

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)
)
Empowering Parents and Protecting) MB Docket No. 09-194
Children in an Evolving Media Landscape)
)

COMMENTS OF GOOGLE INC.

Richard S. Whitt, Esq.,
Washington Telecom and Media
Counsel

Megan Anne Stull, Esq.,
Telecom Policy Counsel

GOOGLE INC.
Public Policy Department
1101 New York Avenue NW
Second Floor
Washington, DC 20005

Mark J. O'Connor
Jennifer P. Bagg

LAMPERT, O'CONNOR & JOHNSTON, P.C.
1776 K Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 887-6230 tel
(202) 887-6231 fax

Counsel for Google Inc.

February 24, 2010

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY..... 1

I. GOOGLE CONTINUES TO ENGAGE IN NUMEROUS EFFORTS TO EMPOWER PARENTS AND PROTECT CHILDREN ONLINE..... 3

A. GOOGLE MAKES AVAILABLE EFFECTIVE TOOLS TO CUSTOMIZE ONLINE ACTIVITY..... 4

B. GOOGLE COOPERATES WITH INDUSTRY PARTNERS, COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT..... 6

C. GOOGLE ENGAGES IN EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS TO INCREASE AWARENESS OF ONLINE SAFETY FEATURES. 7

II. THE FCC’S FOCUS SHOULD BE LIMITED TO PROMOTING PARENTAL EMPOWERMENT TOOLS..... 8

CONCLUSION 12

EXHIBITS

- EXHIBIT 1 HIDE OBJECTIONABLE WORDS**
- EXHIBIT 2 SAFETY MODE VIDEO SEARCH**
- EXHIBIT 3 SET YOUR SAFETY MODE**
- EXHIBIT 4 GOOGLE GLOBAL PREFERENCES: SAFESearch FILTERING**

**Before the
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
Washington, D.C. 20554**

In the Matter of)
)
Empowering Parents and Protecting) MB Docket No. 09-194
Children in an Evolving Media Landscape)
)

COMMENTS OF GOOGLE INC.

Google Inc. (“Google”), by its attorneys, files these comments in response to the Notice of Inquiry (NOI) issued by the Federal Communications Commission in the above-captioned proceeding.¹ Consistent with its mission to “organize the world’s information and make it universally accessible and useful,” Google is committed to empowering and educating parents, enabling the creation of a positive and safe online experience for their children.

INTRODUCTION AND SUMMARY

As described in the NOI, evolving “electronic media technologies present many benefits for children.”² Google works to harness the power of the Internet to provide users with access to content, whether through Google Web Search, Google News, Google Books, or other new and emerging applications. These applications enhance the benefits the Internet brings to everyone and, more than ever, enable children to access the Internet in ways never before imagined.³ In doing so, a child’s ability to learn, become digitally literate, and engage in new ways of

¹ *In the Matter of Empowering Parents and Protecting Children in an Evolving Media Landscape, Notice of Inquiry*, 24 FCC Rcd. 13171 (2009).

² *Id.* at ¶ 1.

³ *See Id.* at ¶ 11 (“Children today live in a media environment that is dramatically different from the one in which their parents and grandparents grew up decades ago.”).

communications has been enhanced dramatically.⁴ Chairman Genachowski recently emphasized the benefits in this emerging space: “We all look at this explosion of communications technology and media and see real opportunities in access to new information to help improve education and enable kids to engage even more with each other and, as they grow up and hit 18, [become] citizens of our country and the world.”⁵

Alongside the benefits of the Internet are legitimate concerns about the potential risks and harms children may face online. Google recognizes the importance in Congressional actions like the Child Safe Viewing Act⁶ to achieve the essential goals of enhancing child safety in interactions with various media. To this end, Google is engaged in numerous efforts to assist parents in protecting children online, so that young people can enjoy positive and safe experiences on the Internet. Google has adopted multiple tools and policies to further this goal, including robust enforcement mechanisms, innovative safety features, educational efforts aimed at users, and active partnerships with prominent organizations committed to online safety.⁷

⁴ *Id.* at ¶¶ 18-20.

⁵ Julius Genachowski, Chairman, FCC, Opening Remarks at the Kaiser Family Foundation event on the release of its study: “Generation M²: Media in the Lives of 8- to 18-Year-Olds,” Jan. 20, 2010 (“Generation M²”). The study finds a huge increase over the past five years in the amount of media consumed by children ages 8-18 with the average child consuming 7 hours and 38 minutes of media seven days per week. Today, this age group spends an average of 1 hour and 29 minutes using a computer outside of school work. Moreover, 84% of young people have home Internet access, 59% have high-speed Internet access and 29% have laptops. Generation M² at 2-4.

⁶ Child Safe Viewing Act of 2007, S. 602, P.L. 110-452, 122 Stat. 5025 (Dec. 2, 2008).

⁷ As Google explained in its comments on the *Implementation of the Child Safe Viewing Act; Examination of Parental Control Technologies for Video or Audio Programming, Notice of Inquiry* (“CSVA NOI”), Google’s efforts to maintain the safety and integrity of Google and YouTube have four primary elements: (1) clear policies regarding what is and is not acceptable; (2) robust mechanisms to enforce these policies; (3) innovative product features that enable safer behavior; and (4) educational efforts across products to increase user awareness of how to stay safe. See Comments of Google at 4-9, MB Dkt. 09-26 (filed Apr. 16, 2009) (“Google CSVA

These initiatives enable all users, and especially parents, to customize their experiences online to satisfy both individual preferences and the needs of children.

In exploring this area, the Commission should recognize the substantial commitments and initiatives of the online community to create and promote a safe web environment for children.⁸ At the same time, the Commission also must recognize the importance of allowing for full and free expression for adults consistent with a robust marketplace of ideas and the First Amendment. As Congress has stated, the Internet and its growing abundance of online content bring a true diversity of political discourse, unique opportunities for cultural development, and myriad avenues for intellectual growth.⁹ In contrast to traditional electronic media sources, this extraordinary potential, including parental empowerment tools and technologies, has been realized in a vibrant and free market.¹⁰

I. GOOGLE CONTINUES TO ENGAGE IN NUMEROUS EFFORTS TO EMPOWER PARENTS AND PROTECT CHILDREN ONLINE.

Google takes very seriously its efforts to provide users with safe experiences online. In our April 2009 comments on the FCC's CSVA NOI, we highlighted our numerous tools and policies to maintain the safety and integrity of Google products.¹¹ Since submitting those comments, Google has introduced further initiatives to help parents, educators, and others maintain a positive and safe online environment. The following discussion examines our

NOI Comments”). The instant comments provide an update to the FCC on the advancements Google has made in this area since the filing of its CSVA NOI comments in April 2009.

⁸ See NOI at ¶¶ 41, 44. See also generally *Implementation of the Child Safe Viewing Act: Examination of Parental Control Technologies for Video or Audio Programming*, Report, 24 FCC Rcd. 11413 (2009).

⁹ 47 U.S.C. § 230(a) (2008).

¹⁰ 47 U.S.C. § 230(b).

¹¹ Google CSVA NOI Comments at 5.

continued strategy for online safety: (1) making available effective tools to empower families to customize their activity online; (2) cooperating with industry partners, community stakeholders, and law enforcement to stop the distribution of images of child sexual abuse; and (3) increasing awareness about online safety through educational efforts.

A. GOOGLE MAKES AVAILABLE EFFECTIVE TOOLS TO CUSTOMIZE ONLINE ACTIVITY.

As Chairman Genachowski has noted, the Internet has great educational potential, allowing for user interaction with a wide variety of targeted and innovative content.¹² New media thus must balance making content accessible to everyone with providing tools to protect the youngest Internet users.

Google strives to provide robust tools to set preferences with respect to online safety and customize online experiences for users of all ages. For instance, YouTube introduced the *Hide Objectionable Words* option in July 2009.¹³ *Hide Objectionable Words*, which is available in all languages supported by YouTube except Chinese and Japanese, allows users to replace commentary they may find age-inappropriate with asterisks in user comments. Users can opt-in to this feature by clicking on “Options” next to the Comments header and checking the *Hide Objectionable Words* box. Users also can choose to hide comments altogether by clicking on “Hide Comments.” These preferences remain in place until the user changes them on his or her browser.

¹² Genachowski, *supra* note 5, at 2.

¹³ See Google, “Safety Center: Parent Resources – How can I control what comments or content my children see?” at <http://www.google.com/support/youtube/bin/answer.py?hl=en&answer=126289>. See also “Hide Objectionable Words,” attached as Exhibit 1.

Users also can choose to opt-in to *Safety Mode*, YouTube's latest development on the online safety front.¹⁴ Launched on February 10, 2010, *Safety Mode* hides videos with potentially objectionable content or that have been age-restricted from the user's video search, related videos, playlists, shows and movies.¹⁵ *Safety Mode* does not remove content from YouTube, but rather keeps it off the page for users who opt-in to the feature.¹⁶ YouTube uses community flagging, the *Hide Objectionable Words* feature, and image software to identify and hide potentially age-inappropriate content.

Google also has enhanced its *SafeSearch* tool,¹⁷ a feature described in Google's April 2009 filing.¹⁸ In November 2009, Google unveiled *SafeSearch Lock*, a new tool that allows users to lock *SafeSearch* preferences at the "strict" filter setting, making it harder for someone to change those preferences without the original user's knowledge. When users choose to password-protect *SafeSearch*, Google shows "colored balls" at the top of the search results page as a clear visual cue that *SafeSearch* is locked and set to strict.¹⁹ *SafeSearch Lock* is live everywhere in the English user interface and can be found in Search Settings.²⁰

¹⁴ Users also can opt to lock *Safety Mode* on their browser using their YouTube account password.

¹⁵ See "Safety Mode Video Search," attached as Exhibit 2.

¹⁶ See Google "Getting Started: Safety Mode," at <http://www.google.com/support/youtube/bin/answer.py?&answer=174084> and "Set Your Safety Mode," attached as Exhibit 3.

¹⁷ See Google "SafeSearch filtering," at <http://www.google.com/support/websearch/bin/answer.py?hl=en&answer=35892#safe>.

¹⁸ CSVA NOI at ¶ 5.

¹⁹ See sample image at http://www.google.com/accounts/safe_search_lock.jpg.

²⁰ See Google "Preferences - SafeSearch Filtering," at <http://www.google.com/preferences?hl=en> and "Google Global Preferences: SafeSearch Filtering," attached as Exhibit 4.

Hide Objectionable Words, *Safety Mode*, and *SafeSearch* are just the most recent examples of Google providing consumers with broad access to the content and functionality available on its websites while allowing users to tailor their experiences to avoid potential online threats. Google hopes that these features, along with those described in the Google CSVA NOI Comments, protect users of all ages as they tap into the vast amount of educational content available online.

B. GOOGLE COOPERATES WITH INDUSTRY PARTNERS, COMMUNITY STAKEHOLDERS AND LAW ENFORCEMENT.

An important aspect of Google's online safety strategy is to maintain strong relationships with industry partners, community stakeholders, and law enforcement to foster thought leadership and momentum, to harness technology to keep online experiences positive, and to stem the flow of images of child sexual abuse online. Google is proud to be a member of the PointSmart ClickSafe Task Force, a cross-section of technology companies, child advocacy and parents' groups, educators, researchers, and policymakers that focuses on Internet safety in the United States. In July 2009, the Task Force released its Recommendations for Best Practices for Online Safety and Literacy.²¹ Perhaps the report's most important finding is the need for digital media literacy and online safety education to empower children, parents, and educators to think more critically about their content creation and consumption and other activities online, as well as to consider what it means to be a digital citizen.

Google also regularly provides funds to numerous partner organizations that share Google's commitment to keeping users safe online. For example, Google provides annual sponsorships to groups like the Family Online Safety Institute, Common Sense Media, Connect

²¹ PointSmart ClickSafeTask Force, *Recommendations for Best Practices for Online Safety and Literacy* (2009), at <http://pointsmartreport.org/>.

Safely, and iKeepSafe. Google also has made major one-time grants to organizations that advocate for a safe Internet environment for all users; for example, in December 2009, Google.org provided a \$1 million grant to the National Center for Missing and Exploited Children.

C. GOOGLE ENGAGES IN EDUCATIONAL EFFORTS TO INCREASE AWARENESS OF ONLINE SAFETY FEATURES.

Our April 2009 filing highlighted Google’s efforts – including blog posts, safety guides, and readily-accessible help pages like YouTube’s *Safety Center* – to publicize tips about staying safe online.²² Since then, Google has added a series of digital citizenship and online safety videos to its YouTube *Safety Center*, including clips on “Playing and Staying Safe Online,” “Detecting Lies and Staying True,” “Staying Safe on YouTube,” and “Steering Clear of Cyber Tricks.”²³

Google has teamed up with iKeepSafe, a leading online safety organization, to develop an in-class curriculum for local communities to accompany the aforementioned video series.²⁴ In December 2009, Google and iKeepSafe launched a nationwide *Family Digital Literacy Tour*, using this curriculum as its foundation. The tour is built around three components: (1) hands-on classroom training for middle school students in targeted communities around the country on

²² See, e.g., “Google Blog Posts on Family, Child, and Online Safety,” at http://www.google.com/intl/en/landing/familysafety/safety_blogs.html; Google “Tips for Online Safety,” at <http://www.google.com/intl/en/landing/familysafety/>; YouTube “Safety Center,” at http://www.google.com/support/youtube/bin/request.py?contact_type=abuse&hl=en-US.

²³ See YouTube “Safety Center Online Videos,” at <http://www.youtube.com/user/SafetyCenterVideos>.

²⁴ iKeepSafe is a broad partnership of governors and/or first spouses, attorneys general, public health and educational professionals, law enforcement, and industry leaders working together for the health and safety of youth online. Its mission is “[t]o give parents, educators, and policymakers the information and tools which empower them to teach children the safe and healthy use of technology and the Internet.” See <http://www.ikeepsafe.org/>.

digital citizenship, ethics, media literacy, and safety on YouTube and online generally; (2) train-the-trainer sessions for the local volunteers who will continue to deliver the program after the launch in each community; and (3) education sessions for parents to share the information their children have been learning and to help them become more comfortable having important conversations with their children about responsible online behaviors.²⁵ In each community, Google will leave a small grant for professional development so that local teachers and volunteers can continue the training and integrate it into their curriculum.

II. THE FCC’S FOCUS SHOULD BE LIMITED TO PROMOTING PARENTAL EMPOWERMENT TOOLS.

As we transition from more traditional forms of media such as television broadcasting to an online environment, Google believes that the FCC should focus on fostering the creation of parental empowerment tools.²⁶ While there may be a temptation to go further and adopt actual regulations, the Commission’s statutory jurisdiction to regulate broadcast television does not extend to Internet content and media online. This is especially pertinent where, as here, robust and flexible “user empowerment” tools already are being made available to parents without regulatory intervention.

In particular, the Commission lacks authority under the Communications Act (“the Act”) to regulate Internet content providers.²⁷ No provision of the Act either authorizes the Commission to engage in such regulation or places that matter within the scope of the

²⁵ The volunteer trainers who will be teaching teenagers to mentor their peers come from Optimists International, a volunteer organization focused on service projects for children. After the launch in each community, a small grant is made to defray the costs of the Optimist International volunteers’ ongoing trainings. See <http://www.optimist.org/default.cfm>.

²⁶ See *infra* pp. 4-6 and notes 13-18.

²⁷ NOI at ¶58.

Commission's goals and purposes. To the contrary, Section 230 of the Act expressly states, as a matter of national policy, that the government's proper role is to "preserve the vibrant and competitive free market that presently exists for the Internet...unfettered by Federal or State regulation." Furthermore, the Act directs Internet Service Providers – not the Commission – "to assist the customer in limiting access to material that is harmful to minors."²⁸

Because online content is stored data accessed via the Internet, the regulation of that content falls well outside of the Commission's jurisdiction. Judicial precedent confirms that the Commission lacks authority to regulate content online because the content is not interstate "communication by wire or radio" coming within the Commission's ancillary jurisdiction under Section 2(a) of the Act.²⁹ Put simply, the FCC has not been empowered by Congress to regulate stored data or the content of stored information.

Furthermore, any regulations imposed on content on the Internet would be limited by the significant constraints imposed by the First Amendment. When the government seeks to

²⁸ 47 U.S.C. §230(b)(2) and (d). This is not to say that the FCC does not have authority over the provisioning of broadband Internet access service. Instead, the FCC's authority does not extend to the content available over the Internet.

²⁹ *GTE Serv. Corp. v. FCC*, 474 F.2d 724, 730 (2d Cir. 1973) (holding that statutory silence did not preclude regulation of the interaction between common carriers and data processors, but does preclude regulation of data processors themselves:

[The FCC's] concern here therefore is not for the communications market which Congress has entrusted to its care, but for data processing which is beyond its charge and which the Commission itself has announced it declines to regulate. We find the intrusion to be without authority either in the Communications Act or in the cases construing it.).

See also MPAA v. FCC, 309 F.3d 796, 803 (D.C. Cir. 2002) (rejecting Title I jurisdiction to require video programmers to provide video description services because "[v]ideo description is not a regulation of television transmission that only incidentally and minimally affects program content; it is a direct and significant regulation of program content."); *Am. Library Ass'n v. FCC*, 406 F.3d 689, 703 (D.C. Cir. 2005) (rejecting FCC ancillary jurisdiction to enact rules regarding broadcast flag equipment because such regulations "do not regulate the actual transmission of the DTV broadcast" and are not incidental to the transmission of broadcast programming).

implement content-based restrictions, such actions are subject to the highest form of judicial scrutiny to ensure that First Amendment rights are not abridged.³⁰ Such scrutiny imposes a heavy burden on the government to show the provisions are narrowly tailored and the same ends are not achievable through less restrictive means.³¹ For instance, in finding unconstitutional certain portions of the Communications Decency Act that restricted the knowing transmission of obscene or indecent messages to minors, the Supreme Court held that, while protecting minors from harmful material was a compelling government interest, “that interest does not justify an unnecessarily broad suppression of speech addressed to adults.”³² Because of these heavy burdens, courts have recognized on numerous occasions that “encouraging deployment of user-based controls, such as filtering software,” serves the government’s interest in protecting minors

³⁰ See *Ashcroft v. ACLU*, 542 U.S. 656 (2004) (subjecting the Child Online Protection Act (“COPA”), a statute that criminalized commercial Internet postings that were harmful to minors unless the age of the viewer was verified, to review under the First Amendment and holding the statute unconstitutional); *Ashcroft v. Free Speech Coalition*, 535 U.S. 234 (2002) (holding that the Child Pornography Prevention Act, which banned any visual depiction of minors engaged in sexually explicit conduct, including computer-generated images on the Internet, violated the First Amendment due to the overbreadth of the statute); *Reno v. ACLU*, 521 U.S. 844 (1997) (holding that the Communications Decency Act restriction on “knowing” transmission of “obscene or indecent” messages to any recipient under 18 years of age was unconstitutionally vague and criminalized legitimately protected speech in violation of the First Amendment).

³¹ See *Reno*, 521 U.S. at 874 (holding that regulations that silence speakers whose message would be entitled to constitutional protection place an unconstitutional burden on these speakers if a less restrictive means is available to meet the same goal); *ACLU v. Gonzales*, 478 F. Supp. 2d 775, 809 (E.D. Pa 2007), *aff’d*, *ACLU v. Mukasey*, 534 F. 3d 181 (3rd Cir. 2008) (holding that regulations that restrict speech based on content are subject to strict scrutiny, are presumptively invalid, and can only be upheld as constitutional if the defendant meets his or her burden of proving the restriction is narrowly tailored to the compelling interest the statute was enacted to serve, and there are no less restrictive alternatives that would be as effective in achieving those interests).

³² *Reno*, 521 U.S. at 875. Notably, the Court also found the statute overbroad due to the lack of reliable methods to determine the age of users and the inability to enforce the regulations against international websites. See *id.* at 854-55.

from content on the Internet “as well or better than attempting to regulate the vast content of the World Wide Web at its source, and at a far less significant cost to First Amendment values.”³³

A parent’s desire to control viewing of content over the Internet can be addressed fully by the type of voluntary user empowerment tools validated by the courts.³⁴ Today, the Commission has ample evidence that Internet service, content, and application providers have adopted and continue to innovate to create more advanced tools to enable parents to protect their children from harmful content available online.³⁵ Enabling parents to use these tools and further encouraging development and enhancement of industry guidelines would be the least restrictive means to accomplish the Commission’s goals.

³³ *Ashcroft*, 542 U.S. at 674 (content filtering software was a conceivable and less restrictive alternative to criminal sanctions imposed by COPA for posting content harmful to minors). *See also Gonzales*, 478 F. Supp. 2d at 793 (“[f]ilters are widely available and easy to obtain,” and “[f]iltering programs are fairly easy to install, configure, and use and require only minimal effort by the end user to configure and update”); *Mukasey*, 534 F.3d at 202-203 (court concludes “that filters and the Government’s promotion of filters are more effective than COPA”).

³⁴ *See Ashcroft*, 542 U.S. at 666 (holding that blocking and filtering software was a valid alternative to COPA in restricting children’s access to harmful material); *U.S. v. Playboy Entm’t Group*, 529 U.S. 803, 821 (2000) (finding that market-based solutions to the signal scrambling requirement, including programmable televisions, VCRs, mapping systems, and signal-blocking televisions were sufficient to protect viewers).

³⁵ *See NOI* at ¶ 44 (citing the extensive availability of parental control tools that enable filtering of Internet content); Google CSVA NOI Comments (explaining the features of *SafeSearch*, including content filtering); Comments of AT&T, Inc. at 5-6, MB Dkt. 09-26 (filed Apr. 16, 2009) (citing the availability of content controls online, including “Smart Limits,” a comprehensive resource for parents to control online information access); Comments of Comcast Corp. at 4-5, MB Dkt. 09-26 (filed Apr. 16, 2009) (describing Comcast’s partnership with McAfee to create free controls for online software and the creation of ComcastSafeSearch, a child-friendly search engine powered by Google); Comments of CTIA at 7-9, MB Dkt. 09-26 (filed Apr. 16, 2009) (detailing initiatives of AT&T, Sprint, T-Mobile, and Verizon to enable parents to filter content available to their children).

CONCLUSION

Google actively supports efforts to assist parents in protecting children online and has adopted multiple tools and policies to further this goal. Google also recognizes and applauds the steps the Internet community has taken to meet the goals of a safe online environment. Google urges the Commission to continue to encourage these valuable initiatives and looks forward to working with the Commission to promote further innovation and industry collaboration. The Commission, however, should recognize the steep limitations on its jurisdiction imposed by the Communications Act and the Constitution in the area of online Internet content regulation.

Respectfully submitted,



Richard S. Whitt, Esq.,
Washington Telecom and Media
Counsel

Megan Anne Stull, Esq.,
Telecom Policy Counsel

GOOGLE INC.
Public Policy Department
1101 New York Avenue NW
Second Floor
Washington, DC 20005

Mark J. O'Connor
Jennifer P. Bagg
LAMPERT, O'CONNOR & JOHNSTON, P.C.
1776 K Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 887-6230 tel
(202) 887-6231 fax

Counsel for Google Inc.

February 24, 2010

EXHIBIT 1
Hide Objectionable Words

TugaPipeJunior (1 day ago)

Great

Reply

0  

Nikinikas (1 day ago)

what the ****....

Reply

0  

EXHIBIT 2
Safety Mode Video Search



No videos found for "XXX"

EXHIBIT 3

Set Your Safety Mode

Not signed in

Current Location: **Worldwide** [Show locations](#)

[Add YouTube to your Google homepage](#)

Current Language: **English** [Show languages](#)

Safety Mode is off

Set Your Safety Mode Close

Use YouTube's Safety Mode if you don't want to see videos that contain potentially objectionable material on YouTube. While it's not 100 percent accurate, we use community flagging and other content signals to determine and filter out inappropriate content.

On Off

You can lock the Safety Mode setting after you [sign in](#). [\(Learn more\)](#)

© 2010 YouTube, LLC

Signed in

Current Location: **Worldwide** [Show locations](#)

[Add YouTube to your Google homepage](#)

Current Language: **English** [Show languages](#)

Safety Mode is on

Set Your Safety Mode Close

Use YouTube's Safety Mode if you don't want to see videos that contain potentially objectionable material on YouTube. While it's not 100 percent accurate, we use community flagging and other content signals to determine and filter out inappropriate content.

On Off

[\(Learn more\)](#)

© 2010 YouTube, LLC

EXHIBIT 4

Google Global Preferences: SafeSearch Filtering

Web [Images](#) [Videos](#) [Maps](#) [News](#) [Shopping](#) [Mail](#) [more](#) mandyb@google.com | [Settings](#) | [Sign out](#)

Google **Preferences** [Google account settings](#) | [Preferences Help](#) | [About Google](#)

Save your preferences when finished and return to search. [Save Preferences](#)

Global Preferences (changes apply to all Google services)

Interface Language Display Google tips and messages in:
If you do not find your native language in the pulldown above, you can help Google create it through our [Google in Your Language program](#).

Search Language Search for pages written in any language ([Recommended](#)).
 Prefer pages written in these language(s):

<input type="checkbox"/> Afrikaans	<input type="checkbox"/> English	<input type="checkbox"/> Italian	<input type="checkbox"/> Slovak
<input type="checkbox"/> Arabic	<input type="checkbox"/> Esperanto	<input type="checkbox"/> Japanese	<input type="checkbox"/> Slovenian
<input type="checkbox"/> Armenian	<input type="checkbox"/> Estonian	<input type="checkbox"/> Korean	<input type="checkbox"/> Spanish
<input type="checkbox"/> Belarusian	<input type="checkbox"/> Filipino	<input type="checkbox"/> Latvian	<input type="checkbox"/> Swahili
<input type="checkbox"/> Bulgarian	<input type="checkbox"/> Finnish	<input type="checkbox"/> Lithuanian	<input type="checkbox"/> Swedish
<input type="checkbox"/> Catalan	<input type="checkbox"/> French	<input type="checkbox"/> Norwegian	<input type="checkbox"/> Thai
<input type="checkbox"/> Chinese (Simplified)	<input type="checkbox"/> German	<input type="checkbox"/> Persian	<input type="checkbox"/> Turkish
<input type="checkbox"/> Chinese (Traditional)	<input type="checkbox"/> Greek	<input type="checkbox"/> Polish	<input type="checkbox"/> Ukrainian
<input type="checkbox"/> Croatian	<input type="checkbox"/> Hebrew	<input type="checkbox"/> Portuguese	<input type="checkbox"/> Vietnamese
<input type="checkbox"/> Czech	<input type="checkbox"/> Hungarian	<input type="checkbox"/> Romanian	
<input type="checkbox"/> Danish	<input type="checkbox"/> Icelandic	<input type="checkbox"/> Russian	
<input type="checkbox"/> Dutch	<input type="checkbox"/> Indonesian	<input type="checkbox"/> Serbian	

SafeSearch Filtering [Google's SafeSearch](#) blocks web pages containing explicit sexual content from appearing in search results.
 Use strict filtering (Filter both explicit text and explicit images)
 Use moderate filtering (Filter explicit images only - default behavior)
 Do not filter my search results

Number of Results Google's default (10 results) provides the fastest results.
Display results per page.