Introduction

Know from whence you came. If you know whence you came, there are absolutely no
limitations to where you can go

–James Baldwin

The Internet burst into our lives in the early 1990s without much preparation
or planning and changed them forever. It has affected almost every aspect of
society. It is a macrosystem of interconnected private and public spheres:
household, literary, military, academic, business, and government networks.
The Internet has produced major leaps forward in human productivity and has
changed the way people work, study, and interact. The mix of open standards
and diverse networks and the growing ubiquity of digital devices makes the
Internet a revolutionary force that undermines traditional media, such as
newspapers, broadcasting, and telephone systems, and that challenges existing
regulatory institutions that are based on national boundaries.

The Internet's design and *raison d'être* are open architecture, freedom of
expression, and neutral network of networks. In the prevailing Western
liberal tradition, freedom of expression is perceived as a fundamental
human right requiring the uninhibited free flow of information. This is
especially true for the Internet. But soon enough, people began to exploit
the Net's massive potential to enhance partisan interests, some of which
are harmful and antisocial. Given that the Internet has been part of our
lives for a relatively short time, the discussions about it concentrate on the
social production and the technological, architectural, and geographic
aspects of the Net. (Thinkers in this area include Yochai Benkler,[1] Manuel

[1] Yochai Benkler, *The Wealth of Networks: How Social Production Transforms Markets and
Freedom* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006).

1

Castells,[2] Aharon Kellerman,[3] Lawrence Lessig,[4] Gary P. Schneider and Jessica Evans,[5] James Slevin,[6] and Jonathan Zittrain,[7] to name a few.) The discussions about the costs and harms of such Internet content reflect on the transnational nature of the Internet. They tend to conclude that it is very difficult – some say virtually impossible – for national authorities to uni-laterally implement laws and regulations that reflect national, rather than global, moral standards.[8]

Most Internet users act within the law. Thus, free speech advocates argue that the collective should not be restricted because of the few who abuse Internet freedom in order to harm others. We should not allow the abusers to dictate the rules of the game, but of course we should fight against those who abuse this freedom. The way to combat problematic speech is said to be with more speech. Organizations and associations have been set up to protect and promote freedom of expression, freedom of information, and privacy on the Internet.[9] In the United States, the land of the First Amendment,[10] emphasis is put on education (see the work of Robert D. Atkinson,[11] Robert Corn-Revere,[12]

---

[2] Manuel Castells, *Communication Power* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2009); Manuel Castells, *The Internet Galaxy: Reflections on the Internet, Business, and Society* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001).

[3] Aharon Kellerman, *The Internet on Earth: A Geography of Information* (Oxford: Wiley, 2002).

[4] Lawrence Lessig, *Code and Other Laws of Cyberspace* (New York: Basic Books, 1999); Lawrence Lessig, *The Future of Ideas: The Fate of the Commons in a Connected World* (New York: Vintage, 2002); Lawrence Lessig, *Free Culture: How Big Media Uses Technology and the Law to Lock Down Culture and Control Creativity* (New York: Penguin, 2004).

[5] Gary P. Schneider and Jessica Evans, *New Perspectives on the Internet: Comprehensive*, 6th ed. (Boston: Thomson, 2007).

[6] James Slevin, *The Internet and Society* (Oxford: Polity, 2000).

[7] Jonathan L. Zittrain, *The Future of the Internet – And How to Stop It* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2008).

[8] Dick Thornburgh and Herbert S. Lin, eds., *Youth, Pornography, and the Internet* (Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2002); National Research Council, *Global Networks and Local Values: A Comparative Look at Germany and the United States* (Washington, DC: National Academies Press, 2001). For further discussion, see Robert J. Cavalier, ed., *The Impact of the Internet on Our Moral Lives* (Albany: State University of New York Press, 2005).

[9] Among them are the Center for Democracy and Technology, http://cdt.org/ ; the Electronic Frontier Foundation, http://www.eff.org/ ; the Electronic Privacy Information Center, http://epic.org/ ; the Global Internet Liberty Campaign, http://gilc.org/ ; the Internet Society, http://www.isoc.org/ ; the Association for Progressive Communications, http://www.apc.org ; and Save the Internet, http://savetheinternet.com/ .

[10] See the text of the First Amendment and annotations at http://constitution.findlaw.com/amendment1.html .

[11] See Atkinson's posts on *The Innovation Files* (blog), http://www.innovationfiles.org/author/robatkinson/ .

[12] Robert Corn-Revere, "Caught in the Seamless Web: Does the Internet's Global Reach Justify Less Freedom of Speech?," in *Who Rules the Net? Internet Governance and Jurisdiction*, ed.

Leslie Harris,[13] Tom Head,[14] Gerson Moreno-Riaño,[15] Andrea C. Nakaya,[16] Michael R. Nelson,[17] and Adam Thierer,[18] among others[19]). "Keep the Internet free and open," reiterates Vint Cerf, Google vice president and chief evangelist.[20] These thinkers recognize the dangers of the Internet, but they commonly argue that the principle of free speech enshrined in the First Amendment shields all but the most immediately threatening expression. A strong presumption exists against speech restrictions. As Michael Nelson said, the Internet helps mitigate tensions. It conveys information, tells us about the aims and activities of terrorists and hatemongers, and shows us how poor their ideas are.[21]

These views represent the existing mode of thinking in the United States. The United States tends not to be preemptive in the sphere of freedom of expression. Among the limited boundaries to free expression on the Net are direct and specific calls for murder ("true threats"),[22] child pornography, direct

---

Adam Thierer and Clyde Wayne Crews Jr. (Washington, DC: Cato Institute, 2003), 219–38, based on amicus brief in *Yahoo!, Inc. v. La Ligue contre le Racisme et L'Antisemitisme*, Case No. 01-17424 (9th Cir.); Robert Corn-Revere, "*United States v. American Library Association*: A Missed Opportunity for the Supreme Court to Clarify Application of First Amendment Law to Publicly-Funded Expressive Institutions," in *Cato Supreme Court Review, 2002–2003*, ed. James L. Swanson (Washington, DC: Cato Institute, 2003), 105–30.

[13] Leslie Harris is president and chief executive officer of the Center for Democracy and Technology. See her biography at https://www.internetsociety.org/inet-washington-dc/speakers/ms-leslie-harris . See also Leslie Harris, "Internet Governance, or Just Governing the Internet," *Huffington Post*, July 5, 2012, http://www.huffingtonpost.com/leslie-harris/internet-governance_b_1643856.html ; Leslie Harris, "From Moment to a Movement: Sustaining Our New Power," presentation at the Personal Democracy Forum, June 13, 2012, http://personaldemocracy.com/media/moment-movement-sustaining-our-new-power .

[14] Tom Head, ed., *The Future of the Internet* (Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven Press, 2005).

[15] Gerson Moreno-Riaño, ed., *Tolerance in the Twenty-First Century: Prospects and Challenges* (Lanham, MD: Lexington Books, 2006).

[16] Andrea C. Nakaya, ed., *Censorship: Opposing Viewpoints* (Farmington Hill, MI: Greenhaven Press, 2005).

[17] Michael R. Nelson, "Sovereignty in the Networked World," in *Emerging Internet: Annual Review of the Institute for Information Studies* (Falls Church, VA: Institute for Information Studies, 1998).

[18] Thierer and Crews, *Who Rules the Net?*

[19] See also Mark A. Shiffrin and Avi Silberschatz, "Web of the Free," *New York Times*, October 23, 2005.

[20] Alex Fitzpatrick, "Google's Vint Cerf: Keep the Internet Free and Open," Mashable.com, December 3, 2012, http://mashable.com/2012/12/03/vint-cerf-open-internet/ ; Bonnie Tubbs, "Web Pioneer Vint Cerf Advocates a Free Internet," *iweek*, September 18, 2013, http://www.iweek.co.za/in-the-know/web-pioneer-vint-cerf-advocates-a-free-internet .

[21] Interview with Michael Nelson, former IBM director, Internet Technology and Strategy, Washington, DC, January 31, 2008.

[22] A statement is a "true threat" when a reasonable person making the statement would foresee that the statement would be interpreted by those to whom it is communicated as a serious expression of an intent to do bodily harm or assault. See *Planned Parenthood of Columbia/Willamette, Inc. v.*

4   *Introduction*

calls for terrorism and spreading of electronic viruses, and material protected
by copyright legislation. Threats of a general nature, hatred, bigotry, racism,
and instructions on how to kill and maim and how to seduce children are all
protected forms of speech under the First Amendment. Speech is afforded
protection except when a life-threatening message is directed against
identified individuals.[23] Blanket statements expressing hatred toward certain
groups are given free sway, even if individual members of such groups are put
at risk.[24] Negin Salimipour argued that government actions "limiting the
spread of harmful content should be carefully designed to ensure that
measures taken do not restrict hate or offensive speech on the Internet."[25]
This statement may sound strange to European ears, but American courts have
followed this doctrine in cyberspace, affording this form of speech broad
protection. Hate is tricky because it is hard to define.

PROMISES AND CHALLENGES

The Internet contests boundaries to free expression and enlarges the scope of
tolerance. With almost 40 percent of the world's population online, nearly
3 billion people,[26] the Internet has been heralded as "the best development

American Coalition of Life Activists, 290 F.3d 1058, 1080 (9th Cir. 2002). See also *Watts v. United
States*, 394 U.S. 705 (1969); *United States v. Kelner*, 534 F.2d 1020 (2d Cir. 1976); Jennifer
E. Rothman, "Freedom of Speech and True Threats," *Harvard Journal of Law and Public
Policy* 25, no. 1 (2001): 283–367; Anna S. Andrews, "When Is a Threat 'Truly' a Threat Lacking
First Amendment Protection? A Proposed True Threats Test to Safeguard Free Speech Rights in
the Age of the Internet," UCLA Online Institute for Cyberspace Law and Policy, University of
California, Los Angeles, May 1999; Kenneth L. Karst, "Threats and Meanings: How the Facts
Govern First Amendment Doctrine," *Stanford Law Review* 58, no. 5 (2006): 1337–1412.

[23] In *Planned Parenthood of Columbia/Willamette, Inc. v. American Coalition of Life Activists*, 23
F. Supp. 2d 1182 (D. Or. 1999), an Internet site listed the names and home addresses of doctors
who performed abortions. The site called for the doctors to be brought to justice for crimes
against humanity. The names of doctors who had been wounded were listed in gray. Doctors
who had been killed by antiabortionists had been crossed out. The court found this speech to be
threatening and not protected under the First Amendment. See Richard Delgado and
Jean Stefancic, *Understanding Words That Wound* (Boulder, CO: Westview, 2004), 127.
Another pertinent case is *The Secretary, United States Department of Housing and Urban
Development, on behalf of Bonnie Jouhari and Pilar Horton v. Ryan Wilson and ALPHA HQ*,
HUDALJ 03-98-0692-8 (decided July 19, 2000).

[24] Anti-Defamation League, "Combating Extremism in Cyberspace: The Legal Issues Affecting
Internet Hate Speech," Anti-Defamation League, New York, 2000); Delgado and Stefancic,
Understanding Words That Wound, 127.

[25] Negin Salimipour, "The Challenge of Regulating Hate and Offensive Speech on the Internet,"
Southwestern Journal of Law and Trade in the Americas 8, no. 2 (2001–2002): 395.

[26] ICT Data and Statistics Division, "The World in 2014: ICT Fact and Figures," International
Telecommunication Union, Geneva, 2013, http://www.itu.int/en/ITU-D/Statistics/Documents/
facts/ICTFactsFigures2014-e.pdf .

in participatory democracy since universal suffrage and the most participatory form of mass speech yet developed."[27] From the highest national courts to elementary classrooms around the world, scholars, lawmakers, and adolescents alike take part in "a never-ending worldwide conversation."[28] As individual participants make connections and share information across the globe, communities form and develop. Unhindered by geographic borders, these communities create new systems of social power and exchange.[29] Collaborations never before possible blur the edges of the private and public spheres, challenging traditional constructs of self and community. Even in its infancy, the Internet as we know it has already proven a wonderful, easy-to-use mechanism to advance knowledge and learning across the world, to bridge gaps (educational, national, religious, cultural), and to promote understanding.

The impact that the rapid descent of this colossal pool of information has had on our lives and societies is nearly impossible to comprehend. The hurried acceptance of the Internet in the Western world has been accompanied by the controversial realization that no central authority sets standards for acceptable content on this network.[30] The Internet's free space is said to be subject only to obligating technical protocols and programming language rules. Orthodox liberals celebrate this lack of rules as a democratizing, publicly empowering characteristic that will promote intellectual and social progress, whereas others see it as creating a potential tinderbox of unguided lawlessness, whose messages and influence might unravel significant common values in the social framework of pluralistic societies.[31] The reasons for this situation are historical and structural: the early Internet was rooted in the United States and became global only in its recent phase. The chaotic structure of the Internet as a complex web of separate nets results in each country setting its own laws and regulations concerning Internet oversight and monitoring. These laws and regulations differ from one country to another.

Perhaps the only thing more impressive than the breadth of the Internet is its near-instantaneous arrival and restructuring of societies and lives across the

[27] Reid Goldsborough, "Leveraging the Internet's Marketplace of Ideas," *Community College Week*, February 16, 2004, 19.

[28] *ACLU v. Reno*, 929 F. Supp. 824 at 883 (1996).

[29] Howard Rheingold, "The Emerging Wireless Internet Will Both Improve and Degrade Human Life," in *The Future of the Internet*, ed. Tom Head (Farmington Hills, MI: Greenhaven Press, 2005), 19–32, 22.

[30] J. Michael Jaffe, "Riding the Electronic Tiger: Censorship in Global, Distributed Networks," in *Liberal Democracy and the Limits of Tolerance: Essays in Honor and Memory of Yitzhak Rabin*, ed. Raphael Cohen-Almagor (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2000), 274–94, 275.

[31] Ibid.

globe. In historical context, the repercussions of the Internet revolution will most likely reach and surpass those of the Industrial Revolution and other comparable phenomena.[32]

Just as we are beginning to realize the seemingly infinite potential that the Internet presents for diffusion of knowledge and educational exchange, so too must we acknowledge and assess the reach the Net extends for dissemination of counterprogressive information. Freedom of expression is of utmost importance and value, but it needs to be weighed against the no less important consideration of social responsibility. The International Organization for Standardization states:

> In the wake of increasing globalisation, we have become increasingly conscious not only of what we buy, but also how the goods and services we buy have been produced.... All companies and organisations aiming at long-term profitability and credibility are starting to realise that they must act in accordance with norms of right and wrong.[33]

When I first decided to write this book, I saw clearly that I could not possibly tackle *all* the problematic information that we find on the Internet. I asked myself, "What troubles you the most, and what issues may present a compelling case for social responsibility?" I think that if I could reach some conclusions and suggestions about dealing with some highly problematic issues, possibly the discussion could then serve as a springboard to drive forward a move for Net social responsibility. After long and careful probing, I decided to concentrate attention on violent, antisocial forms of Internet expression: cyberbullying, hate speech and racism, use of the Net by terrorist organizations, crime-facilitating speech, and child pornography. Criminal expressions aimed at financial gain are outside the scope of this book. Thus, I do not address copyright violations, identity and credit theft, online piracy and counterfeiting, phishing, spamming, fraud, and other forms of financial criminal trespass. These are very important matters – so important that they deserve a separate, thorough analysis.[34] In addition, the book does not cover Internet speech designed to promote democracy and human rights in nondemocratic societies – most notably in the Arab world, Africa, and China. This important issue merits yet another, different analysis.

[32] Joseph S. Nye Jr., "Information Technology and Democratic Governance," in *Governance.com: Democracy in the Information Age*, ed. Elaine Ciulla Kamarck and Joseph S. Nye Jr. (Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 2002), 1–16, 1–2.

[33] "What Is Social Responsibility?," *How to Become a Social Entrepreneur* (blog), http://www.imasocialentrepreneur.com/social-responsibility/ .

[34] See, for example, Hannibal Travis, ed., *Cyberspace Law: Censorship and Regulation of the Internet* (London: Routledge, 2013).

ANTI-UNIVERSALISM

The hypotheses advanced in this volume and the conclusions reached are limited to modern democracies emerging during the past century or so. *Democracy* is defined as a form of government whose power is vested in the people and exercised by them either directly or by their freely elected representatives. As Abraham Lincoln said, democracy is government of the people, by the people, for the people.[35] That is to say, one assumption of the liberal ideology that this book contests is the assumption of universalism. Clifford Christians, a renowned scholar and publicist in the area of media ethics, has emphasized that some universal ethical values withstand borders and are shared by all humans. Quoting Václav Havel, Christians writes that through human solidarity rooted in universal reverence for life, we respect ourselves and genuinely value the participation of others in a volatile age where "everything is possible and almost nothing is certain."[36] In an earlier work, Christians, John Ferré, and Mark Fackler offered mutuality as a model of community that is "universal, categorical, and normative."[37] Our membership in the human species creates the notion of universal moral obligation and a belief in shared universal values.

This belief, however, is more wishful thinking than an acknowledgment of reality. I believe that there are some basic universal needs that all people wish to secure, such as food, raiment, and shelter. I believe that sexual drives are universal and that people need to have some sleep to be able to continue functioning. I also believe that we should strive to make moral principles universal. But our ability to do so will be improved by emphasizing the differences between liberal and nonliberal values, not by blurring them and confusing the ideal and the real.

Sociologically speaking, we cannot ignore the fact that universal values do not underlie all societies.[38] Ideally, some ethical concerns should be accepted

---

[35] "A Short Definition of Democracy," Democracy Building, Lucerne, Switzerland, 2004, http://www.democracy-building.info/definition-democracy.html .

[36] Clifford G. Christians, "The Ethics of Being in a Communications Context," in *Communication Ethics and Universal Values*, ed. Clifford G. Christians and Michael Traber (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1997), 3–23, 19. See also Deni Elliott, "Universal Values and Moral Development Theories," in Christians and Traber, *Communication Ethics and Universal Values*, 68–83.

[37] Clifford G. Christians, John P. Ferré, and P. Mark Fackler, *Good News: Social Ethics and the Press* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993), 75. See also Clifford G. Christians, "Global Ethics and the Problem of Relativism," in *Global Media Ethics: Problems and Perspectives*, ed. Stephen J. A. Ward (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), 272–94.

[38] For a contrasting view, see Christians and Traber, *Communication Ethics and Universal Values*; Leonard Swidler, *For All Life: Toward a Universal Declaration of a Global Ethic* (Ashland, OR: White Cloud Press, 1999); Robert S. Fortner and P. Mark Fackler, eds., *Ethics*

by all societies, but in reality, we know this is not the case. Some countries do not adopt liberal democracy as a way of life. Instead, they adhere to other forms of government that are alien to the underpinning values of liberal democracy: liberty, equality, tolerance, and pluralism. Some societies do not accept the norms of respecting others and not harming others that form the *raison d'être* of democracy.[39]

According to Immanuel Kant, only through morality can a rational being be a law-giving member in the realm of ends, and only through morality can a rational being be an end in himself. Kant distinguishes between relative value and intrinsic value, explaining that people have intrinsic value – that is, dignity. Kant identifies dignity with moral capacity, arguing that human beings are infinitely above any price: "to compare it with, or weigh it against, things that have price would be to violate its holiness, as it were."[40] In other words, "morality, and humanity so far as it is capable of morality, are the only things that have dignity."[41] Each person has dignity and moral worth. People should be respected as human beings and should never be exploited. In this context, Stephen Darwall distinguishes between *recognition respect* and *appraisal respect*, explaining that the former includes the respect we must show to people as people, just out of recognition of their status as people, whereas the latter is the respect we show to people in virtue of their character or achievements.[42] Kant had in mind *recognition respect*. He wrote, "Such beings are not merely subjective ends whose existence as a result of our action has value for us, but are objective ends, i.e., things [*Dinge*] whose existence is an end in itself."[43]

In turn, the Millian Harm Principle holds that something is eligible for restriction only if it causes harm to others. John Stuart Mill wrote in *On Liberty*, "Acts of whatever kind, which, without justifiable cause, do harm to

    and Evil in the Public Sphere: Media, Universal Values, and Global Development (Cresskill, NJ: Hampton Press, 2010).

[39] On the notion of respect, see Ronald Dworkin, "Liberalism," in *A Matter of Principle* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 181–204; Ronald Dworkin, *Taking Rights Seriously* (London: Duckworth, 1977); Raphael Cohen-Almagor, *The Boundaries of Liberty and Tolerance: The Struggle against Kahanism in Israel* (Gainesville: University Press of Florida, 1994); Raphael Cohen-Almagor, *Speech, Media, and Ethics: The Limits of Free Expression* (Houndmills, UK: Palgrave, 2005); Raphael Cohen-Almagor, *The Scope of Tolerance: Studies on the Costs of Free Expression and Freedom of the Press* (London: Routledge, 2006); Richard L. Abel, *Speaking Respect, Respecting Speech* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998).

[40] Immanuel Kant, *Groundwork for the Metaphysic of Morals*, trans. Jonathan Bennett ([1865] 2008), 33, http://www.redfuzzyjesus.com/files/kant-groundwork-for-the-metaphysics-of-morals.pdf . For further discussion, see Graham Bird, ed., *A Companion to Kant* (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006).

[41] Kant, *Groundwork for the Metaphysic of Morals*, 33.

[42] Stephen L. Darwall, "Two Kinds of Respect," *Ethics* 88, no. 1 (1977): 36–49.

[43] Kant, *Groundwork for the Metaphysic of Morals*, 29.

others, may be, and in the more important cases absolutely require to be, controlled by the unfavourable sentiments, and, when needful, by the active interference of mankind."[44] Whether an act ought to be restricted remains to be calculated. Hence, in some situations, people are culpable not because of the act that they have performed, though this act might be morally wrong, but because of its circumstances and its consequences. While Kant spoke of unqualified, imperative moral duties, Mill's philosophy is consequentialist in nature. Together the Kantian and Millian arguments make a forceful plea for moral, responsible conduct: always perceive others as ends in themselves rather than as means to something, and avoid harming others. As Ronald Dworkin suggests, the concept of dignity needs to be associated with the responsibilities each person must take for his or her own life. Dignity requires owning up to what one has done.[45]

Liberal democracies accept these ideas as the foundations of governance. In contrast, theocracy, apartheid, and forms of governance that are based on despotism, either of one person or of a small group, all deny the background rights and moral values of liberal democracy. All forms of governance, all cultures and ideologies, have a certain conception of justice, but their understanding of justice may differ from one society to another. Consequently, the specific ways in which cultures apply justice in particular situations may differ.

In *The Law of Peoples*, John Rawls drew a distinction between liberal and illiberal societies. Liberal societies are pluralistic and peaceful; they are governed by reasonable people who protect basic human rights. These rights include the right to life (to the means of subsistence and security), liberty, and personal property as well as to formal equality and self-respect as expressed by the rules of natural justice.[46] Liberal peoples are reasonable and rational. Their conduct, laws, and policies are guided by a sense of political justice.[47]

---

[44] John Stuart Mill, *Utilitarianism, Liberty, and Representative Government* (London: J. M. Dent, 1948), chapter 3 of *On Liberty*, 114–130, 114. For further discussion, see Piers Norris Turner, "'Harm' and Mill's Harm Principle," *Ethics* 124, no. 2 (2014): 299–326.

[45] Dworkin asserts that people who blame others or society for their own mistakes, or who absolve themselves of any responsibility for their conduct by blaming genetic determinism, lack dignity. "The buck stops here," says Dworkin, is an important piece of ethical wisdom. See Ronald Dworkin, *Justice for Hedgehogs* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2011), 210–11. For further discussion, see Jeremy Waldron, "Is Dignity the Foundation of Human Rights?," Public Law Research Paper 12-73, New York University School of Law, New York, January 3, 2013; Marcus Düwell, Jens Braarwig, Roger Brownsword, and Dietmar Mieth, eds., *The Cambridge Handbook of Human Dignity: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014).

[46] John Rawls, *The Law of Peoples* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2002), 59–88. For further discussion, see Richard Rorty, "Justice as a Larger Loyalty," *Ethical Perspectives* 4, no. 3 (1997): 139–51.

[47] Rawls, *The Law of Peoples*, 25.

In contrast, nonliberal societies fail to treat their people as truly free and equal. Outlaw states are aggressive and dangerous,[48] while other forms of nonliberal societies might adopt skewed concepts of morality and justice based on compulsion and coercion. A nonliberal society may deem it just to cut off a thief's hand, whereas liberal societies may perceive such justice as abhorrent. Another nonliberal society may deem it just to stone a woman who is said to be an adulterer, whereas liberal societies conceive such justice as absolutely repugnant. Authoritarian societies jail their political opponents, whereas liberal societies encourage pluralism of ideas and provide avenues to empower opposition. Moral values, unfortunately, are not universally shared in all countries by all humanity. Thus my concern is with Western liberal democracies that perceive human beings as ends and that respect autonomy and variety. The arguments are relevant to other countries, but because nondemocratic countries do not accept the basic liberal principles; because their principles do not encourage autonomy, individualism, pluralism, and openness; and because their behavior is alien to the concepts of human dignity and caring, one can assume that the discussion will fall on deaf ears. Nonliberal societies based on authoritarian conceptions and principles deserve a study of their own.[49] I elaborate further and explain this argument in chapter 3.

Although I am not a relativist, I believe that history and culture do matter. Societies do not adopt a universal common denominator to define the boundaries of freedom of expression. For instance, Germany and Israel are more sensitive to Holocaust denial, and rightly so. Although the United States protects hate speech, racism, and Holocaust denial, we would be most

---

[48] Ibid., 81.

[49] For information on Internet censorship in China, see Jodie Martin, "Internet Repression in China," December 7, 2007, https://suite.io/jodie-martin/gmo2sb . For information on Internet repression in Vietnam, see "Viet Nam: A Tightening Net: Web-Based Repression and Censorship," Amnesty International, October 2006, http://www.amnesty.org/en/library/info/ASA41/008/2006 . For information on Internet repression in Iran, see "Iran 'Happy' Dancers Sentenced to Jail and Flogging in Flagrant Assault on Freedom of Expression," Amnesty International, September 18, 2014, http://www.amnesty.org/en/news/iran-happy-dancers-sentenced-jail-and-flogging-flagrant-assault-freedom-expression-2014-09-18 ; Bud Simmons, "Internet Repression in Iran," *Thoughts of a Conservative Christian* (blog), September 17, 2008, http://bsimmons.wordpress.com/2008/09/18/internet-repression-in-iran/ . For information on Internet repression in Syria, see Sami Ben Gharbia, "Syria: More Victims of Internet Repression," *Global Voices Online*, October 20, 2007, http://www.menassat.com/?q=en/news-articles/1711-syria-more-victims-internet-repression . For more information on Internet repression in Ethiopia, see "Internet Repression in Ethiopia," CyberEthiopia, September 1, 2006, http://cyberethiopia.com/home/content/view/26/ ; Andrew Heavens, "Ethiopia Blocks Opposition Web Sites: Watchdog," Reuters, May 1, 2007, http://nazret.com/blog/index.php/2007/05/01/ethiopia_blocks_opposition_web_sites . See also Athina Karatzogianni, *The Politics of Cyberconflict* (London: Routledge, 2006), 121–53.