

In many ways I am in favor of filtering, but I feel that the following additional requirements should be made of the filtering software:

Any filtering software used to comply with the law MUST release to public review the list of censored sites. "Public" MUST mean posted to the web (and not self-censored!) and available for free or for a token fee upon demand in hard copy.

Any filtering software company MUST have and conform to an appeal process so that wrongfully censored sites have a process of appeal and redress. This appeal process MUST presume the filtering software is in error and the burden of proof MUST be upon the filtering software company.

Any filtering software company which is found in a court of law to have censored web sites unethically, such as censoring the pages of its competitors or of political opinions its owners disagree with, MUST BE SUBJECT TO UNLIMITED PUNITIVE DAMAGES. There must be restraints on the almost unlimited power being given to these corporations.

If there is going to be a private industry censoring what Americans can read in their libraries, then there'd better be checks and balances. We can take advantage of this situation to force filtering software companies to be ethical and responsible.

Sincerely,  
Mark Lambert