in their eyes<sup>20</sup>. Again, we face an issue of who should be moral arbiters, rather than whether anyone should. The alternative in Russia is someone else monitoring your internet use, not the government.

### **ix. Case Studies Two: France and Germany**

France and Germany have both recently tried, with varying success levels, to bring in legislation imposing ISP-level filtering. In Germany, the bill was met with fierce opposition, and though it was passed in 2009, the successive government revoked it in 2011. This leaves Germany in the strange position of having precedent for the filter, but no law which has ever worked. Instead, they stuck with a more tried and tested method - they continue to use a report and remove system for child abuse images, and this has been noted to improve the chances of catching criminals, as images can be traced<sup>21</sup>.

France has much less of a debate when the bill to impose network level filters was imposed, and have successfully passed some of the original bill. Thirteen of the proposed articles were deemed to be unconstitutional, but network filters were not one of these. They were ruled proportionate on balance of public order and freedom of communication and so passed, proving they can be legislated and approved by constitutional council - something the other case study countries have never managed<sup>22</sup>.

---

<sup>16</sup> EFF, accessed here: <https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2011/06/australia-heads-down-slippery-slope-authorizes>

<sup>17</sup> Jillian York, OpenNet, accessed here: <https://opennet.net/blog/2008/12/uk-blocks-access-wikipedia-entry-controversial-scorpions-album>

<sup>18</sup> ACMA, report accessed here: [http://www.acma.gov.au/webwr/\\_assets/main/lib310554/isp-level\\_internet\\_content\\_filtering\\_trial-report.pdf](http://www.acma.gov.au/webwr/_assets/main/lib310554/isp-level_internet_content_filtering_trial-report.pdf)

<sup>19</sup> Oleg Kouzbit, Venture Village, accessed here: <http://venturevillage.eu/russia-pirate-party-blocked-websites>

<sup>20</sup> Online Petition, accessed here: <http://goo.gl/pPA5zS>

<sup>21</sup> Joss Wright and Yana Breindl, Internet Filtering Trends in Western Liberal Democracies, accessed here: <https://www.usenix.org/system/files/conference/foci12/breindl2012foci.pdf>

<sup>22</sup> UK Safer Internet Centre, accessed here: <http://www.saferinternet.org.uk/advice-and-resources/parents-and-carers/parental-controls>

## **x. Alternatives**

If ICUK were Prime Minister, there are certain alternatives we would propose to dealing with the genuine issue of inappropriate content being viewed at inappropriate ages:

- Promote organisations like the IWF and encourage people to report images when they see them. There would need to be an emphasis that this is an anonymous process, and therefore they should not have any need to be worried about prosecution themselves.
- Provide information about OpenDNS and similar programmes which can be installed on computers to monitor and filter content. However, as even these are not perfect, it must come with a warning that it does not replace direct parental monitoring.
- Support small ISPs who wish to provide information to their current and future customers, so that they do not have to bear the brunt of the costs for these expensive applications.
- Introduce more effective education in classrooms, particularly to inform children that images they take and share, no matter how private they may seem, can end up on other websites without their permission and without any ability to take it down.

## **xi. Conclusion**

As it stands, the coalition government's attempt on an ISP filtering policy is weak and ill-informed. It fails to address the problems it wants to solve at the source of those issues, and it fails to understand that it is likely to drive criminal rings deeper underground so they're harder to get to and break up. The government has painted itself as a naive and ignorant to the real world of tech and the internet, a dangerous image just two years before the next general election.

The next few months are likely to bring several more updates and changes to this policy, and we will see after October if there will subsequently be a law. Before then, it is vital that the government goes back to the drawing board somewhat, develops better methods to protect and support the smaller ISPs, and clarifies the differences between legal pornography and illegal abuse so that separate systems can be enforced to tackle them. State regulation is often time-consuming and ineffective in dealing with global traffic, and further without an independent control mechanism, responsibility for the filters staying with ISPs could be a dangerous notion.

*Notes to Reader:* Each week brings a new aspect of this debate to light, and this paper is accurate at time of release. We continue to debate and explore the issues on our blog, so further developments can be found there.

*Notes to Editor:* Please use the paper, its thoughts and opinions, for pieces related to the proposed filters. Please credit ICUK where it is used.

## Bibliography

This piece has not intended to plagiarize any work from any other author, and statements have been credited throughout. Below is a full list of articles and pieces which influenced the paper, even if they were not directly noted.

1. David Cameron, Speech to NSPCC, 22/07/2013 accessed online here: [http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2013/07/The\\_Prime\\_Ministers\\_speech\\_on\\_protecting\\_our\\_children\\_online.aspx](http://www.conservatives.com/News/Speeches/2013/07/The_Prime_Ministers_speech_on_protecting_our_children_online.aspx)
2. Letting Children be Children, by Reg Bailey: Report, June 2011, accessed online here: [https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/175418/Bailey\\_Review.pdf](https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/175418/Bailey_Review.pdf)
3. Safer Children in the Digital world, the report of the Byron Review: Professor Byron, 2008. Accessed online here: <https://media.education.gov.uk/assets/files/pdf/s/safer%20children%20in%20a%20digital%20world%20the%202008%20byron%20review.pdf>
4. Jemima Kiss, The Guardian, July 2013, <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2013/jul/22/uk-government-online-child-sex-abuse>
5. David Cameron can't protect us from child porn because he doesn't understand the internet, Mic Wright, Telegraph blogs, July 2013: <http://blogs.telegraph.co.uk/technology/micwright/100009396/david-cameron-cant-protect-us-from-child-porn-because-he-doesnt-understand-the-internet/>
6. Teenagers, the Internet Watch Foundation, April 2013, <https://www.iwf.org.uk/about-iwf/iwf-blog/post/351-teenagers-the-new-front-in-the-fight-against-online-child-sexual-abuse-images>
7. Porn, the shocking truth, Chloe Combi, Times Educational Supplement, October 2012, <http://www.tes.co.uk/article.aspx?storycode=6294001>
8. Young People Warned, Internet Watch Foundation, October 2012: <http://www.iwf.org.uk/about-iwf/news/post/334-young-people-are-warned-they-may-lose-control-over-their-images-and-videos-once-they-are-uploaded-online>
9. Sexting: An Exploration of Practices, Attitudes and Influences, Prof Andy Phippen, Dec 2012: [http://www.saferinternet.org.uk/downloads/News/Sexting\\_An\\_Exploration\\_of\\_Practices\\_Attitudes\\_and\\_Influences\\_.pdf](http://www.saferinternet.org.uk/downloads/News/Sexting_An_Exploration_of_Practices_Attitudes_and_Influences_.pdf)
10. IWF Response to Prime Minister's Speech, July 2013: <http://www.iwf.org.uk/about-iwf/news/post/366-iwf-response-to-prime-ministers-statement>
11. Open Rights Group, Wiki, accessed August 2013: <http://wiki.openrightsgroup.org/wiki/Cleanfeed>
12. UK Safer Internet Centre, accessed August 2013: <http://www.saferinternet.org.uk/advice-and-resources/parents-and-carers/parental-controls>
13. Electronic Frontier Foundation, Jillian York, June 2011, <https://www.eff.org/deeplinks/2011/06/australia-heads-down-slippery-slope-authorizes>
14. Jillian York, June 2008, Opennet Initiative: <https://opennet.net/blog/2008/12/uk-blocks-access-wikipedia-entry-controversial-scorpions-album>
15. ACMA, June 2008, [http://www.acma.gov.au/webwr/\\_assets/main/lib310554/isp-level\\_internet\\_content\\_filtering\\_trial-report.pdf](http://www.acma.gov.au/webwr/_assets/main/lib310554/isp-level_internet_content_filtering_trial-report.pdf)
16. Oleg Kouzbit, July 2013, Venture Village, <http://venturevillage.eu/russia-pirate-party-blocked-websites>
17. Online Petition, accessed Augsut 2013: <http://www.onlinepetition.ru/%D0%BE%D1%82%D0%BC%D0%B5%D0%BD%D0%B8%D1%82%D1%8C-%D0%BF%D1%80%D0%B8%D0%BD%D1%8F%D1%82%D0%B8%D0%B5-%D0%B7%D0%B0%D0%BA%D0%BE%D0%BD%D0%BE%D0%BF%D1%80%D0%BE%D0%B5%D0%BA%D1%82%D0%B0---292521-6-/petition.html>
18. Joss Wright and Yana Breindl, Internet Filtering Trends in Western Liberal Democracies, accessed here: <https://www.usenix.org/system/files/conference/foci12/breindl2012foci.pdf>
19. Porn depicting rape to be banned, Daily Mail, July 2013: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2372833/Internet-porn-depicting-rape-BANNED-Cameron-unveils-opt-rule-web-users.html>
20. Block CHild Porn or I'll change the law, Daily Mail, July 2013: <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-2372056/PM-warns-web-firms-block-child-porn-Ill-change-law.html>
21. Cameron Cracks down on Corroding Influence, The Guardian, July 2013: <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2013/jul/22/david-cameron-crackdown-internet-pornography>
22. Online Pornography to be Blocked by Default, BBC News, July 2013: <http://www.bbc.co.uk/news/uk-23401076>
23. Online Pornography, Cameron declares War, The Daily Telegraph, July 2013: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/internet/10194073/Online-porn-David-Cameron-declares-war.html>
24. Cameron's crackdown on illegal porn criticised, The Daily Telegraph, July 2013: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/technology/internet/10194641/Camerons-crackdown-on-illegal-pornography-criticised.html>

25. Comment is Free, Suzanne Moore, The Guardian, July 2013: <http://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2013/jul/22/porn-authoritarian-david-cameron?INTCMP=ILCNETTXT3487>
26. Family Filters won't block 'soft' porn, The Independent, July 2013: <http://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/family-filters-wont-block-soft-porn-david-cameron-retreats-in-war-on-internet-porn-admitting-there-will-be-problems-down-the-line-8726991.html>
27. Online Pornography: Cameron's War muddles two separate issues, The Guardian, July 2013: <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2013/jul/22/david-cameron-crusade-internet-pornography>
28. Child sex abuse online, The Guardian, July 2013: <http://www.theguardian.com/society/2013/jul/20/child-sex-abuse-online-internet-watch-foundation>
29. Parents, take back control, The Daily Telegraph, June 2013: <http://www.telegraph.co.uk/journalists/cole-moreton/10107771/Claire-Perry-MP-Parents-take-back-control.html>
30. Phwoar! The Register, July 2013: [http://www.theregister.co.uk/2013/07/23/content\\_filtering/](http://www.theregister.co.uk/2013/07/23/content_filtering/)
31. Porn sites get more traffic in UK than internet shopping, The Guardian, July 2013: <http://www.theguardian.com/technology/2013/jul/26/porn-sites-internet-traffic-uk>
32. East-West Digital News, November 2012: <http://www.ewdn.com/2012/11/02/russia-lists-banned-web-content-scientists-offer-banned-content-filter/>
33. Porn Filters: 12 reasons why they won't work, and three reasons why they might, The Guardian, August 2013: <http://www.theguardian.com/politics/reality-check/2013/aug/08/porn-filters-evidence-for-against>