

3737 Comments Speaking Up to

save the  link

**Re: Regulatory environment for platforms, online
intermediaries, data and cloud computing and
the collaborative economy**



Executive summary

On 17th September 2015 the European Commission released a questionnaire on the regulation of online platforms asking how such platforms should operate in the European market.

Entitled **Regulatory environment for platforms, online intermediaries, data and cloud computing and the collaborative economy**, the questionnaire had a broad scope, seeking input on everything from geo-blocking and data privacy to contractual relationships and licensing agreements.

However, this questionnaire was widely criticised for its questions directed explicitly at rights holders, overly long and with a low standard for usability and user experience.

As the Save the Link network, we worked to bridge these gaps by isolating questions that could have the greatest impact on our right to link, and then asked them in a way that an everyday Internet users could understand and answer. We narrowed it down to five key questions on intermediary liability, transparency on website takedowns and lost content, and ancillary copyright.

In total, 10,903 people responded to the consultation on the Save the Link

platform, with 3737 responses coming from within the European Union.

This volume contains all of the comments from within the EU that the Save the Link network received in response to this consultation.

Overall the responses show that Internet users regularly find themselves unable to access content, losing access to legal content and inconsistencies in takedowns without clear answers as to why. Additionally, most respondents raised concerns about any system that would require websites or individuals to pay fees to link to content online.

As Internet users, we must play a role in shaping the way the Web is changing. This is why we did everything we could to get this survey in front of as many Internet users as possible. The more people who participate, the more representative the outcomes will be. It is vital that these views are taken into account and properly heard as the EU moves forward with the Digital Single Market Strategy, and with the new copyright directive.

We hope their voices and perspectives will serve as a compass to guide your determinations going forward.

Save the Link question 1:
When using platforms like SoundCloud or Facebook, have you ever seen legal content unfairly removed, or been unable to access it in your region?

European Commission consultation question:

Have you encountered, or are you aware of problems faced by consumers or suppliers when dealing with online platforms?

1476

428

8

Yes

No

I don't know.

Total number of responses: 1495

Unique responses: 661

"So, so, so often. Invariably in the form of a company claiming rights to content they do not have, be it squashing critiques of their work by claiming ownership of the fairly used reference material for instance, or even simply claiming ownership of the content based solely on the title. This seems to be a particularly significant issue in Germany, as I regularly find I am unable to show friends works by artists who have created original works inspired by owned franchises, only to find that ownership of the work has been claimed based on its tangential relationship to the franchise in question and thusly blocked."

yes, a lot, particularly on YouTube.

I am getting notices that certain TV contents if videos are not available in my region because of legal issues

No

Yes. Frequently I have seen content unfairly removed on Facebook.

No, because I don't use this service.

Yes, and I've also had issues linking things to people outside of my region on occasion

Geoblocking, where content is available in some countries and not others can be confusing and restricts access to knowledge and information. Monitoring billions of posts per day for infringement relies on automated systems, which often unfairly censor legal speech and expression. Processes that take infringing content offline (such as filters and notice systems) which take down infringing content consistently overreach and often result in the blocking of legal content.

Yes

Yes, unfortunately. It's outdated. We are living in a global economy and world now.

When individuals are responsible for monitoring content, they apply their unique quirks and morality, often inconsistently

While automated processes may result in unfairly removing/blocking legal content, if it is monitored by humans, those who monitor tend to exercise their "value judgements", so that there will always be a risk that their decisions will be biased, prejudiced and inconsistent.

Yes, sometimes.

Yes I've seen videos disappear of police brutality and misconduct

Yes, quite frequently. Online filters and DMCA notices, which take down infringing content consistently overreach and often often result in the blocking of legal content. Monitoring billions of posts per day for infringement relies on automated

systems, which cannot detect context and unfairly censor legal speech and expression. Geoblocking, where different content is available in different countries can be confusing when it is unclear why content is not available, and restricts access to knowledge and information. When individuals are responsible for monitoring content, they apply their own individual quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity.

Yes. Often the filters and automated detection systems involved are far too proactive and remove legitimate content, sometimes even uploaded by the actual rightsholder. Furthermore, there is a very shady privately owned system to reimburse copyrightholders that sits on a huge pile of cash that is NOT reimbursed to the rightholders. Also, the rules to this blocking are unclear: can a nursing woman be shown, or is this nudity? Meanwhile, video's of people proudly shooting machine guns inciting to racial violence are permitted... This is highly inconsistent.

Yes. For example, my company's Internet connection is passing through Luxembourg, which provides an incorrect geolocation which sometimes blocks content.

Yes. Facebook does weird things.
Now you see it now you don't.

For SoundCloud some disappearing tracks yes. But I do not know if it was removed by the users or someone else. I do not use Facebook. On YouTube, I have some blocked videos «not allowed in your country» ... and I live in Belgium, a «so called democratic and free country».

Yes. Multiple times.

Yes, often

Yes. Copyright holders often take too strict

a stance on what is copyright infringement.

Yes: Since recently Facebook does not allow viewing users' content in Belgium without being logged in yourself. This includes not being able to view any people's data without having a Facebook-account and thus be tracked.

Region locking yes

So far, no

Yes, sometimes things are not accessible in my region.

Yes, it's not infrequent to see content not accessible in my region

yes, anonymous

A few times I have seen legitimate content removed from YouTube.

Yes, quite often.

Yes, some videos have been "not available in your country". Processes that take infringing content offline consistently overreach and often result in the blocking of legal content. Geoblocking, where content is available in some countries and not others can be confusing and restricts access to knowledge and information.

Yes! Quite frequently lately content disappears

Yes, I have been unable to access certain contents in my region

Yes, one item from a Tumblr blog

Yes, on Soundcloud a music producer/artist friend had their own tracks on their own Soundcloud account removed 'due to copyright', this happened because of blanket screening robots, it was a mistake but it took many emails and frustration for the Soundcloud to reinstate his tracks.

In Facebook there have instances were a friend has posted a story link to the source and the post including the link being removed without any reason, this happened with the same thing for a number of friends

I once saw a spoof Twitter account for a Conservative MP deleted within half an hour of its creation, during the 2010 UK General Election. Nothing else occurs to me off the top of my head

Yes, on Youtube

Yes, for no discernible reason

If it denounces the bad deeds of a person or a society, they did and they will without a doubt.

Yes I've seen many cases were relevant and informed political comment (as opposed to abusive or racist propaganda) has been blocked by facebook.

Yes, I have seen tsu links being removed from Facebook

Yes, many videos uploaded legally to Youtube of U.S. news shows are unable to be accessed by me in Australia via Facebook

Yes!.. all the time!.. bogus Copyright infringement has been used to take the guts out of the internet

yes, many times usually with no explanation

Yes, this happens a lot!

Yes. For instance on Soundcloud.

Yes, on a few occasions

Yes. In youtube too.

No I haven't seen legal content unfairly removed or I haven't noticed.

No.I have seen commercial content not being accessible in my region, that is US content not accessible in CZ. I'm not sure if that falls into scope of the question.

Yes, in both Soundcloud & Facebook.
If you censor information then you continue to drive more illegal sites in sharing such content

I've had plenty of videos be unavailable to me on youtube, just because of my location

I don't use Facebook or SoundCloud

Yes, on Facebook, I have seen people block for publishing material on Curds and on sexuality/genderissues. Soundcloud I do not know - only by name.

Using Facebook: Only what Facebook deletes. They are not serious at all.

Yes. I can't see opera direct broadcasts from Europe.

Yes, frequently

Yes. Since Facebook and SoundCloud use computer algorithms to monitor billions of posts, they are also claiming to customize related sites or pages, etc., that the viewer might be interested in, thereby directly choosing content for marketing bottom lines and filtering out any personal choice I would have. They are using psychology against my needs.

I have seen content removed, but mostly I have seen content inaccessible in my region.

Yes. Content should not be removed unless it is clearly making use of copyrighted material for profit. Services should not be required to remove content at any request

Yes, I often see content "unavailable in Canada". I find that really annoying. Also

it is often not clear why it is unavailable

I do not use these platforms.

Yes..

I am not very IT ekspert to know

Not that i can remember

yes, removed by a machine
and not a person

Yes. All someone has to do is report
infringement to TOS and whole accounts
can be suspended, often without recourse.

Yes, I have seen material taken down
that was not offensive but was of a
political nature and challenged corporate
and government perspectives.

Yes, I have seen people have songs that
they created removed because they
sounded 'a bit similar' to other songs. I'm
not even going to even start on the non
profit fanart, animations, cover songs and
parody videos I have seen removed unfairly

Yes, all the time

Yes, all the time. Automated scanning
systems seem to overreach a lot as do
region blocking services. The systems
seem to have little concept of fair use.

Not regularly, but I wouldn't be
surprised if something has simply been
removed before I had the chance
to see it! Geoblocking is sometimes
understandable but always annoying.

Yes, and I am sure in many cases the
content would have been legal to view
in my region. Neither automated nor
manual systems will be perfect and will
inevitably result in excessive censorship

Sure.Censorship exists everywhere. The
goal of preventing dissemination of

copyright works is central to the media
industry.If crowd funding were a bit more
equitable and mainstream it might make
the media industry more consumer friendly.
Now the capitalist system means those
with money try to preserve the status quo.

Yes. E.g. Censoring art & paintings for
nudity but allowing groups like BF
to incite hatred. No consistency.

No.

Yes, sometimes I'm able to circumnavigate
this by accessing other uploads from
different regions globally. Moat of the time,
I'm not able to find other copies elsewhere

Yes. There have been several times
where legal content is blocked through
one service to 'force' the user to view
it through another service. For unfair
removal, I've seen things removed simply
because someone played their guitar
too well on youtube, for example

Yes, and I know of many other
people who have seen the same
thing or had their accounts nearly
shut down for what they post

Some YouTube videos removed due
to claimed copyright infringement,
though the material has been
used for artistic purposes.

it is imperative that any and all
conditions, and or restrictions be
visible in legible text AT ALL TIMES.

Yes, a brilliant pisstake of Total Eclipse of
the heart was removed by Sony on youtube

I think so, when trying to reconnect
with a link it is sometime gone.

yes I often have a problem with
content access by region

Sorry I do not use either of those services

all the time on youtube. few instances on facebook

Not really, no

Processes that take infringing content offline (such as filters and notice systems) which take down infringing content consistently overreach and often result in the blocking of legal content. Monitoring billions of posts per day for infringement relies on automated systems, which often unfairly censor legal speech and expression. Geoblocking, where content is available in some countries and not others can be confusing and restricts access to knowledge and information. When individuals are responsible for monitoring content, they apply their unique quirks and morality, often inconsistently.

Yes, regularly

YES. Many good articles have been removed from facebook and important videos from youtube for not legal rights violation related reasons. This upsets me. The internet should be a place where people can share their opinions and actively support human rights, animals right and petition violations of those rights and freedoms.

Yes. The region locks are especially annoying and unfair. Why doesn't the EU rules regarding the freedom of movement etc. not include the Internet?

I use such platforms minimally so the fact that I have not seen this occur means little

Yes. Facebook removes content that is sometimes even not offensive.

yes.

Yes, I have seen material being blocked

a lot of companies use copyright as a tool to remove content that doesn't look good for their products, including negative criticism and creative content referencing their work.

I've read about instances like this, but not experienced it personally.

Yes! I travel quite a lot all over the world, and it's pretty scary to see how often content is blocked here or there, for whatever reason. And even in my country, how many services and (young/small) companies had faced such unfair content blocking, with no (legal) way to contest it.

Yes, several times even if protected by fair use

Yes, on a regular basis.

I have had problems accessing posts with other friends on political subjects, but we have never been sure why this has happened.

Oui de nombreuses fois je n'ai pu accéder aux contenus. La culture ne doit pas avoir de frontière.

Yes! I have seen other social media sites blocked, and non mainstream information removed.

Yes, usually without any satisfactory explanation

Yes. Facebook have deleted song links to YouTube.

I don't know what's legal or not. But I know I want access to everything. I get very angry when "content" is limited by region & don't understand what good that does aside from providing some kind of copyright rent for someone. I don't think everything should be free, but there are many things I can't buy even if I want to because of the

regionalization of content. For instance, I am a big fan of HBO and don't have access to most of what they offer unless a French company offers it (I live in France).

Yes. While using Deezer, some content was marked as no longer available for my region. Given the fact that my region was the same as the artist's one, that looks a doubtful reason. I would understand if the content was no longer available anywhere in case the artist wished to remove the content. But I seriously doubt this was the artist's initiative.

Yes. Facebook regularly removes content that is against their Byzantine maze of fears, censorship, and personal opinions

Unable to access: yes. When it happens, the site usually says I am not in the right country, due to DRM contractual obligations (I am in France, and they have agreements with a restriction to US customers).

Unable to access in my region

No content removed, but repeatedly content being blocked regionally. So I stopped trying most of the time, and use darker file-sharing systems or VPNs. Annoying and tedious, but I ultimately get the content.

Not that I am aware of

YES!!! many times.

Geographical restriction, f.i.

Yes, there has been some posts of breast cancer survivors, turning their scarred bodies into platforms for tasteful, quite well designed tattoos, that have been banned for "sexual content".

Sometimes with SoundCloud, which is sad but not with Facebook

yes, I frequently see "unavailable in your country or region"

Yes. Repeatedly.

I do NOT use Facebook due to its new terms of use. They want you to agree to spy on ALL of your data on your hard disc and ALL cloud space AND they want you to agree to spy and use ALL of your contacts AND they want you to agree to use ALL your private data publicly. They want to take over your complete life and make you completely public. NOT WITH MY CONSENT!!!
q: No
2nd q: I did not notice it.

Yes, I have seen it for youtube

Yes. Partic with online TV broadcasts

All the time. YouTube has a lot of videos that I cannot access because I live in Germany

yes, links shared by friends which I connected with, were unaccessible

don't know

Yes, many times

As far as I can say, no

Yes, multiple times

Yes, mostly because of regional locks for marketing or right purposes. I encounter these mostly on youtube, especially on streams. Also, the same happens on Twitch if the hoster was listening to music in the background. I think it is unfair, because no one actually benefit from it.

Yes I have seen this often

I think I have occasionally

It sometimes looks very much like it.

Yes, and currently established procedure to review and remove content based on the personal opinion/claim works good enough

Yes. I regularly come across content that I can not access in my country that is heavily promoted through links posted to facebook and the like. This is very unfair that I have to find ways of working around these blocks, when I want to access this content

I only have seen "unable to access in your region"

Geoblocking, where content is available in some countries and not others can be confusing and restricts access to knowledge and information.

yes, usually American tv shows on YouTube don't playback.

my computer is not allowed to go to faceache (facebookK

yes, I have seen many images and videos unlawfully removed due to Facebook's complaints services. As a result, good people I know have had their accounts banned because of something they posted and someone flagged it

I've never used 'sound cloud'

Yes. Art works removed from FB

I don't use platforms like those. But it happened that I wanted to watch a video on PBS and couldn't because I don't live in the US.

oh yes I did.

Yes. I have seen transformative parody works removed under claims of "copyright infringement"

Yes. It happened too much often

Yes. Politically embarrassing videos have

been removed only to prevent voters from learning what was actually said

Yes. That prevents legitimate access.

Messages from Gaza and sometimes also from the territories occupied by Israel are regularly removed.

I haven't really noticed any removal of legal content. Sometimes things aren't available in my region

Yes, in Facebook is not uncommon and it amazes me to see pictures of naked people (whether they are artistic, pornographic or even people breastfeeding childs) removed in a very short time after posting and letting other like explicit violence against animal content, even drug usage by underage children not being removed at all. This should make people think about what's really harmful about some practices and the double morale standards for censorship

Yes, some harmless parody gets removed for copyright infringement while vile islamic extremist warcrime shit is just left on

Sometimes

Yup, I've seen videos pulled because an automated system detected a song being played on a TV in the background.

yes on all counts.

Legal content is often be removed

I guess Yes, but it's hard to make it evident

Yes, a lot

yes, i have

I often cannot access music videos on YouTube for copyright reasons. I don't think removing content or making it inaccessible is a good solution, not even

for the film/music business. If I can't access it, I simply forget about it. I don't go to the cinema nor do I buy the CD. I would prefer making a monthly contribution (a sort of tax for internet contents).

Constantly

Yes. Certain lectures, BBC content, etc., have been unavailable to me in the US

Yes, especially on Facebook. The measure with different sticks between individuals and politicians & corporations.

Yes I have. Someone I know had their original comedy video taken down because there was a Russian television program with a somewhat similar (but not the same) name

yes, i think so, but fail to remember where and when exactly...

Yes, mainly on YouTube.

yes I have seen this. Music which is not by GEMA was removed to put GEMA-music up instead. And our government is attacking Twitter and removing comments which is not in favour of our government! This is unacceptable!

yes, music and video footage

Yes!

Yes, on many occasions

For a free internet

I'm neither on Soundcloud nor FB but I've heard of some instances via Twitter.

It is my own responsibility to decide on / assess the legality of the content that I seek. I don't need an automated system to determine what is legal or not on my behalf

Not yet

Yes, I have!

Yes, quite often

You Tube

I've not had much opportunity to see the "before and after" to fairly judge if removal has been unfair. That said, this is certainly something that happens

Yes, I have regularly encountered content that was removed using the DMCA. Content holders are notoriously bad at interpreting 'fair use'

There are many posts I want to do and I get somehow blocked. Internet is for everybody and everybody has the right to be informed

I haven't seen this sort of thing on SoundCloud or Facebook, but it appears to be an almost constant occurrence on YouTube and similar sites

Yes. Canadians cannot view some American content

Yes, happens all the time

Yes, and I have also seen political videos (featuring short news clips that would qualify as 'Fair Use' in the USA) removed under the pretense of copyright infringement. This is an easy way for media companies to conduct censorship

I have seen legal content unfairly removed

Yes, Facebook

I haven't witnessed an incident of unfair removal YET. I would like to continue having free access to any content I wish to in the future.

Many videos cannot be accessed from my country.

Yes, mostly on YouTube.

I have not but others (friends) have seen such things occasionally.

Yes, absolutely

yes, both

Yes, quite frequently

yes, of course.

yes, like region authorization on youtube and FB allowing harmful, hate filled posts, pages

Very often! As someone currently living in the Republic of Ireland, the amount of restricted content is simply shocking. Also, often content that are using things under Fair Use - for example, for the purpose of review - are automatically struck out or removed by bots.

Yes I think I have

It's a pain when I'm told that content isn't available in my country. That's when I use other tools like a VPN or TOR.

All the time. Far too much content, especially videos, is U.S. only for no good reason. I've also had bogus copyright claims on my YouTube videos and no way to properly report them

Yes it is common, "copyright trolling"

I haven't noticed any examples (I'm not a very regular Facebook or SoundCloud user)

I've never seen legal content unfairly removed, but have encountered "This content isn't accessible in your region". I do not agree with this, and feel like we shouldn't deny others not within a specific region/country access to 'public' material.

Yes, several times

Rarely

Yes. More common on YouTube, though

Yes, see it all the time especially with YouTube

All the time. Copyright has changed from something to protect content creators to another weapon for corporations to control us.

Yes! You cannot preach that you want a globally aware society and then restrict access to information based on location!

Yes. FB is particularly disgusting. I stopped using it

Yes and when individuals are responsible for monitoring content, they apply their unique quirks and morality, often inconsistently.

Yes. Some links from the USA.

Yes especially video content on Facebook. Also the methods of determining the target country are often inaccurate - e.g. if you are on a VPN you may be getting content for a different country than you are actually in physically.

Yes, as a resident outside of the USA and Europe, content is frequently geoblocked due to rights concerns. Rights need to move to a global model, and better explanations where content is not available internationally are needed, rather than the trite "this content is not available in your region or location." I have also used several sites that have been aggressively issued DMCA notices for no justified reason

Yes absolutely. It happens all the time even if the copyright holder thinks it even sounds or looks a little like their original property.

Not where I am currently based but has happened in certain

countries. Should not be allowed.

Occasionally

Yes, I cannot see videos from certain countries such as the USA and the UKGBNI.

I can't notice this because i'm not on facebook

Happens all the time on YouTube

Not that I've been aware of

Yes, often content that seems completely legal is blocked

Yes, a lot of times.

Yes. E.g. Censoring art & paintings for nudity.

Yes. I have seen original machinemas (animations) that parody cartoon or video game characters being taken down on Youtube, which is a form of censorship

Yes. It happens far too often. Content monitoring bots, and spineless web services, who simply remove content without question when they receive (often unwarranted) complaints, will be the downfall of the free internet.

I have seen many many instances of film clips being unaccessible with the message that this content is not available in your area.

Yes. Regional restrictions have kept me from enjoying content legally posted online.

No, not that I know of.

Yes, it is very frustrating to not be able to share information directly. Censorship is unfairly and unnecessary applied.

Yes, and it's an unfortunate pain. How is one supposed to share the existence of an artist when they are inaccessible?

On another note, my friend (and others online apparently) have had THEIR OWN creations taken down due to DMCA notices that had no business taking them down

No yet I use them too seldom to get a proper idea

Yes, I have experienced geoblocking and legal content removed.

Yes, I have seen legal content removed from these platforms. I am a musician myself and have friends who have had their own songs wrongfully removed from SoundCloud. Using automation to censor is as ridiculous and problematic as it sounds. And Geoblocking has got to be one of the most annoying things to emerge in recent years. At the very least we should be given a reason why something is "not available in your country" I prefer the old system, where nothing was censored

Yes. There are a lot of videos on YouTube , unable to being viewed in a lot of regions, which is unfair, and counterproductive for the video's popularity.

Yes, and it's irritating.

It happened with LinkedIn.

Yes. For example videos that should clearly be covered under the fair use clause or otherwise not violate any laws are removed from YouTube constantly. I've seen other sites attacked and given notices for things that are legal no matter how you looked at it but some companies just don't bother to investigate and just demand removal of anything even resembling something that might be copyright.

No, not as far as I remember.

Yes, of course. In this case "fairly" is very dubious, as "fairness" cannot be considered without due process. In fact, many trolls

use accusations of copyright to get content removed they dislike - it is a tool for different kinds of warrior mentalities, from feminists and putinists to islamists.

I've seen that specially with Instagram and Facebook because even if it's artistic content, it goes against the platform's policies

It has not happened to me directly but I have heard of instances

Yes. The Youtube copyright fiasco is infamous

Yes, and I've supported a number of individuals who were wrongly taken down by overeager companies filing indiscriminate copyright violation notices that were fraudulent

Yes, I have seen this on e.g Beatport.

Nope

yes, due to all the region locks often content is puzzlingly unavailable to view

Yes, I've found content which wouldn't play in my region on Facebook

yes. All of the time

Obviously this is an everyday occurrence, the better safe than sorry approach is limiting me every day to get access to information.

Yes. Large businesses simply don't find it worth the time it would take to investigate the merit of every individual takedown request made, especially ones that come from other large businesses. So they simply implement the takedown requests automatically, without consideration of merit, and then it is up to the content provider to argue their case to have their content restored.

This clearly shifts the balance of power into the hands of large businesses and away from small content providers

Yes, it happens far too often

Links to videos produced on other continents seem to be removed regularly. This is utter nonsense, since the internet is a global concept, and the antiquated copyright legislation developed by ignorant, stupid lawyers and money-greedy lobbyists is not working in this age of inter-connectivity. Update your business model or perish!

Not using both

Yes, all the time. Basically, the filter(s) err on the side of caution rather than validity

I have often seen this, and it really hurts my trust in these companies

Yes. I've seen legal content removed.

Yes, on a variety of sites, such as Youtube and Facebook

Yes, on multiple occasions

Yes Youtube Says things Cannot be played In my Country!

Yes, quite regularly

Yes, several videos

Youtube often has been problematic here. I get linked something by a friend from abroad and I can't watch it because it hasn't been made available in my country. It's only a minor annoyance, but one that could so easily be fixed, and due to greedy rights holders hasn't been

yes, this happens way too often. Especially as a UK national who used to live in the US I had this problem all the time

Yes! Weird regional rules don't make sense on a global internet

Yes, usually mistaken by illegal content

Yes. Some elements of provided services are limited by country, like certain videos on YouTube.

Yes, when I'm visiting my wife's home country of Greece

yes! which is both insensitive and harmful.

Yes this occurs all the time and can be a little depressing

Don't use Facebook

Yes to both

Yes. Art work that meets Facebook rules has been removed from someone that I follow

Yes, too often.

I haven't and I'd like to keep it that way.

Q1 Yes

Yes, legal content has been unfairly removed.

Yes. Access to videos is routinely blocked for Canadian IP addresses. Geoblocking by US corporate providers is an unwarranted restriction of access

Yes. This has happened often.

Yes. Videos have been removed due to copyright restrictions

Yes. When individuals are responsible for monitoring content, they apply their own individual quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity.

Yes many times.

Yes, Youtube sometimes does not show songs in my region

Yes, many times legal content on youtube has been blocked by unfair DMCA notices. While this was usually corrected after several weeks, the content was no longer current. This system does not work as it is very easy and quick to flag content (wrongly) as infringing, but very hard and time consuming to get it reinstated.

A lot of USA shows are not available in my country.

Yes and regularly, most notably on Youtube, but equally on Marktplaats, Ebay, Tumblr

Yes, I have seen this and I have felt left out of the world community

Yes I have, and it equates to censorship.

Not that i recall

Yes, it happens all the time without explanation.

Yes, both of these have happened and it is frustrating and discriminatory

Yes. DMCA notices are known to request the removal of content it should have no bearing on, and I have personally experienced this many times over, mostly on YouTube and legal torrents.

Yes, some youtubes are unavailable to watch in my country

YouTube often removes legal content unfairly or makes it inaccessible from the Netherlands. www.ted.com removes legal content unfairly due to a pseudo-science mandate.

No idea

All to frequently. It leads me to actually boycott the company that

is doing the fraudulent removal.

N.a

Yes, unfortunately

Yes, even times when content clearly doesn't violate any private platform agreements, in addition to being legal

Yes. Geoblocking is a problem. Automated blocking of legal content is also a big problem. Too many artist get their works removed form the internet because of automated copyright infringement notices. Guilty until proven innocent.

1/ No2/

Legal content is repeatedly blocked from view in my region

Yes, e.g. Sony Pictures claimed an opensource movie at YouTube and caused a take down of it even though they don't own anything in it (<http://www.cartoonbrew.com/ideas-commentary/sony-demands-removal-of-open-source-indie-short-sintel-from-youtube-98182.html>).

Yes. The Conservative Party used it to censor unflattering videos of their speeches during rallies in Canada.

Yes, I think. On a Wisconsin site, I recently posted a comment critical of Governor Scott Walker. A statement then appeared at the top of the page stating that I would have to go through another site before it could be posted. It was then impossible to get to the second site

Yes, all the time, can't access content due to region

Yes, I've seen many photos being taken down for no apparent reason. There were no copyright issues and the content was pg.

Yes, legal content is often removed

Yes, its a nuisance

Yes. Often content that I was previously able to access with no problems. This had led me to other platforms in order to access the very same content

Yes, I have! Legal content is removed. Not often yet but it is

Yes, it's a consistent problem for Canadians using the internet, and it makes academic research almost impossible

Yes: I'm in Canada.

Occasionally I have been unable to access EU content from this Region

Yes, and I find it frustrating

Yes. A support group for sick and disabled queer people was wrongly deleted.

Yes, I have.

Yes. Geoblocking occurs regularly, assuming that those outside the region are not allowed to view the content while they rightfully can often, and vice versa, geoblocking is easily hacked by using a proxy, making it a moot measure to begin with

Yes, my facebook page was taken down because my son is in prison and I was trying to bring awareness for his cause

Yes. I have been unable to access some videos due to regional restrictions. In today's world this is nonsensical to say the least.

Yes. I have seen several times an apology for the content not being available for my country.'Maybe we are a lesser people?' Is that what I should think?

yes.Although geofencing should be use to alert the user that the content

it is trying to reach can have personal negative results in their country/region.

Yes, quite a few times

Yes, especially videos!

yes, I saw many times legal content removed unfairly and illegally, includidng even human and animal rights petitions

Yes. I see a lot of websites that have the restrictions to regions.

Yes. This restricts my access to info

Yes, all the time. I never find out why

I don't think that internet is only Soundcloud or Facebook. I'm not sure if I ever saw this kind of legal content on those sites, but I sure did see it on Netflix for example.

Yes, there is content that we are unable to view in Canada all the time due to licensing restrictions

Many times.

Yes unable to access it due to region

Yes, many times!

Yes, some American sites will say the content is not available in your region

Can't say I have. I have never used SoundCloud

I remember it happening with whole services, like Pandora, because of copyright issues. I'm a citizen of the world, and don't need this kind of restrictions, because there are companies that exploit another people's talent to make themselves rich without lifting a finger, and aren't even capable of adapt to the global communications era we are living.

I don't use them

Yes, I have been unable to access some content on Facebook

Through YouTube

I see both every single day, between Facebook using arbitrary criteria to remove things, to Youtube georestricting videos, even on the country they originate from.

Yes, I've often seen content blocked for unclear reasons. It's hard to tell if it's content providers removing content for legit reasons or some overaggressive internet filter or even just some weird restriction due to where I live. The bias should be towards free linking, not aggressive blocking

Yes. Also, equal level of nudity or of hate speech have received different responses, some being surprisingly removed while others being shockingly tolerated. The system deciding on what should be banned is biased and often based on moral rather than legal rules

Yes, always on youtube. just because it had the intro of star wars it doesn't mean it's making money out of the 5 seconds of it.

Yes, many times I see legal content removed for Copyright reasons but the content was not in violation

Yes, on many occasions

I have not personally, but have heard of it. In any case I use Facebook very rarely.

Yes, most often with music videos, but sometimes talk show clips as well

Yes, I have. Lots of YouTube videos

yes, alot from google, i no longer use it... bunch of crooks.

Yes. A poster for the World Naked Bike Ride made by a friend.

Yes. Often it is overreaching rules (such as the ones proposed) that are abused and used vexatiously with false claims being brought. However, the legal copyright holders should have the right to protect their work, as they do with current copyright laws

Yes. Youtube videos.

Haven't noticed this

Yes, because in germany we have legalized pirates called GEMA and additional censorship by the goveremanet, who prevents free distribution of information

I've often seen legal content removed because people don't understand what rights authors actually have and don't have.

q1 no

Yes, I have seen where facebook has disallowed posts that have been taken out of context. Yet I have also seen outrageous comments against Muslims

Yes, information is often and regularly held hostage in this way.

Yes, this is ridiculous, www mean "World Wide" web. There is no frontier

Yes, many times and many times in other forums have I seen complaints about the stupidity of the "offence" and the inconsistency of it throughout something like facebook

Yes, mostly music

Yes, people have been blocked from Facebook because of innocent pictures which for some reason have been classified as obscene.

I think so, when copyright processes go wrong.

No, not really.

I have seen US websites inaccessible from Europe

yes many times, especially when the content exposes the government or shows up their hypocrisy Online filters and DMCA notices, which take down infringing content consistently overreach and often result in the blocking of legal content. Monitoring billions of posts per day for infringement relies on automated systems, which cannot detect context and unfairly censor legal speech and expression. I have had many notices removed on face book, especially when I criticise my government Geoblocking, where different content is available in different countries can be confusing when it is unclear why content is not available, and restricts access to knowledge and information. When individuals are responsible for monitoring content, they apply their own individual quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity.

I've seen it mentioned in the media, mostly regarding harmless female semi-nudity (such as breastfeeding). YouTube I'm occasionally barred from watching certain videos due to my geographical location.

Yes. Automatic filters often overreach and unfairly remove legal content

Yes. Facebook has removed content. I have never used Soundcloud.

Yes, I have several times been unable to access content due to restrictions based on geographical location - no reason as to why or by whom the restrictions were imposed have been given. Removal of content seems to be more uneven - on

one hand it appears that the reporting options (at least those available to regular users) have little effect, but at other times it seems almost as if a copyright claim is a censorship tool and it does not matter if the claim is legitimate or not.

Yes. On Facebook

I've seen embedded Youtube videos that didn't work because they are blocked in my region by Yukin media

Yes,

Yes, I noticed this happening several times on Facebook

Yes plenty of times

I have seen legal content disappear from the web.

yes. Youtube illegitimate copyright strikes

Yes, absolutely, and frequently.

Yes, for some links

Don't know

1. YES, Some government comments have been removed. Some MP content has been removed, this should not be happening.
2. When anyone puts content online that content should stay unless it is infringing copyright or patents. 3. If an owner of copyright or patent puts content online they have allowed the use of that info by the public and it should not be removed, unless by public appeal of judicial review

I would not know this since, if it is blocked, I would not have access to it. I find it worrying that content may be blocked and I oppose it.

I haven't knowingly had that experience, and I shouldn't expect to unless the authorities stifle the democratic principles

that should govern internet use

Yes, many times, annoyingly..

Not that I'm aware of.

Yes, even under fair use. And doing that does not benefit anyone and it hurts the content creator

Yes, many times.

Content is regularly region gated, mostly from the US, and I don't even live in Somalia.

Yes, I did

I have never used SoundCloud or Facebook enough to see content removed. I have, however, been unable to access certain YouTube content in Britain.

Yes, I follow some educational sites that have had their content removed sometimes and one had their site shutdown, for no reason, and it took months to sort out. This was with facebook.

Don't know.

Yes, all of the above

yep

Yes to the latter. In the former case I have heard of it being done but not had personal experience.

Yes. Blocks and other things on YouTube, even on things that are clearly within fair use, or even not copyrighted at all, at least not by others than those who uploaded the videos

Yes, I have seen legal content unfairly removed and, also, I have been unable to access various contents because of the region I live in

Occasionally.

Yes, links have been removed from my region

Me personally not yet, but discussing this question we should consider that 1. Monitoring billions of posts per day for infringement relies on automated systems, which cannot detect context and unfairly censor legal speech and expression. 2. When individuals are responsible for monitoring content, they apply their own individual quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity

I have seen legitimate content removed, and / or been able to access it. This is not acceptable. Note that it can push people towards less legitimate sites in an effort to find content that they wish to access, but which has been censored on the 'legitimate' sites

Yes. Facebook regularly removes completely legal content on issues to do with Palestine/Israel. They censor Palestinian rights issues very often.

Yes, I have, many times I have seen content being used under fair use law removed anyways

Yes, geoblocking is particular problem.

Yes, I don't believe in censorship. Regional blocking is meaningless when users can use a proxy anyway.

Yes on many occasions.

Yes many times, it has to stop.

No, not to my knowledge

Yes, I've been blocked from content due to geographical location
do not use them

Yes: Rebelliouspixels's 'Buffy vs Edward: Twilight Remixed' on Youtube

My friend's facebook account was closed and he was unable to access it because he had used the name he performed under and not his legal name. Also, I am part of a group that supports breastfeeding and I cannot even begin to enumerate the number of posts of breastfeeding women that were removed. It is disgusting that Facebook permits hate speech but bans nudity

yes, all the time!

How do I even know if something has been removed or I can't access it in my region? There are different rules in different countries so it is hard to know what you can and can't send. If something is blocked how can you find out why it was blocked?

Yes, in Japan

I never want to see content removed or controlled by government. It is in the world's best interest to be able to share knowledge!

Yes, from time to time links to "controversial" opinion such as those implicating governmental foreknowledge of terrorist attacks or involvement in illegal activities disappear from Facebook and it's well known that Google censor anything they're told to.

Some films are not accessible in my region. This is unfair.

Automated tools, which are the only way billions of posts a day can be scrutinised, are coded to err on the side of safety, or as many users would say, overreach and block what should be legal content. Free speech should be a global right on the internet. Blocking based on location/area leads to massive confusion, why should

it be that a source I can view and use at home suddenly becomes inaccessible because I happen to be somewhere else, this confusing manner of accessibility prevents the free flow of knowledge and information around the world

Only on YouTube

Yes, many times. I cancelled my FB acct for just that reason

Yes, it is very frustrating

Not that I am aware

I've seen political censorship on YouTube and I've seen censorship on facebook with regards to copyrights

Yes, many times, and with no way to protect one self and ones content

Yes. Stupid stuff like 'the quran experiment' is blocked!

I have seen instances of legal content that was removed for no obvious reason

I have

Sometimes a notification that Video and pictures have been removed. I have had posts monitored and I am not always aware of the outcome of that

Not on those sites specifically, but on other sites, most notably on YouTube where people from other countries have provided a link to something and it's not been available in my region.

Not to my knowledge.

Yes, frequently.

Geoblocking is a frustrating and confusing system which restricts information dissemination. For television shows and other copyrighted material, it is applied

in an over protective manner, often resulting in a reduced audience and missed opportunities for social promotion of the product that is being obscured by the block. Automated filters that seek out copyrighted music in videos on sites like YouTube have an indiscriminate and unfair approach, censoring free expression. Likewise, the monitoring of billions of social media posts a day for infringing content results in an censorship of legal expression of ideas.

Occasionally, I have been unable to view content from another country.

Yes, I have been subject to that myself, however I believe there is much confusion over what constitute private and public 'commons'. Facebook is the Downtown Mall of the internet.

Yes, on multiple occasions

Yes, especially geoblocking is tiresome, when you know that the content is available elsewhere. When official label or artist channels are blocked, it really begs the question, what the heck is going on behind the scenes. Or when parodies get taken down, because someone used the copyright shortcut to silence criticism

Yes, posts that adhered completely to fair use guidelines (and explained in detail how they were compliant with said guidelines) were summarily removed, and the posters were penalized despite having obeyed the applicable laws

I have, on several occasions.

Yes and having to prove one's innocence to copyright claims rather than the claimant having to prove their claim reverses the legal burden of proof unjustifiably

No - I don't in fact use Facebook or SoundCloud.

Yes, rather than a fair and legal investigation into the validity of the content, advertising sponsors blackmail platform providers with the threat of withdrawing their money. This means only those with money get to decide what content is viewed and small independent content providers are silenced.

Yes , I sometimes grasped those no explicable occurring.

I believe so, although since there is often no way of checking the legality of the original content, it's hard to tell whether it was removed legally or not

yes. pretty much everything from america is region blocked. even news articles.

Yes, especially frustrating coming from a country that we share an undefended border from!

Yes, there has been a number of times when I cannot see content 'in my region'

Yes I have, and it makes me want to use that service less, or find an alternative service without that problem

Yes, sometimes there is no chance to access a video because some algorithm deems it not appropriate in my country, even if it does not (to my knowledge) contain proprietary content

Yes. Meaningful humanistic posts with useful and positively provocative images and messages have been removed by Facebook, with no more reason than it exposes corporate corruption

Occasionally. It seems that most platforms are too quick to judge and censor. It's not their job to interpret and implement the law, so we shouldn't ask them to do this. Regional restrictions are also a very bad thing, resulting in limited

access to information across entire countries. This is a security risk and almost certainly in infringement of human rights, so should be strongly opposed.

yes, things critical of Israel tend to get deleted

Yes, this happens all the time

Inconsistent local standards and overreach will result in the takedown of legal content, especially by automated systems. Geoblocking will meanwhile block access to ideas and information, negating the freedom of the internet.

Yes, this happens all the time. The worst case I remember reading about was of an artist who licensed a video backdrop to an entertainment company only to find that subsequently that company requested his own content to be removed from YouTube. Also, regional blocking is wide spread in the EU and seriously harms our right to free speech and the idea of eventually having something like a shared European identity

I have been unable to access content because of the region of the world I am in. Geoblocking is wrong as the wholesale approach that it adopts restricts access to things which are almost all probably legal.I did hear a story in the news about somebody whose business website was blocked incorrectly as it was deemed to contain inappropriate content (it didn't and wasn't inappropriate in any way).This proves that any system monitoring billions of posts online has to be automated and, as such, the system will always block things unfairly.It is also hard to expect a person to monitor content as every person's sense of what is acceptable is entirely different.

Yes, too many times

Yes, have seen Facebook posts taken down

I have not noticed this.

Yes, in the form of video content that was region restricted.

Filters often block legal content. Automated systems cannot judge context and therefore unfairly censor legal speech and expression

Not yet.

Yes, far too many times. Filters aren't perfect, so it's not unusual for something to get unfairly censored. Also on sites so big that the support team doesn't have time to do a real investigation after any complain, it's not hard for someone with a grudge to get something taken down. And I have seen that happen several times. As far as being unable to access to legal content, that has become very common in the last years and is already restricting things for worse as it even takes away the means to *pay* to access to something

Je n'utilise ni l'un ni l'autre. Facebook = BigBother sans respect pour la vie privée !

Yes, I have seen consistent overreach resulting in the unfair removal of legal content. For example, the recent film 'Pixels' starring Adam Sandler, resulted in takedowns of countless other videos which featured the word 'pixels' in their title. There was no valid legal basis to remove these videos, indeed, many had been created and posted to the internet long before the film 'Pixels' was even made. Automated infringement monitoring results in exactly this kind of consistent overreach. Manual monitoring is no better, however, as decisions of whether to take down content or not are left up to an individual's own personal judgment, resulting in inconsistent takedowns and sometimes outright malicious censorship of moral or intellectual content they do not agree with.

Don't use platforms like SoundCloud

Yes, on Facebook

Yes! This happens on a regular basis in Malaysia.

Yes! All the time. It's really frustrating, and makes it more difficult to interact with others online

Let's keep it simple. Yes

Not in my experience but friends tell me they have seen this happening

Yes, quite often. And, again, often, either there is no reason given in the first place or they will not give reasons (nor even discuss it).

I have seen this many times, most prevalent in fan made content that is not violating copyright under free use.

I've never seen this happen, or at least never happened to me when using SoundCloud or Facebook, though in YouTube for example, there is often content that is unavailable for my region

Never use social websites

I have seen content removed but no idea whether it was fair or not - the reasons for removal were not given so I couldn't make a judgement.

Yes it's a very common and serious problem that stifles creativity, creates problems for creators, damages platforms reputation and ultimately leads to stolen profits or lost profits from content that does not get made

Yes, legal content removed and lots of YouTube videos unavailable in the UK

Yes, Facebook regularly takes down things it does not agree with without discussion or giving reasons.

Yes and it should not be allowed! Except for online bullying, aimed at teenagers in particular

Yes. And since it's impossible to monitor all publications manually, the automated systems put in place end up removing material that in no way infringing content. Plus, since the number of reported contents is also very high, it's easy to report contents as infringing material just as a quick way to silence it until someone challenges the report and checks it

Yes. I have had a perfectly reasonable posting removed. I have also seen video content on other people's pages blanked out

Yes, and I think this is an unfair and unethical practice. Users should be able to make their own decisions about what content they will look at and what content they will avoid. This is unnecessary censorship and we are going down a tricky road. Who decides which content will be available and on what basis? Geoblocking, where different content is available in different countries can be confusing when it is unclear why content is not available, and restricts access to knowledge and information. Monitoring billions of posts per day for infringement relies on automated systems, which cannot detect context and unfairly censor legal speech and expression.

Yes. Most disappointing. Who actually has the legal authority to decide to censor non offensive materials?

Yes. Content from the US and Europe is sometimes blocked for Japanese users

Yes. Content is often not available in my region

Yes. Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity even if it is innocent

yes, and yes. i have seen takedown notices and access restrictions applied in an unfair and arbitrary manner.

I'm not sure. Regardless of my personal experience, the fact remains, the idea of forced impediment to private communication through any venue without a warrant is both illegal and immoral and must not be condoned or accepted in any manner

Yes. Hoaxslayer on FB. Also other links that appear dead when clicked on

I don't know, not that i've noticed, but that's part of the issue.

Yes. Hulu, for instance, refuses to allow the Dutch to access any of their content for unknown reasons, probably the rest of Europe too

Yes. I even experienced it myself on YouTube. I added a piece of classical music, by Erik Satie, to a video knowing this particular performance was licensed for reuse, but YouTube's algorithm instantly tagged the song as being copyrighted

Yes- it's infuriating and results in needing to use unnecessary proxy systems to bypass the stupid restrictions.

I do not use Soundcloud nor Facebook, but there has been content on YouTube that is not accessible.

Yes: frequently cannot see content on youtube that is available in other regions

Sometimes, yes

I don't recall.

Yes. I have noticed some news being blocked, so that I have had to go through a series of other links to find it. And this was ordinary news about the

boats going to Gaza. No propaganda.
Published by European newspapers.
But blocked by the Australian gov

Yes, I have. Especially common on youtube

Yes I have.

Yes. I've heard from friends closing
down complete accounts

Yes. I've seen freely downloadable content
owned by me removed on the DMCA
request of a competitor. I've also seen
blocks preventing access from here simply
because people posting it didn't assume
people from here would look at it

Quite a few things in the USA are blocked
in the UK which is extremely frustrating.

yes. inappropriate take down
messages are a limit to creativity

Yes. It feels like sometimes the website
is a little trigger happy when it comes
to removing or blocking content

Monitoring billions of posts per day
for infringement relies on automated
systems, which often unfairly censor
legal speech and expression

Q1....yes

Yes. Lots and lots of times. I'm
estimating over 100 times, but it
could be a huge underestimate.

Yes. Many times

Yes, I have been unable to access
material because of my region.

Yes. My friend is a birth photographer
and captures beautiful moments of life
just beginning. Nothing graphic. Her
posts have been filtered for 'nudity'.

Yes. Not available in your country

There have been plenty of cases
where content has been unfairly
removed or prevented from
being accessed in my region.

Yes. Things that clearly fit under Fair Use
and parody clauses are constantly being
taken down by parties who deny the
existence of such clauses in the first place

Yes, it's a real annoyance.
And it needs to stop.

Yes. It is unacceptable to have
content unfairly removed.

Yes, and it's ridiculous.

Yes, I have been unable to access content
in my region. I am an American living in
Japan but sometimes US content is blocked
here. It seems arbitrary and strange

Yes. The removal of content is
inconsistent and seems to be poorly
implemented based on personal
agenda's or poorly written systems

yes I have

Very likely on Facebook.

No. I don't use those type of platforms.

I have heard reports of platforms like
Facebook removing content that clearly
should not have been removed.

Yes. Too many examples to remember

I have seen legal content
removed from Facebook

Yes, I have seen content being removed
by automated systems even when
the content does not violate rules.

Yes. Unable to access free content
in my region too often.

Yes. Why is that?

Yes. YouTube sometimes issues arbitrary takedown notices when the content is held up in some legal dispute. There is no reason that copyright disputes between big companies should keep content off of legal services like YouTube

I've heard of it happening but not experienced it myself

Yes and the reasons are unclear and this is unacceptable. There must be a clear and uncorruptible process followed for any interference.

Yes I have. It happens more and more and it should stop.

all the time, i get so upset not being able to access information just because of my geographical location

Yes, i have not been allowed to view certain things in my region. I disagree with this - it's the "World-Wide-Web" after all...

This is not right. Content should be up to poster unless clearly illegal or inciting to hatred.

I see it on YouTube ALL the time. I am blocked from seeing music videos by artists from overseas.

never used soundcloud.Facebook it's too easy for the admins and hosts of groups to impose their own view capriciously and throw folks out capriciously and Facebook does nothing to stop them.

I don't think so, although I have seen where things have been removed but have notion why, or if the removal was legal, because it has been removed.

So far I've been able to access the internet without restriction, as it should

be. China and North Korea have been heavily criticised for restricting the internet access to the people.

Yes, and it was often difficult to contest the invalid takedown request

YES several times !!!!

I do not use SoundCloud or Facebook

Yes, it is a regular occurrence especially on Youtube that either an automated process will remove perfectly legitimate content or a company will use their power to censor criticism of their work.

absolutely, I was in NZ and everything is blocked for people there. we need to accept we're a global community now and remove these barriers.

I don't use these services so I cannot comment on this question.

I only use Facebook. I don't recall legal media being blocked. If it was, and I was sufficiently concerned, I would copy the link and access it direct from a browser.

Yes, often social comment and news items are removed because they "Infringe" on the original source. I recently read go an artist who creates stock videos having his youtube account suspended because a record company licensed his work for a music video, then claimed his youtube account showing samples of his work available for purchase was "infringing on the music video"!There are systems in place to help creators of some types content control how it is shared online (often it is only utilised for large corporations for financial gain), however they should be expanded upon and made more available for more forms of content, although for the end user it can often appear restrictive, one of the basic principals of copyright is that the creator can control who views

and has access to the work created, but once they have granted access to that work (per haps after a fee has been payed), how much control dose the creator have, can the require that I don't read my book out loud to my young nephew, or can the forid me from loaning or selling on a DVD? - Right now content creators have the ability to restrict consumption of content legal purchased like movies or audio files or digital books, so the can only reaccessed on the device used to purchase the content, if i travel to another country that content might no-longer be available, even though I legally purchased it and want to consume it for my own use.

Yes. See answers to question 3.

Have never seen legal content unfairly removed and have, constantly, been unable to access content in the region I'm living in at the moment.

Monitoring billions of posts per day ends up censoring large amounts of legal expression online.

Geoblocking is anti the spirit of the web. Some bizarre moral choices are made when blocking images.

Yes, fair use is often usurped by takedown notice

Sometimes.

can't be sure, don't think so

yes. I had my own 100% original composition removed from SoundCloud due to their copyright infringement detection algorithm mistakenly identifying it as some existing piece of music

Yes, People on Facebook have often complained about this whilst at the same time immoral violent postings seem impossible to have removed

Yes, absolutely!

Yes I have. It's extremely frustrating

Not noticed, don't use SoundCloud at all and rarely use Facebook.

Yes. For instance, the Discovery channel in the US put up (some of?) their shows for free on the web. But they are not viewable from the EU. Also, I have had a video removed from YouTube that I had written permission from the creator to publish in any method possible

Yes. Fed up of having to proxy.

Yes, I have, on Facebook. On several occasions recently, posts my friends have made have been unavailable for no good reason, and I have heard reports from friends I trust that innocent posts they have made have been removed.

No, but I make little use of Facebook and none of SoundCloud (never heard of it) or Twitter

I have seen posts deleted when they should have been left on facebook

Yes, content from Australia and US

Yes. One of my friends had an event video taken down due to peripheral background audio in a small segment of the video. At most, that segment of audio should have been redacted

Seen it happen a lot on YouTube. There are many content providers on these services who themselves are asking for the removal of these tools, and better content control for blatant plagiarism (Freebooting)

Yes, and it's beyond frustrating. I've even seen specifically Canadian content blocked in Canada. Which is ludicrous.

I wouldn't know if I had been unable

to access something that had been unfairly removed! Monitoring billions of posts each day inevitably means that systems to do so are automated, thus unfairly censoring legal speech. Human beings ultimately decide what is legal content and therefore biases creep in. I wish to make my own decision about what I receive from online platforms

I think so. Some things disappear for unknown reasons

Yes, sometimes content is removed without explanations even when it wasn't posted online to make money.
Need a moderate approach

DON'T USE THEM

Current Automatic filters (used with DMCA) on popular websites such as YouTube often takedown legitimate content accidentally, leaving little recourse for the original content holder to oppose the decision. I see this happening frequently in the online community news.

Yes! I'm not happy about this either!
I should have the choice, not some automated piece of software!

How would I be able to make a judgement as to whether it was legal or otherwise, if I couldn't see it. If a site tells me I cannot see something, I have no way of knowing whether it was blocked on regional grounds unless the site expressly tells me, and even then I only have their word that a block or a removal is legitimate, and that it hasn't been censored for other more personal or corporate reasons. Furthermore, a large site, relying on automated tools is bound to make mistakes, either in blocking legitimate content, or in failing to block inappropriate material. Corporate parties have a natural tendency toward tuning detection in favour of

catching the failures to "protect" their interests, which leads to increased and disproportionate numbers false positives and blocking of legitimate or competing material. With no cost to business in doing so there is no pressure upon them to maintain a fair and reasonable balance. The public view of the world is increasingly controlled for the benefit of the entities acting as our conduits, and their political masters. We can only see what we are allowed to see, and have little or no oversight of how those decisions are made

Yes and Yes

I was a founding member of FAST [Federation Against Software Theft] and as I approach my three score years and ten, I would suspect that my understanding of the issues involved here, are quite comprehensive, in comparison to those of the EU Commission who are involved with this proposal. As an example of my own long-standing commitment to FAST, I purchased a BLU-RAY copy of the PBS TV Production of EARTH from SPACE in NTSC, from the USA, which I can't watch on my PAL Home Cinema System, so that I felt that I had paid my dues and could therefore freely discuss the ramifications of this 'most expensive ever' movie, to all that would listen in cyberspace via Facebook etc. and feel comfortable with posting a YouTUBE version/s of the PBS Production as an embedded or hyperlink item, as an important part of my discussions. What on earth is the internet for, if it doesn't readily and freely provide the basis for DEMOCRATIC DISCUSSION? NEED I SAY MORE. So my answer to this particular question IS a definite YES. A classic example of the "essence of the problem" about rights etc. is exemplified by the current situation in the UK. The BBC, for which I and the vast majority of the viewing public, pay handsomely for a TV Licence, are subsidising those who the BBC allow

to watch their output FREE of CHARGE on their computers and mobile devices and this is the situation with just one of the 28 members of the EU. Is the EU, as ever, trying to establish a TOP DOWN, ONE SIZE FITS ALL SOLUTION to these issues and if so why has English NOT been made the ONE SIZE FITS ALL LANGUAGE SOLUTION for ALL 28 of the EU Membership?

No, but I don't use Facebook anymore. It is not safe.

I personally do not use these platforms so I cannot answer this question directly. However, I would say that the rule of law using our existing court system should apply.

Youtube videos occasionally say not available in my country

Yes. far too often.

Yes, and this is happening more which defeats the point of the internet

Yes, by facebook.

Dont use these

Not sure

Yes when trying to access certain television shows.

Yes, especially on YouTube, where content is regularly unavailable in Germany, sometimes due to snippets of background music or even though it is an official music promotion video

Yes. The use of online filters and DMCA notices are abused, in such a blatant manner, that they consistently overreach and, more often than not, result in the blocking of legal content. Also, the monitoring of billions of posts per day for infringement is executed by automated

systems, which lack the ability to discern on context and unfairly censor legal speech and expression. The concept of geoblocking is unfair, resulting in a disparity of content in different countries. The reason for its existence is unclear and confusing. In the end its function is restricting the access to knowledge and information. When the monitoring of content is relegated to individuals they apply their own individual quirks and morality in the process, to varying degrees of inconsistency. Take a look at Facebook: permits hate speech, but bans nudity

Frequently get irritated because Facebook falls out of something I am reading via a link and when I go back into Fb the original post seems to have vanished. Have seen reports of photos of eg breastfeeding mum being taken down by Fb. Not sure if these are the same thing described in the question...

Still not

Yes, things that reflect governments badly seem to dissapear pretty quickly.

Yes. I'm often unable to access material on Facebook in my region.

Yes, and when this happens, it is often censoring more than is necessary, apart from the intended illegal censr, the broom is too wide reaching and unfair

Yes, unbelievable.

Yes, fairly frequently

Yes. There's often region restrictions for some reason. I don't know why anyone tries to do this in the age of the Internet!

Yes. Fair use and summary use of content has been blocked for reasons such as hiding reviews of poor products. Automated systems may restrict free

speech by being too aggressive.

I do not use these platforms, but monitoring/blocking systems will inevitably be abused by authorities, and be applied unfairly and incompetently.

Yes, on YouTube, tons of videos containing music is blocked due to problems with the GEMA

Yes, facebook blocked links to my own blog

Apparently

I be heard of it but it's not happened to me.

Sure, especially on Youtube. There are two problems, 1. Censorship, 2. InconsistencyIt seems to be very easily for a political group to make a lot of noise and have moderators pull down content that offends them. I think these websites have a duty not to take down speech that piss people off religiously or politically.

yes often unable to access

Yes. And it takes sometimes days before it is been made available again. An innocent nipple to some is more disturbing than the horrors of hate speeches and resulting wars

I have seen it removed but am not certain it was "unfairly" removed

There are times when I've been unable to access material as the link is blocked.

yup!

Not sure, how would I know if it was removed?

Yes, I have often seen legal content unfairly removed or not been able to access it in my region. It is very frustrating that in this day and age there are still geographical restrictions on information, and even more disappointing that more

restrictions are being contemplated.

No, but some links have gone to places where I got a "not available in your region" notice - generally for video

Yes,whilst obscene and terror related pictures and videos are not removed from Facebook?

Rarely, but it has happened.

Geoblocking means that what I can access when I work in France ceases to be available to me in the UK or spain. This restricts my freedom of choice

Yes links that have been blocked for no apparent reason

Yes. It is too bad that information in the public domain is stopped because someone thinks they have the right to block it

Yes- using YouTube and SoundCloud

often, particularly content made inaccessible outside the United States.

I don't use social media

I believe so. By Facebook.

Yes, and on Youtubr as well. It's ridiculous and inconvenient to have something advertised as available then to be blocked out because I don't live in the right country. The internet should be without borders, especially when you consider the fact that you can use an IP blocker and freely access the content anyways.

Yes, but not on these platforms. And it's kinda against what the internet is all about

Yes and many times in my region :)

Yes, I believe so

Yes, it is quite annoying absolutely the

same video is accessible in one country and not in another, just because of Geographical location and not related with any cost whatsoever. E.g. youtube music clip available in Germany and not in Bulgaria. To worsen the case, there are legal IP content providers, like Netflix not available in certain markets, thus limiting distribution of legal content to users that would pay for it, which is absurd situation.

Yes. Facebook for example allowed Nintendo to delete a link on somebody's wall that lead to a website that discussed circumvention of DRM. Hence, "discussed". Completely legal. On Youtube we see legal content be claimed as copyright by people that do not own it. Many videos in Germany that do not break any laws are blocked in Germany.

Yes, Facebook removed a picture of a woman who'd posted a picture showing her double mastectomy concealed with tattoos. They claimed it was obscene even though there was nothing except the woman's tattoos to be seen. I often can't see US ads/clips on Youtube, which in the case of ads for shows seems rather daft.

Yes, far too often.

All the time. There is no freedom of speech on large internet platforms - content gets removed as and when anyone decides.

1) Yes

Any legislation should be extremely carefully framed. "Don't throw out the baby with the bathwater"

Derbyshire

Do not use

I don't think so

I have never seen this happen

on soundcloud or Facebook

I personally have not seen this.

I'm not in Fakebook

I've seen this often on Facebook, which is part of the reason I rarely use it now.

Maybe ,but not sure

Monitoring billions of posts per day for infringement relies on automated systems, which cannot detect context and unfairly censor legal speech and expression

N/A

Not certain

Not so far but I am concerned about the survival of democracy with increasing surveillance which I do not regard as directed at terrorism but more about keeping us all under control.

Online filters and DMCA notices, which take down infringing content consistently overreach and often often result in the blocking of legal content. Monitoring billions of posts per day for infringement relies on automated systems, which cannot detect context and unfairly censor legal speech and expression. Geoblocking, where different content is available in different countries can be confusing when it is unclear why content is not available, and restricts access to knowledge and information. When individuals are responsible for monitoring content, they apply their own individual quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity.

Processes that take infringing content offline (such as filters and notice systems) which take down infringing content consistently overreach and often result

in the blocking of legal content.

So, so, so often. Invariably in the form of a company claiming rights to content they do not have, be it squashing critiques of their work by claiming ownership of the fairly used reference material for instance, or even simply claiming ownership of the content based solely on the title. This seems to be a particularly significant issue in Germany, as I regularly find I am unable to show friends works by artists who have created original works inspired by owned franchises, only to find that ownership of the work has been claimed based on its tangential relationship to the franchise in question and thusly blocked.

Sorry I do not use either. But I am all for the internet to free os any restriction.

Yed

Yes due to agreements not being in place for revenue

Yes I have, often

Yes multiple times

Yes too often!

yes yes

Yes, and i was shocked. I was kidding with my neighbor, and I reported her picture with just naked shoulders as offensive and rude, and the day after they really removed the picture. We couldnt believe! :D

Yes, but generally it is released again after review

Yes, frequently, especially on youtube with copyright restrictions.

Yes, I believe that Facebook has unacceptable prejudices in some cases, and that Twitter lacks accountability. The lack of effort devoted to dealing with trolls suggests unwillingness to engage with their users/clients reasonable expectations.

Yes, including automatic software which has flagged content provided by companies for PR purposes incorrectly, or regularly allows non-owners to register content fraudulently.

Yes, numerous times Infowars facebook page has been shut down.

Yes, some political posts have been removed/become inaccessible though others in different regions reported still being able to access.

Yes, things get removed from facebook, that they deem inappropriate, but leave up some hideous things.
All or nothing, facebook!

Yes. FB posts complained how it happened to them. I just read one today. My friend posted that FB removed his pic for nudity but it wasn't a nude pic.

Yes. Overblocking, or in one recent case, nervousness about giving access to UK visitors, has led me unable to access content.

Save the Link question 2:

Do you think rightsholders (such as the film or music industries) have too much say in which content is taken down from the web?

Do you understand why some content (e.g., pictures, videos, gifs or text) get taken off the Internet?

European Commission consultation question:

Are you a holder of rights in digital content protected by copyright which is used in an online platform?

- As a holder of rights in digital content protected by copyright have you faced any of the following circumstances?**
- An online platform such as a video sharing website or an online content aggregator uses my protected works online without having asked for my authorization?**
- An online platform such as a video sharing website or an online content aggregator refuses to enter into or negotiate licensing agreement with me**
- An online platform such as a video sharing website or an online content aggregator is willing to enter into a licensing agreement on terms that I consider unfair**
- An online platform uses my protected works but claims it is a hosting provider under Article 14 of the E-Commerce directive in order to refuse to negotiate a license or to do so under their own terms**

If yes, explain.

Total number of responses: 1411

Unique responses: 1060

"Absolutely, especially when it comes to adaptations of protected works. Having the possibility to adapt existing works and create new types of content (video, audio etc.) is essential to our cultural and individual development. Artists/people have always stood on the shoulders of giants - that's just how the creative (and intellectual) processes work."

Yes

I think the balance is right for the right holder to take information down

I'm happy that content holders have some say but not at the expense of expression and especially not in cases where they don't actually hold the copyright for the work in question

Yes, should only be removed if personal. It's a stupid idea thought up by people who really don't understand why the web is there. It's totally impractical to force such controls on an open system.

I understand they have profits to protect. Once their work becomes a meme, it has a net benefit for their output and I think they should accept it

Yes. Any suggestion that copyright should be attributed to hyperlinks is a disingenuous distortion. Any plan to copyright URLs has nothing to do with resolving copyright issues that have been in disarray for years.

Sadly, yes. Right holders should only be able to have actual piracy down. Anything else is an exaggeration

Oui

The Internet by definition is a Free service for everyone - not a money maker and sensor in the background

Despite what some rights-holders say, hyperlinks themselves must not be copyrighted. The freedom to direct web users to interesting or relevant content via hyperlinks should (and must) be protected to preserve the internet itself. Can you imagine, for instance, never being able to direct someone to a webpage selling a wonderful book, simply because you cannot legally post the hyperlink to the page? It is a ridiculous prospect, and will be enormously detrimental to both web users, and to the rights-holders themselves, who misguidedly want hyperlinks to be copyrighted. Rights-holders already have ample opportunity to request that copyrighted content is removed from websites, and they must be compelled to follow due legal process in order to do so. A large amount of legally-sound content is automatically removed from the web (for example, 'fair use' of copyrighted material for purposes of parody and review), without due process or any way to appeal the removal of content.

Yes. Yes.

Yes, but content like child pornography has to be removed or blocked

They have too much say and I do not always understand the take-downs. "Rightsholders" plain siphon revenue straight out of most artists' mouths, they have no place in today's connected world. A not-for-profit collective dedicated to protect artists' rights could do a much better job, provided it has safeguards built in to prevent it bossing artists around

Rightsholders have far too much say in what is taken down from the internet. Simply having a copyright should not give complete control over use.

Yes

I don't know

Not that I am aware

but no for the second question No

No.

no

No I think copyright holders should have rights to govern how their content is used

YesYes, I understand but disagree with their arguments.

don't know

Yes I do - it seems to me to be profit related. As a teacher I find it infuriating that clips I want to use in class get taken down

Yes I do. Often it is for 'reasons' which are nonsensical - why should a video/music clip, for example, be freely available in one region, yet banned in another? Particularly when a near-identical clip is listed just below the 'illegal' one

and IS playable. It is more to do with power and litigious mentality than common-sense. Do I understand why other content - pictures, gifs etc. are taken down? More often than not, I don't. Only rarely are explicit reasons for the decision to take down made available, which make any sense to the layman.

Yes. I understand why some content is taken down, but too much is taken down for the wrong reasons.

I believe they should have the power to protect their content but they abuse it significantly out of nothing more than greed and selfishness.

I understand why SOME content is taken down. In some cases it's confusing. Haven't really seen a problem with that until now, except for the attempts of some rightholders to achieve more control on which content can be uploaded, viewed, listened to or used for non-commercial use

Yes, sometimes they are there to intimidate or harass a person.

copyright is important but should only apply to serious content not trivia

I am not the best person to answer this question - I do not use the internet for music and films.

Yes, corporate interests have too much influence over content on the web

No idea - nobody has presented the arguments on both sides in a balanced way for me to understand. Without that, I can't judge. There are strong arguments on both sides in individual cases - a universal one-size-fits-all solution affecting everybody including content providers that are happy to publish widely has to be wrong. The technology isn't there right now to achieve this!

Yes yes

es their automatic crawling finds content that is a perfectly fair usage, and webs companies unfairly take it down to avoid bother rather than look into fair use

Yes, and I think that a lot of the time they're damaging their own cause, since the people posting these things are fans and by cracking down on their fanbase they reduce the long term viability of their own products.

Absolutely they have far too much say, and most of the time it only seems to be due to a complete lack of knowledge of what constitutes 'fair use' on their part that things get taken down - especially on YouTube.

I'll take it a step further. I think the copyright industry (it's hard to call some of the sludge they push on us "entertainment", or "medicine", for that matter, with a straight face...) not only overreaches but also overreacts, cutting off their own nose in spite of their face. how many times could they have gotten on the ground floor of innovative new ways of making money, and instead chose to treat it like the enemy? The obvious example is Napster, but there are others, like YouTube, where if they had simply abandoned the "direct" pay model, they could have reaped huge profits from advertisers

Yes, they do have too much power, and I understand why this happens

No, this is insane

Yes, the balance of power is far too far in their favour

1 - yes 2 - profit is the answer

I don't think there's too much say in which content is taken down. I think

there's far too much automation about it. I think it requires oversight from human beings to verify that the content doesn't violate intellectual property, copyright, or Fair Use laws

Yes, there's definitely a bias towards large media companies bullying content sharers, and although I do understand the need to keep new content under control I think that the period where it's acceptable to strong-arm sharers should be fairly short.

YES! They go over board in their copyright control. Remind me of Marvin Gaye's family - they are greedy and ridiculous!

no and I don't understand. Only if there is a legal infringement of laws should it be used. I presume they get taken off because of their rights to have their work be seen or not for free

I think they should be able to charge or lease the rights of their film to services that stream

Yes I understand that some music videos are copyrighted and the advert-free versions get taken down

1. These industries have far too much say in content removal. To remove an entire unauthorized film or music collection is one thing, but to remove a couple of pictures, texts or bits of music is quite another. We've been down this road before, it doesn't work.

Yes and yes, though I disagree.

A few deserve removal: how to build a nuclear bomb, how to attack a government institution, violent hate speech, etc. Otherwise, many removals are not justified. Pushing the copyright notion in so many video and audio messages is ludicrous, incredibly costly and has little effect. Litigation lawyers must love it. Pathetic

No, they don't have too much say. I do understand why those who produce content have the right to take it off the Internet. They have invested money, time and creativity in producing the content and it should be subject to copyright protection.

Yes, rightsholders (or those claiming to be so) have too much influence over site providers. I understand that some content needs to be removed to prevent harm or other crimes and that rightsholders need to be able to protect their works but they shouldn't be able to have stuff taken down so easily

Yes. These cases rarely if ever involve potential lost revenue from the content

Yes, they have too much say.
Yes I understand why some material is taken down.

Yes too much say. No understanding of why some content is taken down

No. I'm not clear on this question

Yes.

yes, corporate rightsholders have too much influence. yes, i understand the limiting effect of materials removed from the internet

I understand why inflammatory and pornographic communication would be removed from the web/internet

I do understand why some is removed. They do, however, have too much say but I do not say they should have none at all.

yes and yes, but i do not necessarily agree

Certainly not!

Yes they have way too much say, their profits are prioritised over basic free speech principles in many cases.

Yes. They have too much say.

No, no no!

Yes, they use there privilege without considering 'fair use'

Yes they do.

Yes- often it seems the blanket rules punish those using the material in good faith or non-profit situations.

Yes way way too much. It is high time that these organisations were required to prove what that allege, but I suppose that the amount of money they donate to various government officials, gives them clout.

I understand why some are removed, but I think it's counter-productive - embracing the power of such easy exposure would surely get better results

Yes: some is blatant profiting from the work of others, but most is fair comment/use

I do understand, and whilst protecting an individual's copyright is important, I find some companies approach rather precious & over protective.

Yes. And yes, but disagree.

yes and yes

Yes, there is too much guilty until proven innocent in today's internet, critics are often targeted despite fair use

They use a blanket tool to take down all uses, which includes legal uses too, but webmasters have to choice but to comply.

don't understand

Rightsholders have an inordinate amount of say in how policy is set. It appears that government's bend over backwards to cede to company's lobbying efforts

and give short shrift to facilitating a grown-up and transparent discussion between citizen stakeholders and company stakeholders. I can hazard a guess as to why this is. Most often, the message that something has been removed makes me think that a lawyer has been in touch with a website owner and pressurised them into removing it.

not sure. if they have sole rights, then they can do what they want, cant they?

Yes, some level of copyright control is acceptable, but it has to go through proper legal channels. Much stuff which is removed serves more as advertisements for such companies, and I would have thought serves them better by staying up

yes, I think they have too much power

Yes, they have no business in initiating force through the government

Yes - they seem keen to use the system to self promote ad nauseum, while denying a right of free speech that is in anyway critical of them. And while madly keen to prevent a lot of sharing, they're pretty good at taking copyright on anyone else's work posted to their sites.

Well... Taking down your own intellectual property is fine, but too many people abuse it to bully websites into taking down images or video that they don't have a right to claim, simply because it's easier than fighting it legally

Their copyright claims are insane

I understand that artists and those responsible for recording their work require fair remuneration for doing it

Different countries in the EU have different rules on what use of copyright material is permitted, making it difficult for Internet

users to know if what they are doing is legal

Youtube and many other sites constantly remove user-created content due to overzealous DMCA and similar copyright complaints by big media corporations. These complaints are often without merit, and would be thrown out by a court of law. However, corporations can throw their weight around too easily, and other companies -- the companies that run websites hosting user-generated content -- often bow too easily, out of fear of legal costs to defend the issue. This must stop. Copyright, as first created, and to some extent still today, is finely balanced: balanced to support creators, but also the rights and needs of society to share new ideas. This was created in a time when a song might spread around the world via paper, in a number of years, rise to popularity in decades, and fall out of fashion in a lifetime. So a lifetime of copyright was sensible. Today, however, a song spreads around the world in seconds, makes money over days, and generally fades within a year. After these creative works fade from popular consumption, public interest in them is generally academic, historical, and related to community discussions. As such, copyright terms should be reduced to a few years, rather than extending to multiple lifetimes, as corporations are encouraging. The extended inability to share creative works, which are often the concepts with which we share ideas, is a form of control over free speech. A similar issue arises when we, as a global community, are prevented from seeing content based on geographical location -- so-called "geoblocking". We are now a global community, discussing issues -- democratic, political, and creative -- globally, within seconds. The world has changed, but the corporations enforcing this approach -- often bypassing copyright law to do so using technical measures -- are taking their self-serving

profit goals too far. Limiting content to one country is too stifling to this freedom of speech and debate. They undermine global society itself, the bridging of social divides across the world, for profit.

Rights holders already have too much power to take down content from the web. The USA DMCA is widely abused as there is little penalty for false claims, see for example <https://www.eff.org/en-gb/deeplinks/2015/02/absurd-automated-notices-illustrate-abuse-dmca-takedown-process>

I can see both sides

Creators need to have rights returned to them from the rights holders

Q2: yes

Q2...Yes and Yes

I think the limit of rights needs to be re-examined and re-defined

Yes to the first. Yes to the second

Currently I think they have just enough say, although they are trying to change the rules so they don't have to do as much to justify taking down content they believe infringes on their copyrights. A court order should be required to remove content from the internet.

Yes. Supposed rightsholders (sometimes those seeking take downs do not have permission from the rightsholders) have far too much say. The burden of proof should be on the rightsholders and the responsibility for carrying out take downs should fall on publishers and not web hosts or ISPs.

They might be a bit powerful, but I understand why some images should come down.... but it may be too much

competition

Internet should be free as long as nobody is hurt personally. The rightholders may protect their content by encrypting it but they should not have the right to do anything more. Rights should be the same in every european country

They have too many rights. Those creators, too, have used other people's creation/work for inspiration or base for their content, and should not prevent others from basing their content off of their work.

Yes. They want the right to stuff us full of advertising so the off set to consumers should be the right to view/listen to content

No. Yes

These are two separate questions. 1. I believe rightsholders have say in which content is available on the web. Piracy is a major problem. 2. Yes, I understand why some content is removed.

Rightsholders seems to have difficulties understanding when their content is being used in a flattering way and when it's being infringed. Their say differs from content provider to content provider. I see more active takedowns on YouTube than I see on Tumblr for example. The reason why some content gets taken off the Internet is usually not detailed or a generic message is provided

There needs to be a way of challenging copyright claims - automatic removal is unfair, particularly in cases where music happens to be playing in the background (as was the case in my video of the Olympic torch passing through my town), and - as I'm sure has been mentioned plenty of times - legitimate uses for parody, satire and fair use. Leaving people without the ability to make their case skews the whole system in favour of larger actors

who can use their monetary and legal muscle to do whatever they want

Yes, I think it unfair that a video can be removed simply because music is playing in the background, for example. This in no way infringes the profits that can be made from a song. Copyright law should not apply to links.

I think they have far too much say over internet content. I understand copyright rules, but think they go too far.

Yes, rightsholders do have too much say. Most of the money is rarely going to the original artists. If no profit is being made from the pictures, videos, gifs, etc, on what grounds should the rightsholders complain, unless the videos are in some way slandering the brand?

They absolutely do have too much say. There are too many subjectives in how to measure quantity of content that can be quoted. Who's behind this and for what purpose? will we not even be allowed to state the name of a company or quote research materials? For the health and safety of all this needs to be ended.

I understand some of the motivations why content does get taken off the Internet. This is a new medium. We need to develop new and democratic ways of working and dealing with content in a way that supports equal rights, transparency and fosters understanding. In other words, create new platforms for content distribution and support an open dialogue and discourse.

Righstholders do have too much say

Yes, rights holders (such as the film or music industries) have too much say in which content is taken down from the web. We need new laws and protocols to protect free speech on the Internet, rules that are not written by

corporations and which afford some rights to individuals despite corporate participation in the creation of such content

Yes they do as they should be required to prove the infringement.

Rightsholders do have too much say in which content is taken down from the Web

don't know

rights holders believe that rules that exist outside the Internet should apply to the Internet. This is based on the presumption of 'lost revenue' They have failed to convince me that someone watching or listening to something on the Internet results in that person failing to buy the content. They probably would not pay anyway. I get the feeling that rights holders wish to screw as much money as they can from us and will try anything to get their way.

Yes, I think that rightsholders are sometimes too aggressive in taking down content from the web

Rightsholders must be free to sell their content and request its removal if posted without authorisation. But removing or taxing links helps no-one. The existing laws need to be unified across the EU because the internet must remain totally accessible

They should have no say, and they should have no right to interfere with free speech

Yes. I understand why some content is removed

I think they have too much control because they take some and leave others,

I can understand why rightsholders would not ant their work copied without permission. I cannot understand why there should be any restrictions on accessing

their work. Once they place it on the internet, it should be available for all to see.

Yes, rightholders have too much say.

I do understand why some pictures, videos etc. are removed from the web

Rightholders should be able to ask a court to have infringing content taken down. Experience has shown that if rightholders communicate with the platform owners directly that they often ask for content to be removed that is not, in fact, infringing.

I understand when content is taken off the internet when it violates a very specific copyright

Actual creative content such as video and music should be protected, but should be subject to fair usage such as short clips for reference. Parody and mimic is a form of expression and where original content is created to reference existing material this should not constitute a breach of the originator's content. There needs to be an equal balance for content owners and service users to enter a dialogue when there is conflict - the ebay complaints model might be a useful reference. It should not be a case of media giants getting their way and no comeback for individuals.

I understand why some copyrighted information is removed from the web, however enforcing this en masse restricts freedom of speech. I think rightholders should be able to remove content which infringes their copyright, but only when it falls outside the bounds of fair use. I also feel that the ability to share content helps rather than hinders content creators as it functions as a form of advertising

The film and music industries are stakeholders in our cultural life - they do not own it. Some images contain

significant chunks of content.

Yes, I do. Sharing is dissemination so ought to be good for rightholders

Yes. Corporate interests are over-represented in these kinds of affairs because of their moneyed interests and presence in lobbying. Similar to the SOPA/PIPA campaign several years ago, corporate interests overshadow the interest of millions, just like in the current copyright landscape. I have seen images taken down from websites like imgur just because the moneyed interest was harmed by them (e.g., a figure in a scientific article was posted on pubpeer for discussing potential fraudulent activities and got taken down based on current copyright law) Yes. Corporate interests are over-represented in these kinds of affairs because of their moneyed interests and presence in lobbying. Similar to the SOPA/PIPA campaign several years ago, corporate interests overshadow the interest of millions, just like in the current copyright landscape. I have seen images taken down from websites like imgur just because the moneyed interest was harmed by them (e.g., a figure in a scientific article was posted on pubpeer for discussing potential fraudulent activities and got taken down based on current copyright law)

The concept of copyright is now severely abused - in how many professions do you do a job once and then get paid for it over and over again for a lifetime and more?

Although I appreciate that content which is unambiguously illegal must be taken down immediately, I think film and music industries have too much say in what is censored on the web.

Yes, rightsholders are unwilling to share to a greater extent. However, in certain parts of the Music industry, Independent

artists lead the way in sharing.

Hyperlinks should not be copyrighted in fairness. Removing videos just because an artists song is in the background is wrong. Personally I would feel delighted if people were using my creations as long as they were not profiting from them or claiming it as their own work. And how can you be offended if your material is used for parodies and humourous GIF's ? A bit of common sense is needed

Of course not. It's the Web. It's nobodies personal property.

Yes, in the case of large groups but not in the case of the individual rightsholder. This seems more a matter of resources that can be thrown at the problem but in the case of many large groups, fair use doesn't seem to be something considered.

I understand issues of copyright and fair payment but sharing things to suggest others may like them and enjoy them is often taken down from Youtube etc., perhaps irrationally because if people like or are interested in things they may well buy them

Media-related monopolies have entirely too much say in what is said and done online. Media that appears by those corporations that contribute to the multi-billions of dollars extorted from their customers to add to their bottom line should become public domain once it is aired. They should be held accountable for their actions when they act like the Ministry of Propaganda for our corrupt political system. Some things should be removed from the internet depending on the nature of the issue involved. If people paid to see it they should be able to access it as long as they so desire

Yes I think they have too much say.

No I don't understand why some content is removed and it should not be possible for this to happen without a legally verifiable process

Yes, no

Yes, I have seen content taken down even when the use would be covered by fair-use, due to automatic takedowns via DMCA

Of course content must be protected and rights maintained but surely there is a middle way that can be followed?

yes i do understand the legalese behind the removal of songs or video but quite often the letter of the law is usually applied rather than the spirit. to be honest if they aren't making a profit then whats the harm? that is what they are protecting after all, profit

no and no

Far to much say. Film and music industry push things to the ultimate.

Copyright holders should have rights over their direct items

No I don't. I believe in copyright law. I think copy left is silly. If one owns a copyright then they also have the right to give away that intellectual property freely if the owners wish to do so. It seems that it is the untalented are those that wish to see copyright laws abandoned so that they may exploit the works of others

Of course, they have too much power and its destroying our society, the environment & they've already bought the politicians. Disgusting

Yes, I think "rightsholders" have too much say, and I do understand why some stuff gets taken down

There should be sufficient say-so for film and music industries to dictate when things don't have to be public domain as otherwise they can't be financially viable. As long as there is some transparency over why they are doing things (e.g. respecting artists' privacy but not being dictated by unfair financial clout) this is reasonable.

They need to substantiate the copyright loss every time. Old TV shows that are not being regularly repeated on TV, or have not been on for a long time, there is nothing for anyone to lose in having them freely on YouTube

Not if they hold the rights to the material taken down. I understand why some content is removed, e.g. to protect. However, other content is removed in the name of decency when it is not indecent, e.g. pictures of breast-feeding.

I think copyright should be upheld. I do understand why material which has had its copyright breached should be removed.

When there is legitimate infringement, they should be able to protect the investment made in producing films and music. But the current system to remove suspected infringing content is too vague and lots of non-infringing content gets caught up in it

I think that film and music industry have far too much power and because of the way copyright law works in certain situations these can work against individuals who produce their own songs, films etc.. Removing links is self defeating. Adding a link to social media is sharing something with friends and family, frequently such sharing introduces a friend to a musician or film maker that they have not previously been aware of. As for parody and humour - we need it to remain sane in an insane world. Second, my understanding of copyright law is that if I take another

person's idea and make sufficient changes then it is no longer their work. In the event that they challenge the "sufficient changes" then there are laws and courts in which to make their challenge. Only via the law does a copyright holder have the right to remove another person's work - and a parody is NOT the original.

Only within reason, and not gratuitously or automatically.

In some instances yes rights holders have had too much control.

The internet is a web of electrons arranged in specific order to share information between individuals. It is not physical property for you to claim. Keep your greedy paws off!

The internet should stay basically as it is now. Luddites be dammed.

YES.The Only Possible reason that can apply, is NEEDLESS and RESTRICTIVE CENSORSHIP !!!!!!

I think too many rightsholders abuse the trivial process now available that allows them to demand material be taken down. Whoever put the material on the web must have equal right and time to respond and justify keeping it up

yes i understand if somebody shares something of mine without my consent, it can have negative consequences: Presumably individuals will want to protect their intellectual property which is fair enough. I also understand why film and media industries need to protect their product from piracy which ultimately doesn't benefit anybody but the pirates: The artists and media workers depend on the industries for their living - also, pirate copies can be terrible quality so purchasers of pirate content are usually being ripped off. However, a lot of the

industrial secrecy surrounding new films just prior to their premiere is cynical pre-release hype deliberately manufactured around a new film to generate lucrative interest, increase promotional reach, and maximise box office and future investment. It is often disingenuous of large companies to claim damage when they rely on "leaks" to build aura around their products.

Yes, large commercial Rightholders have consistently tried to protect their commercial interests by stifling new technology where it presents a challenge to their current technology investment, rather than embrace new technology. Hyperlinks should not be copyrighted.

I believe that copyright should apply to the internet in the same way as in the "real" world.

Yes. I do think that they do have far too much say in which content is taken down from the web. Also what can be seen in one country can't be seen somewhere else, which make a mockery of the system anyway. I do understand why some content is taken down, but this can reach absurd lengths.

Yes. Copyright laws in general are far too much in favour of letting big businesses keep earning money from work that was carried out decades ago which serves no legitimate purpose for the true reason for copyright which is to encourage innovation and growth by protecting new ideas.

First part: Sometimes. Second part: Not always

I understand why they sometimes want to protect their IP but when it gets in the way of parody satire and general creativity then it's hurting society to protect a company, the opposite of what we should be aiming to do

The rightsholders have far too much influence in matters which are none of their concern, and are stifling new avenues of expression.

Yes and No.

Sometimes but not always for the right reasons

Sometimes

I don't think anything should be removed from the net, it's storage. I can understand why stuff is taken off the net but don't think it will alter anything

Yes I do think film and media companies are given to much backing to use heavy handed methods when it comes to control of copyrighted material. Yes I do understand why some material is removed but I feel that in areas of uncertainty the site holder should have the right to appeal to an independent arbitrator regarding the legitimacy of the request to remove content

I think rights holders do not consider fair use enough. If copyright is infringed and they consequently suffer a loss, that is fair enough, but often it just seems to be petty. Copyright infringement fines should be proportional to the actual loss, not exemplary. There should be a process where an infringement is claimed, a dialogue between the claimant and the poster. The host is just a carrier. Is the post office held liable for the content of its letters?

Copyright protection is important, but when a website is forced to just take the word of a copyright holder that something needs to be removed, when they themselves haven't even reviewed the content (because they use automated tools) is unfair. A take down notice stays on the file of an account even if its successfully appealed, and too many will on some sites result in an account being

suspended, but there is no penalty to the rights holders if they make a false claim, nor even the requirement to apologise.

The use and abuse of the DMCA in the US shows that rights-holders will always abuse their power. Fair use should be a major principle.

Yes, and yes (I have studied intellectual property at university and since!) The proposed copyrighting of hyperlinks is absurd, being both anti-competitive AND anti-collaborative. A breach occurs when and where copyrighted material is posted, NOT simply by providing a route to it. This is one area where there is an abundance of copyright case law (though much of already alarmingly draconian) which can be, and is being applied, without creating another level of control and censorship. Of particular concern are the assumption of knowledge of this complex area of law, with all its national and regional variations, and the way that traditional and essential forms of creativity such as parody are being circumscribed. Any new rules must look at how traditional custom and practice might apply in new media, rather than serving commercial and political interest in stifling creativity and dissent.

I understand if the copyright holder's rights are being breached and or where hate and abuse are being promulgated.

I agree that the rightsholders' rights are exaggerated. The power they hold is immoral in my opinion.

I do think that rights holders have to much say which impinges on individual rights of access.

I do understand why some content is taken down, however, to much emphasis is placed on financial consideration as opposed to social and recreational matters

Way too much power almost as if they can circumvent the law. Piracy tho' wrong is almost becoming a crime treated as worse than violent street crime.

I can understand why many big companies want to remove stuff. But it does seem a bit "their my toys and you can't have them" sort of attitude. Hyperlinks should not be copyrighted.

The existing legal process encourages unreasonable takedown demands. There needs to be a system, but one which penalises unjustified demands or threats. The number of demands is rising exponentially which means that ISPs have little ability to assess whether the person making the demand actually owns the right they claim to be protecting, or whether infringement is real. If current trends continue the system will be unworkable and runs the risk of destroying the internet as an open system.

Yes and yes. Rightsholders can be over zealous in protecting their intellectual property.

I understand, in terms of existing copyright laws, why some content might be taken down - in the event it has infringed copyright, or no permission to reproduce has been given. This, however, needs to be in terms of actual copyright laws which exist. Parodies and/or pastiche are not actual copies of published material, and should not automatically be removed. Proof that they breach copyright laws needs to be established.

I think they have the right to defend their rights. Some things are certainly removed for good reasons. But of course there are many abuses of that principle

Rights holders, have to much control over content removal. It has now got

to the point where copyright is abused for censorship, when unfavourable content is online. As always the users are penalized, but rights holders have no penalties for abusing the current system. I have no issue with legitimate court ordered take downs, but do not believe the current system is fit for purpose.

As ruled on by a U.S.A judge, when he found the “fair use” of material to be abused by the industry, as happened in the trial of a YouTube mother and her dancing baby video

I am not sure what are the legal right of rightsholders to take down content, however I do think that having content removed\blocked automatically is plane wrong.

I do understand that content creators rights should be protected against malicious actors who make profits by distributing their content without consent and without sharing the profit with the creators.

I do understand why content is removed however in an age of evolving technology we need innovative ways of dealing with this

I don't understand why content gets removed as it is usually giving exposure rather than harming income. People won't necessarily buy something they are prevented from seeing on the Internet anyway.

Most definitely

They get taken off for financial reasons, not legal reasons

Yes they have too much power as fair usage rights are being trampled. That being said there are legitimate reasons for some media to be removed

If someone is making money by stealing and re uploading another person's content then that is wrong, and there should be systems like YouTube's where someone can flag content as stolen. I do think that large corporations can and have abused systems like the one mentioned above.

I do understand. However I also know that the best way to get word out about awesome content is thru sharing links.

I think the balance of power is too much towards rightsholders at present. Automatic blocking or banning of background music or parody usage, for example.

Yes they have to much power! They are trying to protect their investments to the detriment of progress.

Yes I think they have far too much say. Yes I understand that content is taken off the internet often unfairly

Yes they have to much power. And no I don't understand what some things are taken down, other than to make money

I think rightholders have too much say regarding content being taken down.

Yes, and I think that the bully and intimidate people even in instances of fair use.

I do respect copyright IF the copyright holders respect fair use.

Intellectual property is a nonsense. How can someone own an idea? Also, the vast majority of ‘rightsholders’ aren't even the people who had the ideas in the first place. The music industry and the academic publishing industry especially is basically parasitical

I do understand why rightsholders might want to limit access to their product, but being too heavyhanded seems to

rebound on them in terms of viewer goodwill. They may not realise the extent to which this could actually harm them.

Yes, they have too much say. They should be required to prove ownership of copyright before insisting on material being taken down, and even then the submitter should have the right to contest it in a court of law.

Yes I think they have too much power and too much control

Yes, I believe the rights holders have too much say, and I do understand why some content is removed

It depends... If they own the intellectual property or copyright, they have every right to remove it - no one else. Yes, some of it makes sense to remove if it is hateful or blatantly offensively harmful to another

Rightsholders have too much say in which content is taken down from the web. They interpret the rules in a ridiculous and unnecessary strict way.

I have no problem with removing content that infringes copyright, provided that content violates the laws of the country in which it is hosted. I would not support simply removing content that big business does not like.

It depends on where in the world the web services are operated. In the US, big media has too much control as the DMCA allows for skirting any sort of due process (as there is no burden of proof (for either ownership or infringement))

Yes, too much say by rightsholders re what content is taken down.

Tools should exist that allows these companies to flag content for inspection by an impartial moderator. Tools

that automatically remove content have been shown on YouTube to be abused and used incorrectly.

This is completely against the spirit of the Web, which is generous in scope and concept, and becomes weakened when people act selfishly.

I firmly believe that the STRANGLEHOLD That "Rights-holders" have over content needs to be almost entirely eradicated, strongly curtailed at the VERY least. Parody and Satire need to be important weapons in holding the powerful and the self-important to account

Copyright rules are already broken and should not be applied to linking on Twitter and Facebook. I am concerned that hyperlinks do not become copyrighted.

I suspect the answer is yes. I do not know why things disappear

Copyrights should be protected but not the links

Removing video that just happens to contain a common word that is the name of a new movie is insanity. I do understand there are legal cases

not sure

THEIR RIGHTS SHOULD BE CURBED AND THEY SHOULD LEAVE THINGS ALONE

yes i do

Yes, power without oversight. Rightsholders industry is effectively crippling access to our culture. This is not acceptable under premise they have right to sell cultural products.

A lot of parodies get removed from video-platforms because they use too much of the original content. But

that's what parodies are made of!

Current rights holders in America do have too much power with DMCA, with automatic filters, so much content is flagged that websites aren't able you handle all of the false positives.

Yes, they seem to have far too much power over these matters! As long as there no real piracy involved we should be able to see or hear snippets of a movie or snippets of music!

I understand why some content is taken down, especially in the case of new release music, the artists need to make a living and that's difficult if their work is available for free. But I also think that fanworks, gifs and other forms of appreciation for the original work should not be taken down.

no yes

Unsure

Yes. I know what the excuses are.

I understand that the industry is arguing that they loose to much profit, if content isn't taken done. If I like a movie or a song and have some spare money, I buy the content or watch it in cinema or pay-tv. If i don't have the money and use it "illegaly" there is no damage done, because they can't get money which I do'nt have, regardless if the content is used or not

I think they have too much power and I don't understand sometimes why content is removed

Maybe they do have to much rights, a lot of content i attempt to view isnt available in my country. also no i dont under stant why content gets take off of the internet

I understand that there is a right to intellectual property

I understand the Copyright law, however I am not agree with the way that is implemented.

I understand they need to protect their intellectual property. However, their judgement as to what constitutes their own property is not infallible.

If content is copyrighted then it is fair for it to be taken down if used without creators permission

Rights holders have a lot of say in what gets taken down. Sometimes they are so aggressive they get things taken down that are legal under fair use.

YES, fair use should be respected

Yes, but what is immoral or reprehensive varies from culture to culture and should be left alone. A newspaper's comments column is of course up to the editors to regulate.

Yes. Yes (but it is wrong), and no: (too much dog-in-the-mangerism)

Yes, and they should adapt rather than trying forcing their ways over consumers

They already have too much say in what is accesible, though I can understand that as the copyright holder they are entitled to some say

They have too much power modelling that of drug and oil companies.

Despite what some rights-holders say, hyperlinks themselves should not be copyrighted. Copyright rules are already broken and should not be applied to everyday linking on Twitter and Facebook. Also, Hyperliks themselves should never be criminal

Web is the perfect democracy

example. Don't anti-democratize it

Yes. Copyright shold be limited to commercial use

I think the rightsholder has way too much say in which content is taken down from the web. It limits the freedom of speech cos it controls more than just what they have the right to. Competitors ause eachother to limit the content. Limiting the speed of internet and so on. Yes I do understand why some content are being removed but it's way more than just a illegal content.

Yes, they have too much say and no, I don't understand why there is so much censorship except that mind control is needed by these gangsters

Yes, they obviously have. The right to link must be protected, and it is way too easy to get material removed from Youtube.

Yes and yes.

I understand copyright, but Companies are taking it too far

Yes and yes. Although I know a few rightholders ask for content to be removed because it's in an embarrassing context.

I do understand why content sometimes is taken off the internet, and while I am okay with the way it is now, it should not get easier than what it already is.

The systems in place, especially on YouTube, use a policy that presumes guilt rather than innocence. As such, copyright takedowns have occurred for reasons such as censorship, silencing of critique, and for reasons as petty as improved search ranking.

Yes, I absolutely do think so and understand why some content gets taken off the internet - copyright or not, small things

such as music or small parts of a movie for instance, should be alright. We got so many of such things on the internet anyway.

Yes, I do, if someone buys something and wants to share it-they should be able to do so. and no, I don't understand

I know that collage films (such as Craig Baldwin's) are illegal, because they use copyrighted material. But I think they should be legal, because they use the original material in new ways in order to comment either on the original material itself or on some other things, so there is original value added. Plus, famous stuff, such as Mickey Mouse, are - in my humble opinion - part of our culture to such degree, that they have become shared icons of our civilization, which I think everybody should be able to use to comment on our world

Yes, they abuse the system to prevent fair use.

yes I do think they have too much say and no I do not understand why some content is take of the web

They have too much say. A Let's Play video that features a short sample of a song should not be taken down due to that.

Yes. Flgrant IP infringement is real. That being said, a global set of frameworks are necessary to effectively manage and administer fair and beneficial intellectual porperty rights. While the Trans-Pacific Partnership is a step in the direction of a multilateral policy, all early indications are that it is severly lacking in the fairness. Yes. I understand that content is removed at the request of rightsholders, but it's not usually clear what the claim is

Definately. Yes, I do.

I do believe they have too much power - especially since there appears to be

no consequences at all for claiming copyright on material not owned by the claimant. Current regulations are - in my opinion - far from balanced and give too much power to established industries.

I understand perfectly well why some material is taken down (I'm not stupid), but unfair takedown requests and even sheer bullying by big media without proper legal reason is way too common.

rights holders have too much say. People should not be able to make money (or over a certain amount of money) from their work but it should be allowed to appear

There is too much emphasis on the "rights" of the industry to the point where there is often a reverse-onus to prove "fair use". Flagrant copyright violation is one thing, but censorship in the guise of protecting it is simply a case of manipulating the "rules" to conceal activity or block fair editorial comment

Content has to be taken down in situations where it's posted unaltered, with the sole aim of using it to make money off of Ad revenue. In the cases where it's transformed, though, companies have too much power to take it down. There have been many scandals involving DMCA overreach, especially via automated means

The range of content over which right-holders have the power of removal is, I consider, too broad and is not sufficiently open to review or appeal. One example of what I consider unnecessary removal is that of youtube videos when mere background or incidental content is sufficient reason for the removal

Seems like restricting who and what can be 'checked out' at the library. Or as if limiting what reading materials may be included @ the library. Things may

be limited if they are openly violent or pornographic, especially child porn

Yes! and No!

I believe rightsholders have been given too much power of censorship on the internet, often times I don't even understand why content is censored.

Yes, maybe, I understand why music and TV artists industries remove some content from Internet

I think that is correct to remove such contents if they have been misused compared to their original aims

I don't know. Yes, some

no. I can see why somethings get taken down due to promoting violence or promoting sex trade.

All someone has to do is claim a rights violation and the item in question is immediately taken down. Even if it's a totally legal use.

Yes, I Think rightsholders have too much to say.

Yes. I think content should be free for nonprofit use. It's like an ad for the product/service

no, yes

Yes. No, I do not understand

depends of what kind of content

I do understand and accept the way it is now

I understand about copyright laws

I understand some take downs but they abuse this ALL the time and take down content unfairly often

They have far to much power and say. It is s hughe disadvantage for anyone else

Yes, sometimes rightsholders takes down content in “bulk” without even checking if it’s the infringing content, as when an old indie movie named “pixel” was removed from Vimeo, Youtube and other places before the Adam Sandler movie came out or when Microsoft ordered a German university to remove OpenOffice from their FTP servers since they only searched for the word “Office” and decided it was infringing on their intellectual rights of Microsoft Office. As long as the industries does like that, they should have no right what so ever to touch content on the internet.

Yes... & removal of content is usually childish.

1 Don’t know2 No

Yes. While I understand that copyright laws need to be protected, I believe that this should not be at the expense of users who are merely posting music or film clips particularly to illustrate a point or to provide background music to a piece of home produced video. Providers should be more selective in what they remove and more robust in defending ordinary net users.

It depends.

It's definitely skewed in their favor and that needs to change

I'm not sure to be honest as I don't know enough about it

Very much

I don't know as I have not been aware of this being done to specific contents, which is not to say they are not doing this kind of thing. If you could tell me examples, I could answer this question.

Yes, they have too much say. No, I don't understand why content is removed

Yes. I've seen things like art or videos taken down on DeviantArt or Youtube, even when everything used in the work was fair use. These industries don't even care about fair use laws and just let their bots take things down without considering if each case is a legal use or not. This only makes people who support these industries less inclined to continue supporting them, which will make these industries suffer. They're not killing piracy or anything like that, as there's no way to eliminate pirates, the only thing they're killing is themselves by doing this to us in the first place

Yes. There is no effective fair use policy anymore. It has also been demonstrated that “leaks” and “infringing” use of copyrighted material leads to MORE SALES

No simple answer re rights holders, though I tend to sympathise with them as I don't want to relinquish control of music that I write, play and post. Re Q 2, it all depends on the content. No one should be a guardian for other adults.

Far too much. Copyright law is out dated and needs to either be rebuilt from the ground up or scrapped entirely. It was supposed to protect artists and creators, instead it is used to allow large corporations to sit on rights and have a stranglehold on expression.

Yes. Fair use is already being ignored even if the video is not monetised.

Yes. I don't believe any content should be taken down. It should only be labelled in advance and filtered according to age appropriateness.

I don't know whether they have too much power. What is certain is that they want more and more.

Yes and No (That's two questions.)

YES/NO

Yes and yes I understand the reasons that prevent open source - our monetary market system is outdated and is incompatible with the freedom the Internet could give us.

Yes, they are greedy, antiquated, and refuse to adopt new business models

not enough say, and I understand why

Yes, rightsholders have too much say.
Should be decided by a court or the 'poster' if they are of the opinion that it is illegal.

money money

Yes, to both questions.

They do have too many rights. "Intellectual property rights" are far beyond reasonable for the intended purpose, namely stimulate / support creativity and innovation. Such rights are clearly distorted to make an endless stream of income to the publishing industry, unjustifiably to the cost of the rest of us.

I have many times become aware or more interested in some content to the degree of actually buying it after seeing some random GIF on the internet. Removing "unauthorized" content therefore works against its intention

Holders of copyright should have the ultimate say as to which elements of their copyright material are freely visible to all non fee payers

Yes. Removal for copyright issues and hate content are legitimate. Everything else is censorship.

Yes I understand if it infringes copywrite laws it should be taken down

yes, they have too much say. I understand why those companies want things taken down, but I do not believe they should have a legal right to do so

The Internet should be a public forum where people can discuss any topic without fear or favour. Those companies which feel threatened need to learn to adapt to changes in society rather than to curtail the public's free speech through legislation.

Music & film people put their stuff up to view & promote it, and encrypt it if they don't want it copied. Yes take gratuitous morbid real death scenes out as they are very disturbing, even if preceded by warnings of its sickening nature. Perhaps I don't know all the reasons stuff is censored, it's unlikely to be because it's bad taste, more likely bad business

yes. I think copyright law sucks as it stifles human creativity

Yes, due to copyright laws or obscenity laws

1. Sometimes. 2. Yes.

I think they do, and yes I do understand

Yes they do. Why am I not able to watch a video about a show I watch? I don't understand why they do this, I'm not sure why they would stop people looking at promotional items which fans want to see

I totally understand we're in a transition between gifted works and highly defended intellectual property, not all of which is Rentist capitalism, and some does genuinely need an income, but there was a reason the old model was failing far before the internet: Prince changed his name to symbol because of property ownership of his unpublished works

There is a sad propensity for many copyright holders to act as "dog in the

manger," in that they will request the removal of material which they themselves no longer supply (such as music tracks deleted from current catalogues) certainly the option of filtered content may be a useful one, but it cannot be compulsory - otherwise such a mechanism may be used to suppress legitimate dissent, on the grounds that certain persons find it "offensive." Certainly all material - that is legal - must remain available to those who wish to see it, with no monitoring of their doing so. this is mere spite. There should be a concept similar to the "freedom of panorama" as it applies to photography, whereby if a particular song happens to be playing on a workman's radio while someone films a street scene, this is considered to be merely part of a larger whole and therefore not a breach of copyright - any more than being in the street and hearing it by accident would be. While there may be a case for requesting the removal of content in certain circumstances - as is the case now - there is no case for any pre-emptive ban or restriction on the ability to link to other material, whether one's own or others'.

They do have too much say and are becoming like a private police force - this is not what the Internet is supposed to be and is driven by hunger for corporate profit

Yes. Too much say. No, don't understand why some content disappears.

Not sure. No, I don't understand why... although I do believe 'free expression' should not include the right to pornography on the internet because it is too accessible and too difficult to filter to protect minors and those being exploited

The web in a way is a copy of our real world, where you e.g. music is a part of everyday life. So it seems quite strange and going too far, that for example, right now rights-

holders can request videos are removed from YouTube where copyrighted music happens to be playing in the background, such as the 'dancing baby case'

I realise that a business' role is to gain money and one means towards this, is to protect its intellectual property. There are, however, limits in what can be considered property and what not. It is fair for example to ask for a song to be removed from the internet, in the case that the song is uploaded just to be heard, because you lose money. It is a different case to ask for a video to go down that shows something very funny, but because the song is played in the background. This is unfair exercise of the rights. You kill content with the excuse that something indirectly relevant is used. This is abuse, not rights protection

I do believe that rights holders exercise too much power over removing content, when no rights infringement is intended and it is obvious that music (for example) is incidental and, often, incomplete. How can this be correct application of law? I understand that it is fair and reasonable for rights over movies and music are protected, but this should be in an appropriate and reasonable manner, with provision for an open appeals process

The Internet is about people not big Business. People are voters and remember their enemies

Yes, rightsholders have much too much say. No, I do not understand why some content gets taken off the Internet

Yes, I think rights-holders have FAR too much say in what gets removed. They have far too many 'rights' in the first place, but especially they should NOT have the ability to block fair use under any circumstances. They should also not be able to block use where there is significant

added material such as incidental use, parody / humour or creating new works that incorporate the content

Yes, fair use is a thing.

I don't know

Yes. Some rights holders will demand removal of content that should be allowed un 'fair usage', such as clips a few seconds long.

No I do not understand. It is supposed to be legal to include brief quotes from copyrighted material

undecided

I think fair usage should be considered and free speech / artistic interpretation / satire should be protected. I know there are a range of reasons some things get taken down. There needs to be the right balance between harm/loss to the subject/owner, and the principles of free speech, artistic expression, and the right to dissent/protest.

Yes. They appear to want set themselves up as final arbiters of law, completely bypassing all due process and operating under a "guilty until proven innocent" system.

Large corporate rightsholders are dictating policy to politicians (who should be representing voters generally) in order to extend their own copyrights, whilst at the same time lobbying to have the right to steal the content of ordinary people which is posted online for their own corporate profitable use. Links to corporate owned content acts as free advertising yet is most heavily attacked...

It should only be taken down After it has been proven to violate whatever law or statute it has been accused of

No and yes

Yes, if orgs or people have copyright on their original material, that makes sense

yes.and yes

Yes, too much say. It is becoming a form of censorship. It is wrong.

Yes. Right holders as well as cloud service providers run automatic tools that are far from perfect and frequently hit the wrong things

I do understand that content is taken down however i also think rightsholders have too much to say in which content is taken down. Again for example Rebelliouspixels's 'Buffy vs Edward: Twilight Remixed' was taken down after Lionsgate filed a DMCA takedown even though the US copyright office exempted this video to DMCA

I think that rights holders have WAY too much say in which content is taken down from the web. I do understand why some content needs to be removed to avoid copyright violations or because the content is illegal, but large companies can bully small websites easily.

Uses of parody and humour, such as funny gifs, are often removed automatically without respect for different laws, or any way to appeal the removal of content

I understand why some content is taken down if it wasn't used with the copy write holders permission. Some film and music companies do go too far though if they say there is an infringement of copy write but the content isn't that close to the item contested

YES I DO. I guess they want even more money before we can see content. There are often utube videos which are unable to be shown in New Zealand

which the rest of the world can see

I think creators, songwriters, photographers etc should have the right to charge a fee for their material to be accessed, but everyone should have equal opportunity to buy those materials.

Copyright legislation is a complicated subject and the advent of the internet raises new questions and challenges as technology becomes more advanced and prolific. I think that this becomes an issue specifically when copyright holders attempt to force blanket legislation that could unfairly affect non-copyrighted materials. Destroying the weblink is a perfect example of this. We don't throw out the baby with the bathwater do we?

Sometimes they are tempted to abuse claiming copyright

Yes they do have too much say, but yes I do understand.

I firmly believe that the rightsholders have far too much power in what is and isn't taken down off the internet. The current system is so automated that the end user has no chance of appeal in a timely manner the right to appeal a take-down order should be accessible prior to the order being enacted, rather than a takedown order being applied and then the user having to retroactively appeal. Additionally, the variable laws, not just around the EU, but around the world make the legalities of what can and cannot be done very confusing. Parody and humour should always be an acceptable use, irrespective of what the material is and what has happened to it.

Yes, and much of it for no reason. I can understand the need to protect copyright from blatant violation and the need to ensure that some material is removed for

legal reasons ans to protect the rights of individuals in certain cirumstances. Large powerful corporate organisations are disporportionately powerful compared to individuals who lack accesss to powerful legal teams and the ability to threaten service providers and bully them.

They have a significant influence on content on websites such as YouTube, Vimeo and Facebook. As evident through the various corporate deals between the companies and the industry bodies.

Do you mean Hollywood and that pig Harvey Weinstein? No nobody should have any more rights than anyone else and GOVTS SHOULD MIND THEIR OWN BUSINESS!

Yrs

Yes a lot of things appear to be taken down when rightsholders request, without consideration for whether there might be a legitimate use being made.

Yes, without a doubt - the contract between buyer and seller does not confer upon the seller whatever rights they want!As for removal, usually infringement of some imaginary loss of revenue.

Politics

Yes. I dont understand.

Yes they do, among the millions of requests sent to Google, some of the DMCA takedown requests are for their own things

No currently it seems fine Yes

Facebook is not able to let innocent use of protected material

Yes, they have way too much power when they can just send a DMCA notice and it has to be followed. They should look more

to providing their content in a way people want it, and for decent prices instead.

I think rightsholders (such as the film or music industries) have too much say in which content is taken down from the web. I understand why some content (e.g., pictures, videos, gifs) get taken off the Internet

Yes, I believe rightsholders have too much say, but I understand why some content may be taken off the internet.

Whilst some stuff like child pornography should be taken down, anything else shouldnt be removed! How can people make up their own minds if everything we see is prescribed by someone 'in power'?

I do think that some rights holders overreach in ways that do not help them or protect their property, but rather unfairly remove interesting content from public view. I do understand why some content is removed, when clearly in violation of copyright laws, but restraint should be used instead of a shotgun approach

Yes. I do understand why

I do think rightsholders have too much say. But I do understand why certain material is taken down.

I think so

Yes, too much say. I would understand and agree with removing "hate" items

I understand why, some content is deliberately created to inflame or defame, or offend.

Yes. Yes

I Understand that it is a complicated situation, currently it feels like the Film and Music industries can accuse anything

of being a copyright infringement, even when it is not, and the content is still removed.I understand some content gets removed because the industry feels that their content is being copied.

I understand why they would remove some content, however who regulates this and for what purpose.

They have much too much say! And they are far too free and easy with their power to take things down, because there is no penalty when they get things wrong and remove content that is legal, has nothing to do with them, or is protected by fair use clauses -- and this happens absurdly often.There MUST be penalties for false/erroneous take-down notices!

It's reasonable to remove copyrighted material, but the ability to link to existing content should remain. I understand why some content is removed.

Yes, the film and music industry have too much influence on the web. I understand about protecting copyright, but the creative world is being stifled by the over protective influence of lawyers and money makers.

Yes, rightsholders do have too much say in which content is taken down from the web. They seek to apply the most restrictive national laws on the use of copyright material throughout the EU irrespective of whether those laws apply in each internet user's own country. New EU-wide rules need to be developed and publicised which give rightsholders much less power than they have at present to demand the removal of content (eg pictures, videos, gifs) from the web.

Pressure from rightsholders to have all links copyrighted is an attack on freedom of expression and communication and must be resisted. Also, when content is removed the person or organisation which placed

the content must have the right of appeal.

Copyright rules are already broken. They shouldn't be applied to the use of links, for example those that people use to share content on social media. Humour and parody exemptions to copyright are often ignored by the implementation of copyright rules on sites like YouTube, where rightsholders can order videos to be taken down because their music is in the background. It is not hard to expand this example to wider uses elsewhere on the Internet and imagine the disastrous effect that enshrining such poor practice in law would have.

Yes, rights holders who frequently are not the authors of intellectual property have too much power altogether. No I do not understand why content should be taken off unless it breaches pornography laws or is otherwise offensive to the majority of right thinking people.

Artists and Companies should have the protection of copyright law to make sure their creations or products are not exploited. However, it should only be enforced within reason and sound judgement. Content should only be removed if it directly breaches copyright or criminal law.

I don't understand it. They're much too powerful. People just want to post what they want!

I think it's important to protect artists via copyright, however this needs to be implemented with discretion

The media industry has way too much power and should not be regulating the Internet. It is not right and they only get away with it because of massive lobbying power i.e. money.

Yes they do have too much say

for content to be taken down.

I imagine (hope) Porn and Paedophilia correspondence is removed. but who polices it and how unless we're snooped on.

yes I think the film and music industry have too much say

I am not normally a rights holder of digital content

As far as I know, I don't think rightsholders have too much say in which content is taken down from the web, if their say only extends to taking down things that are copyrighted by them. I think they have a right decide who it is shared with and protect profits for their work. As far as I understand, that is why some content is removed from the internet.

I think rightsholders have too much leverage on censored and removed content. I have seen parodies, reviews, and other content protected under fair use removed by copyright claims. I understand that some content is a valid copyright violation and should be removed, but a large amount of censorship has no legal basis.

No, peoples privacy should not be taken away to provide entertainment to others. Freedom of information is important but it should not trump privacy unless it poses a threat to the freedom, safety or wellbeing of others

They definitely do. Even if they do need a tool to deal with some issues, at the moment there is far too much collateral damage.

No, it's easy to see why it happens, simply copyright

I agree that genuine rights violations exist. If I were to take someone's movie and make money off it that would be wrong.

But I do think rightsholders have too much power in taking down content from the web. People who make commentary videos I watch online on news events and speeches have to stop the recording that they're playing and commenting on every few seconds so as not to run afoul of automatic content detectors merely for wanting to take a political video and criticise its message. This constitutes suppression of political commentary and the present situation is intolerable

Yes. The overreach of copyright protections for rightsholders is malignant against average content users, and often skirting or breaking the law in its abuse of censorship-by-copyright.

No, I don't understand why some content gets taken off the internet.

probably not

Of course I understand why some copyrighted material is taken off the internet, but it can be a bit over zealous in its enforcement - when it comes to comedy or parody videos for example. Also I do not believe that hyperlinks themselves should be copyrighted.

yes they do, no i dont

Absolutely - they are overly concerned with losing profits. They must learn to make money in new ways - the world has moved on, and they are mired in past ways of operating. Sure, some copyrighted info gets removed from the smart people and companies have already found ways to make money on the internet, and stupid people and companies will go broke. We *must not* artificially prolong their death throes. they are now imposing penalties on everyone due to their failure to maintain their own solvency. If they cannot find another way to be profitable,

they should go bankrupt. The race goes to the swiftest. internet at their request, but that cannot continue - it's too time-consuming. This nefarious plan they are now proposing will cost money

I understand why content is removed because it is breaking the copyright law. However, yes they do have a little too much say in what is kept and removed from the internet.

I think the corporations have too much say and the artists not enough

I think they do have too much say and take things down when they should not or it is being 'fair used' within the law. However I do understand if someone is overusing the content or copying it without paying a licence then it should be taken down.

I think rights holders should be given more rights to their own intellectual property, as illegal downloads and copying are theft.

Yes, manipulated images and parodies are generally harmless to the original product, in fact often help publicise the original. But the brutal take down orders from the film industry just make the media giants look pretty and vengeful and if anything hurts the reputation of the original product.

I sort of understand. I think film or music industries had a big financial loss and it's fair they want their rights. That they all earn enormously anyway is a different subject.

Those above mentioned industries had needed the public to let them flourish. Now that they have got a predominant position, they are driving the people's choices. It sounds like unfair manipulation.

Yes I think rightsholders have too much influence over which content is removed. I understand there are instances where it is

right for content to be removed, however I also think that there should be much more flexibility and allowances for situations where it is not straightforward copying, to allow for more freedom and creativity.

Yes they do- particularly when the item is available in other localities. This just makes it more likely that people will resort to illegal means of accessing the content

I think that's just too petty. Yes they probably do have too much say

Yes No

yes. a lot of copyuright holders regularly abuse dcma takedown notices. often removing fare usage under copyright content.yes i understand why some content gets removed. nearly always for some bogus reasons to do with lost profits...

yes. Punishing or criminalizing those who steal is one thing, but finding data on the internet should not be a crime!

To a point yes

Absolutely yes, the very fact that legal departments of companies have been known to reactively request take down of their own, legal content is testament to the fact that even the current powers are used in a way which damages user faith and the reputation of the creative industry as a whole

Copyright becomes longer and longer and thus legally robs the public. Movies are used to export the American culture. Thus they should be cultural goods, over which - after a short while - the public has a saying, while they[the people who watched the movie when it came out] are still alive.

In a society where money is distributed unfairly and unevenly, we should PROMOTE ways to help balance out this inequality

I understand that rightholders want to protect their rights. On the other hand, the public also has a right to share contents that become part of the culture. Citing other content is a way our culture evolves. We should make sure that we do not put the right of ownership higher than other values

too much and no i do not understand it.

The internet, Tim Berners Lee envisaged as being democratic. No single company or power should control it. It is a riddle why some material gets erased, for example in the UK,a statement by the Prime Minister,that the NHS would be, "a wonderful business", was removed in the 2010 election campaign - he had spoken, departing from his official text, released later by Dowuning Street.

Under the guise of copyright images and information are removed or banned because corporate money is more important than human beings

No, I think rights holders should be able to remove their items from the web. I do understand why protected content is removed

Yes, I think rightholders have a bit too much power. There is already plenty of legislation relating to intellectual property, and it is constantly being refined. Platforms should not be held responsible to infringement of copyright, as they are not the host and have not chosen to upload that material.

a. Maybe too much influence in areas of dispute. b. Yes

Not sure. Yes

Rightholders have far too much say in which content is taken down.

Yes, but we need to uphold 'fair use' policies.

.....
don't know and no

Nobody should have a say to take content down, except a court of law.

Yes I understand why some content gets taken down, but we need a level playing field, at present big money has too much say and too much sway

Where I agree that any material infringing copyright laws should be removed, hyperlinks should not be copyrighted - the information on each page is subject to change. People can ask for things to be taken down if they own the copyright to them - therefore hyperlinks must be left copyright-free. Copyright laws are all different right across the EU, which makes it very hard for you to know if you are breaking copyright law. Parody and humour are perfectly acceptable, provided that they are not illegal (e.g. slanderous). There should also be an appeals process where somebody feels that something is taken down unfairly.

Not familiar with that

yes and no. I understand about copyright but they too much power

Yes far too much say. It must be allowed to share information about anything

I understand that copyright holders have a right to make a living from their work, but too often it appears that it is the companies, not the creatives who are driving the enforcement

Yes generally content appears to be removed to protect earnings-streams

They definitely have too much say.

I think they have too much interest in profit and are unaware that peoples interaction with their product can often spur new interest in it.

.....
Yes, there absolutely have to much power.

Possibly. Yes

They certainly shouldn't have more, though I usually understand why things are taken down.

Yes. And since different countries have different copyright rules, this can only lead to confusion

Yes, but it is on the owners of digital media to fight piracy. Netflix has shown people are willing to pay for content if it is reasonable and convenient.

I think rights-holders should be able to prevent other people making money with the precise things they own the rights to. I also think that, if there is a market for something that they're not currently meeting and they require someone who *is* meeting it to take content down, they should put it up themselves. With YouTube specifically, I think the location-based limitations are fairly silly. Why aren't the companies just putting ads in front of videos instead of keeping the videos completely away from countries they don't have agreements with? Who exactly loses out if someone in my country can watch an Imagine Dragons video?

Definitely! The big corporations with their push for outrageously long copyrights are effectively killing human culture all over the world - They are a disease to human progress! DRM (Digital Restriction Measures) is nothing but a war by oligarchs and major corporations on the 99%.

It's hard to understand what happens when content gets removed - oftentimes

it just makes no sense to the viewer

Some rights-holders want links themselves to be copyrighted, meaning that existing broken rules around what content can be shared could be applied to everyday linking on Twitter and Facebook. For example, right now rights-holders can request videos are removed from YouTube where copyrighted music happens to be playing in the background, such as the 'dancing baby case'.

Yes... Sharing is a great way to share sources and build followers. Ideas aren't really unique. Search engines prove this. I've searched hundreds of times and found that people have already thought of my ideas. It's called sharing, community. I'm tired of a world run by the profit motive.

what one puts on the internet is already protected by the existing copyrights law. There's no need to extend this protection of the already powerful lobbies of rightsholders. In so doing there's the strong risk to stifle everything on the internet, even the content of the less considered rightsholders category: we the people

Yes, because they are "unconvenient" to mainstream lobbies and they might give an objective point of view of facts.

All The censorship is made by bots which overkills tons of legal contents in "defense" of big lobbies. Once you've been censored, there's no turning back

Sometimes they have too much say

Yes, they have too much say

their automatic systems fail and target fair use too often, yes they have over reached

Rightsholder companies have entirely too much say in what gets taken down when content is posted. There needs

to be protection for original works, but fair use should still apply without big business stripping content from the web or attempting to charge for it.

Media industries have too much influence in deciding what content can be shared and how. There is no shortage of content production, so there is no reason to further restrict sharing and copying. On the contrary, legislation should be relaxed to allow more freedom.

I think that artists and authors have the right to control their own work. At present the corporations control the art/music industry, not the artists. Nothing should be arbitrarily removed from the Internet, there should be a fair and open procedure for handling any copyright/ownership issues. I believe that we should be supporting the artists NOT the industry getting rich by their parasitic and greedy behaviour

Yes, they usually don't have to prove infringement, just file a protest

I'm not sure, but I guess they have too much sway and that may be why the censorship criteria keep murky

I think rights holders have way too much say in which content is taken down. It's ruining the experience for everyone. The people policing such things often have no idea what they are looking at or listening to. I know people who have had their own content removed because some half wit working for a big movie company mistakenly thought it was breaching their copyright. And then Youtube removes the video and issues a warning - guilty. If one tries to dispute the claims, they are ignored. It's ludicrous! And if links are copyrighted, then that really will be the beginning of the end. People will abandon the internet in droves. It will become a corporate ghost town, full of ridiculous rules... and nobody

to follow them. Good luck with that one

I understand, but, as a culture that is gravitating to information, it's impossible to remove all derivative content. Everything we say, do, think, it's all derivative from some work or other. Even new works take from old ones. But this is what generates new ideas, the constant mashing of diverse topics, to result in new concepts.

no, yes

Yep, they get taken down because they infringe upon a rightsholder's ownership of a product (artistic, whatever.) And these rightsholders are absolutely owed their income, I have no qualms with that. However the amount of power that these industries already wield is way off the scale, and more would be completely unnecessary. People should be allowed to share things with their friends, for fucks sakes.

No and Yes. I understand copyright, but making gifs, using excerpts and the like, shouldn't be illegal.

I don't know the law, but some "fair use" of quotations and music clips is important to daily life

It's not that bad. I understand why content is being removed. The motivations are driven by both good and evil aspirations.

Some that have too much money have too much say in case of content distribution, and this is a self-reinforcing loop, as the ones with the most money for marketing get most attention and therefore again money. Yet, I doubt that Mickey Mouse or some other relatively stupid characters are so valuable to stay in copyright forever. Of course, it is never said, why some content has been removed, as the empty placeholder always contains "removed for copyright violations". It is

like an empty place in newspaper.

Rightsholders limit a lot of what can be seen online, even if that's stuff that could get them more people to see their content. Although I understand there are things that should be removed because otherwise rightsholders would get no money for their stuff

The interests of internet users and of content providers are not always the same. Content providers have extended copyrights to very long periods and are trying to impose global rules that are only favorable to them but often hinder users needlessly.

I think they have too much say. I don't understand why some content get taken off the Internet.

Yes. Artists must have the right to "fair use" to generate new creative works. Also, critics and teachers must have access to fair use for their work.

Yes, they generally have too much to say, not only in what is taken down from the web, but also in not permitting other users/artists to remix and re-use/recycle, that is how information becomes truly free and organic. In the current situation, rightsholders are part of censorship and media manipulation

They have a heavy handed say.

Yes to part 1 and no to part 2

yes, i do

they should get their rights protected but yes, sometimes it is a bit too tight

Sometimes rightsholders do exaggerate too much, but if something that is stated in a legal document, gets infringed, they have rights for action, but ONLY if it is for illegal

purpose, not as background music/ links.

I understand why rightsholders can remove content and am all for it, but to restrict hyperlinking is not the way. The web isn't just for rightsholders, it's for everyone

They have way too much say in it. I know why it gets taken off, but they are simply an abuse of copyright laws. I don't mind jail sentences as long as copyright gets pulled back to 20 years MAX.

Yes. The internet is the current social forum. People have been sharing music in this way for hundreds of years, now it's just much more visible because you can track its progress. I do understand why some content is removed, but if someone uses a song in the background of a YouTube video, then their video shouldn't be taken down. Especially if they credit the artist at the beginning, end, or video summary. How else will other people find it and share it? In the long term it would probably help to increase sales.

No, it is against freedom of speech

fair use is not often honored by large media conglomerates. This often leads to non-infringing content being overzealously removed

yes to both of those questions

Rightsholders are never the ones who put consumer interest first, they should have no voice in this matter.

Of course some violation of copyright occurs, and it is natural for rightsholders to want to protect their rights and prevent this. What is important is that any measures to do so are balanced and proportionate. Fair use, parody, reportage, free speech and comment, teaching, amongst many other things, also require protection: as these are often the preserve of smaller content

providers, with less resources to argue their case, it is essential that any copyright protection measures do not simply give the rightsholders the ability to remove, or have removed, content - including removing access to content through removing or blocking hyperlinks - without review that their rights have actually been infringed. Content providers also must have rights: they must have the right and ability to argue their case BEFORE content is removed or blocked, without being put into a position where the time or cost of arguing their case is too onerous for their means. It is also essential when creating rules which cover many jurisdictions not to end up, in effect, implementing the most restrictive ruling from each separate jurisdiction. The incentive to do so by rightsholders is to most aggressively protect their content. The incentive to do so by online platforms is simplicity, automation and defensively protecting their own legal position. However, the effect is to create a wildly unbalanced and restrictive set of rules in aggregate, that go far beyond what what be considered balanced or permissible in any of the individual jurisdictions

Yes, They abuse take down rights in the face of fair use doctrine. Yes some content is taken off the net because people are afraid of lawyers. Sometimes the content does infringe, usually not.

It is very one sided

Absolutely, lobbyists and corporate lawyers dictate ignorant lawmakers what can be removed. If you don't want to share your product for free, than don't share it on the internet. But stop complaining that people make copyright infringements. The poor business models of the technologically challenged media companies are the problem, not the consumer.

That's ok

Yes,

I understand. But sometimes content is taken down by a party that does not own the content. They have too much say

I do think rightsholders have way too much say in the content which is taken down, a lot of unfair or false copyright claims are being made on the internet these days, but for the internet to be a sustainable open platform copyright infringement should even be allowed for personal or educational use. the only copyright case i can object to is against commercial use. general copyright as it is now is evil and a crime against humanity

Yes. This should be the right of the artist him/herself.

Yes to both

Yes, I think rights holders have too much say. My niece's high school put together a super cute video to a song. The whole school and in one take everyone was involved - an ENORMOUS EFFORT. They had to strip the video of sound. Such a shame and now this memoir of my beautiful niece has been forever butchered. The music was not used for any monetary gain for anyone

I do think that rightsholders should allow more stuff to be shared between users. Most of us want to preview stuff before we commit money to buying something, that way we don't waste money on a bad album or movie.

Yes, it is especially onerous with Youtube. I understand but they are doing themselves a disservice

Rightholders (those with money) have too much to say on what content can be taken down. I do not understand why some content is removed so easily.

Yes. Though I'll say it's true that these are the people who own the right to distribute and sell their product, and it's not wrong for them to want to make money off of what they create. That said, they get far too much power and reach in doing so. Especially if they have a lot of money. If they got their way, nobody would be able to produce content based on their IP at all, even in jest or as a fan appreciation. The internet in its current form would die

I feel that rightholders, notably major industries and corporations, have far too much power (which already lies in their favour as they have more funding available to engage actively), especially given the very aggressive and incorrect censorship of information. Indeed, copyright enforcement is no longer about pirate sites, but is becoming a tool used as a sword to silence critics who mention brand names, materials, article information, or anything they feel they have any decent chance of success in flagging as copyrighted material just to silence a critic or an opponent. This has been often used to such an effect, for example, in American political debate, to censor politicians who views aren't congruent with that of a particular ideology or viewset, especially if the politician in question is criticised and exposed as being a sham or fraud of some sort. This runs the risk of extending into Europe, where backdoor deals between corporations and government are censored by non-disclosure agreements that act as a form of copyright censorship. Indeed, even without NDA protections, corporations can often argue that so-called 'trade secrets' are being stolen (but when corporations keep *everything* secret, they can claim everything they do as a 'trade secret' - even nefarious material that is in the interests of the public to disclose publicly). The people are disadvantaged in this, as they do not have the money nor the means to appeal. Often, copyright strikes are faceless

systems via automated systems, where complaints can be ignored, or even if one is persistent for weeks, be answered in a way that fails to address the problem. Indeed, the average layperson has no true grasp of law, and the indecipherable nature of the legalese of which copyright law is written is often too bamboozling for them to grasp, and therefore, retort. Seeing as the individual is not in a position to financially fight (without major assistance from third parties: EFF, for example, can't help everybody with a similar case to "dancing baby"), and especially with corporate leverage over lobbyists passing laws in-favour of unfair copyright laws (such as ones that threaten to cut off internet connections which would be a violation of free speech, and in this modern age, would be a death knell to an online social life) the system should be geared in favour of the individual, with the corporation required to prove there was a breech, not for the individual to disprove the accusation.

Yes. If there's an immediate treat, A JUDGE could order something taken down. Copyright should never have the same weight as free speech for any politician. Not even close!

they have to much control for too long change it now.....

Yes. Without web content like Youtube my music collection would be much poorer. If I like music I find on the web I BUY IT.

In general, yes. They can scare organizations into removing content simply because they themselves are large companies with legal departments

No. The right is already abused on some sites to take down any critism or negative reviews, making it more difficult to tell what the quality of a product is or what a company is actually

doing. When the usage of the material is unfair, that is already protected by law.

I understand copyright to an extent. But I think there should be a distinction between people who own copyrights on their own work and corporations that hold copyrights. As well, it's annoying that - even though it's voluntary - when I put my photos out on FB, for example, they can be used with my being compensated. It needs to work both ways or not at all

the rights holders want the world to go back intake when they owned everybody and everyone was treated like a slave. I do understand why material is removed from the internet but in some cases these removes are not legal and the RIAA or MPAA doe not have ownership of the said material

No, internet has to be free

As long as copyright isn't infringed. Yes I understand why some content is removed

no and I don-t understand. Only if there is a legal infringement of laws should it be used. I presume they get taken off because of their rights to have their work be seen or not for free

I understand the need to protect film or music from exploitation. I am not aware how some content is taken off the internet.

Of course, rightsholders should have SOME voice about their content which could be copyrighted. But, every removal should be reasonable and valid - for ex: if someone posts song recording to youtube which is copyrighted, it should be removed. And this should apply to content itself only, not links to that content!

Of course, right holders have a right to act if their rights are really violated. But there should be room for fair use.

Also, we have seen take-down notices being abused to silence criticism.

Yes, they do, and yes I understand. But at the same time it's an overreaction. I see people trying to upload gameplay videos of Star Wars games and having to censor the music because it's copyrighted. As if anyone's going to watch a Star Wars gameplay video complete with player commentary and ingame sound effects just to be able to rip the music. These are people who are trying to run their channels and are severely hampered in their ability to do so by draconic copyright enforcement.

Yes. I do think they have too much say, and yes, I still understand that some stuff is fair to remove, but

Yes and yes. The internet gives the consumer, any consumer, more choice over what he consumes. Allowing industries to control what is and isn't available online is essentially allowing them a more controlling grip on the market and limits the power of the consumers -- the people.

No.. If its yours i think i should be easier to take it down (drunk pics etc)

Yes, they have too much influence

If it's copyrighted, they should have the right

Rights holders have a right to exercise their rights in my opinion

Yes. They want the right to stuff us full of advertising so the off set to consumers should be the right to view/listen to content

yes anti-copyright is the preferred global solution, fuck capitalism!

Rightsholders have too much to say. Content gets taken down without even looking at the content they claim to

be copyrighted. Most of the times it isn't copyrighted. I understand that copyrighted content in some cases needs to get taken off the internet.

Yes they have too much control.

Yes, I understand why some content gets taken off, mainly owing to copyright issues. However, the hyperlinks themselves should not be copyrighted. I think certain, mostly corporate rights-holders are more concerned about their own profits than the rights of content creators (who have often assigned their rights away). With proposed extensions of copyright globally, this can only get worse. I think there needs to be better focus on fair use of materials, such as personal videos obtained with music on in the background. Also, parody must be able to use materials -- that's the whole point of it!

So called 'rightsholders' do, indeed, have far too much power. Only content can be copywritten. A 'link' (more accurately as URL listing) is an address and is NOT 'intellectual property'

Yes and Yes. Still, these laws are going too far. Certain laws and regulations are turning our world into a horrible thing. I understand rightholders want to see money, but that doesn't give them rights to censor us for profits. I thought we were past this childish behaviour.

Rightsholders do not have too much to say on the web and they are justified to protect their rights and interests.

Completely agree that rightsholders have too much say. I wouldn't mind if the money went to the artists, but I understand their cut is negligible. Look at what Prince has to say

Yes, Yes

Yea, they publicite it, and then decide who can and can not see it.. For extra gain and leverage of course. Getting a big fine for promoting an image/video is just fucking pathetic aswell.

Yes, as a rights holder you cannot expect that you have full control over who sees your work. I can show a foto to my friends and family in the physical world, I should not be infringing on anyones rights when I do the same in the digital world. It is not possible for content rights holders to expect that their content can be a popular part of the cultural environment of society, while not allowing society to use that content in a fair manner.

yes. some of the time

I think it's fair for content to be taken down if it's breaching copyright, intellectual property, or human rights. I don't think it's fair if it's taken down just because someone thinks it should be an income stream (if it wouldn't usually be one)

Again commercial use and personal use makes the difference.

I understand that the people who first pushed for DRM are now proposing a return to old conyent-delivery in order to enforce their rights. However, those rights are NOT the authors', but the publishers'.

Yes, I do and I understand the laws although lots of content is taken offline without actually contacting the video owner and they are taken offline for really dumb reasons (like sound in the background or in games) even when the video isn't even making money off the content in question.

I am not too familiar with what is now standard practice for removals as a result requests from rights-holders. But I think a tax on links is wrong.

I feel rights holders such as the film and music industries have far too much say in what is taken down from the Internet. Parody and humour are often taken down without due consideration. Please ensure that links are not copyrighted. That will destroy the very useful and effective linking system

No, and no. I think rightsholders are usually dettached from the production of the goods (in this case music or films) of which they have the rights. They are just instruments of profit with no place in a truly fair market. I think the people involved in the ACTUAL production of those goods should be the ones to decide.

Yes I personally think that some rightsholders have too much say.

yes, I understand

1: No 2:Yes

Yes, and yes.

I have never been unable to access content I wanted to see, but this does not mean that it does not happen

May be. I don't know.

Yes, some rightsholders have to much influence. Sometimes I understand that some content get taken off, but the thruth must be said and not taken off the Internet

Yes they have too much say and I don't understand why such content is taken off.

Yes, most definitely. I can understand it only as a causal result of actions by, based on interests of, industry and government, but not as anything that is any good for anybody not directly connected with these institutions. On the contrary.

Yes they have too much say. The same way

as if you stole their “property” anywhere else LAWS protect them and they have the resources to handle their own “affairs” which they should do as a “cost” and “risk” which IS inherent within their industry - we DO NOT have to sacrifice our FREEDOM so they can have total control. If someone breaks the law then they can investigate and prosecute according to the law, u know the way the law is SUPPOSED to work. Giving them control of ALL CONTENT is vexatious and DELIBERATE and undermines TRUE DEMOCRACY

Yes, they routinely ignore fair use

Yes. I understand that rightsholders (Usually big corporations.) have the right to attempt to stop illegal sharing of their work, but at the same time... I stopped watching movies and I despise most “popular” music simply because of all the bullshit they’re saddling their content with

They have too much power and it is not always clear why certain content is removed

Yes. As a content creator myself, it is my personal belief that once your content is released to the public, it to some reasonable degree belongs to the public. Taking down a 15-minute video over a 30-second copyrighted movie or music snippet in the background is counter-productive and does not benefit anyone. Nobody will change their mind on buying a song because they can listen to a part of it in the background of a restaurant in a video.

Absolutely, especially when it comes to adaptations of protected works. Having the possibility to adapt existing works and create new types of content (video, audio etc.) is essential to our cultural and individual development. Artists/people have always stood on the shoulders

of giants - that's just how the creative (and intellectual) processes work.

Content that is legal and copyrighted should be under the control of those who have the rights. No one else should have control. I agree that those rules are already in place and there is no need for further “regulations” by politicians.

Despite what some rights-holders say, hyperlinks themselves should not be copyrighted. Copyright rules are already broken and should not be applied to everyday linking on Twitter and Facebook. Uses of parody and humour, such as funny gifs, should be acceptable uses of copyrighted content, but are often removed automatically without any way to appeal the removal of content.

I think that copyright holders have a right to prevent free distribution of their copyrighted work.

the film and music industry are getting their come-uppance. if they had not been so exploitative in the past, people would be happier to pay for downloads. Charging 20 euros or more for a cd which cost 0.20cents established their greed. And yes they definitely have too much say. The artist is the only entity entitled to a cut of profits.

They do have to much influence and in some cases I do understand why it got taken off. No link tax, ‘old fashioned’ firms are trying to protect their old fashioned business models and not recognizing new developments on the internet.

Too much say They feel buthurt

While piracy is a bad thing, the amount of control these greedy companies have and how aggressively they fight against every thing they see as piracy is plain ridiculous. This is exacerbated by idiotically inflated copyright terms (and the fact that

copyright tends to be in the hands of a company rather than an actual artist).

Yes and not always

Yes I understand that things sometimes need to be taken down. However the old pricing model and outdated sales techniques no longer work . It's time to change, an ebook should not cost as much or close to a paper book for example.

Yes they do have to much to say. No i do not.

Yes they have too much say in this already no need to enforce more

Yes,they have too much control

Yes!!! and yes I understand.

Yes. Video's of the meteorite in Russia some time ago where blocked because the car radio played music.Sharing news and culture is humane. Don't block it.

Yes to the first part. For the second part, I understand, without necessarily approving

Take downs are too inclusive. Some content should be taken down but content with fair use should remain

I think rightsholders have too much say in which content is taken down from the web. They are able to file erroneous take-down notices to services such as Youtube, who may be a hosting provider under Article 14 of the E-Commerce directive, causing cost overheads to the service and generally causing the service to take down the content without checking the validity of the take-down notice (presumably to keep associated costs down). I understand that rightsholders should be able to control their works online, but the onus should not be on Youtube and similar services to enforce this. This should certainly not extend beyond the service that is hosting

the content - holding Twitter to account because a tweeted a link to a video on Youtube that may or may not contain copyright material (since this is rarely actually checked before sending take-down notices, I see no reason to believe they will be any more rigorous in the future) is ridiculous and would massively break so many services. The ability for services to provide a place for users to place their own content and link to it from other non-affiliated services is critical to how the web works. Restricting this behaviour, making companies check every link on their service, would cause so much overhead that linking entirely would need to be banned unless you can prove ownership of the target - very difficult when the target may be e.g. the BBC news website, a deviant art page, a youtube video - all provided by different companies, with different non-linked user accounts, requiring huge amounts of work to organise the identification of ownership

Yes, the film and music industry has too much power over what gets taken down from the web.

I understand where some has but in the main it is totally unnecessary 'ownership'

Yes, rights holders have to much say over what gets taken down. They may argue that they're losing money. If that's the case, provide a service your users want to pay for in the first place

Yes, yes.

Rightsholders have too much say. The total idea of the Internet is about freedom and interconnectivity. It should not be made into a profit-making tool by the few who "own" content.

Yes, they do. And yes, because they want to destroy our culture. Don't let them!

Yes for both.

No, there is a lot of copyright infringement on the net

Regarding part A of this question, I do not know enough to have an opinion. Regarding part B, no I do not understand what is taken down, who is authorised to do so, nor how this is implemented Internet wide.

Not sure

Yes - releasing full films/games/music is one thing if it enables people to get hold of full, copyrighted material for free. Small clips in the background etc will not deter people from buying the full song - if anything, the reverse. And companies already know this - they openly put movie trailers at the start of YouTube clips to advertise. If they genuinely thought that seeing a clip would make people NOT subsequently see the full film, they wouldn't do it

They have far too much say and the burden of proof should be on them

I understand that copyright holders (often) don't want their products to be distributed freely, and they should be protected from this, or fairly compensated. However, I think the tools used or proposed in this fight against misuse are often, especially lately, overreaching and restrict basic freedom of everyone for the interests of a few, and this is unacceptable. A better, cleaner compromise has to be made here. I also think "fair use" needs a new, better discussion – e.g., fan-made, non-profit derivatives are art, too, and should be allowed accordingly (maybe with a small fee, like for song covers)

They have too much power, I don't understand why some content is removed.

yes. Yes. This is two questions, not one

Rights holders should be able to say

what of their material is published on the web just as they should be able to control material that they have rights to in any medium

do think they have too much power. And they leverage it to protect currency undermining creativity, culture dissemination and personal growth. Specially to those that would benefit more of it. Those who are unable to reach it in any other way. I do understand why its take off the internet. Yet it is just as i mentioned above.

Yes, rightsholders have too much say in which content is taken down from the web.

I understand that artists become grateful when people share their work, they gain public. I understand that big rightsholders profit allot from hard working artists, even more when they're dead, and an educated and 'arts knowing' public is not good for that profit of so few. I understand perfectly that freedom to share as never been so easy and unexpensive, and that is threatening the big profiteers, not the artists much less the Arts. I understand that Knowledge is the problem, not Arts. I understand that access to independent news and to Knowledge is threatening for the very alone few on top of the power ladder, and that is the problem. Not so long ago they were burning books and even people for that, knowledge and information. Thanks for reading me, if you have any power on this issue PLEASE help our Human spirit (which is sharing all that is possible to share)

Yes, rights holders seem more concerned on stopping people from accessing their products than selling them, and public interest is secondary to their opinion. Yes, some content is taken off for legal reasons, but it should be sold with the right to share.

I think they do. Obviously some content should be taken down, especially if it is directly hurting or harassing an individual. But that has nothing to do with music or film industries trying to sniff out copyright claims. They take themselves too seriously and apparently others do too

Yes, and I understand that rightsholder needs to protect their income stream, but that can be done by not allowing downloading

yes, each photo or movie is property of is maker unless he says otherwise

yes, they have too much power. I understand how some content is removed but it must be done in accordance with proper legal mechanisms.

Yes, rightholders try to block the poor from accessing contents. They have so much money, why bother people that buy a CD or Movie and decide to share it with the world? Why don't they try to block porn?

I've actually bought a lot of film and music CDs because I had the opportunity to watch/listen to them online. Restrictions will have the opposite effect on me - I'll not buy.

Yes, big rightholders are bullying everyone into submission, while individual artists are often unable to effectively fight people "stealing" their work. And censoring links is just absurd. People who invented this have absolutely no idea about technology. They should go and play with sticks and stones instead

Yes, far too much say.

Yes. Yes

i understand why but geographical discrimination and limitation of availability of content, huge discrepancy in income

globally, the hypocrisy that somehow only people in area x are worthy of content will never fly no matter if we have the internet or still scribe on papyrus. knowledge will always find a way to reach the seekers.

Rightholders regularly abuse the power to take down even legal content.

I understand their right of taking off from the internet of pictures, videos and so on but I don't understand why? People will want to be free and talk freely and if a site won't allow it some other site will.

I get it, but I think it is a foolish, short-term, artist-damaging practice. People will follow whom they are able to follow, and in the long-term that will be people with freely accessible content. I think there is too much emphasis on the business side of copyrighting, and not enough that is meant to help people

The rightholders may protect their content via encryption if they wish to but nothing else.

Yes, there should be forced internet licensing that applies to every region, not just certain regions. Why should content be restricted? Just license it for the whole world to be fair for consumers

I do not know much about this

I understand. It is their right, however content through the web should circulate without restrictions.

Yes. No

Yes, the copyright laws are outdated and rightsholders have too much control

Yes, I feel that rights holders have too much control to censor content, and this will only get worse under the TPP. I understand why content gets

removed, but I think it goes too far

They absolutely have too much power. I generally understand why some content is taken down. It is due to copyright infringement

Of course that they have too much power!! The musicians and other artists should be able to sell their creations directly nowadays, instead of having such parasites as the music industries in the middle.

Yes. WAY too much control

They definitely have way too much power, they're basically carpet-bombing sites in a "innocent until proven guilty" manner, frequently going beyond any reasonable standard right into censorship

The EU lacks a fair use exception doctrine.

Yes, they should have the burden of proof

yes there is too much say in take down

Obviously copyright and patents have become abusive and excessive, all driven by bribes to politicians and policy makers to enact laws and policies, which favor the particular interests (large media providers) against the general interest (the public and the nations)

I share hundreds of links every week, sharing information I believe some people may find interesting or helpful. Spreading knowledge so to speak. Do rights-holders really want to alienate the quest for learning?

Let me choose what I want to see and share

Yes. They should have to provide a public explanation

Yes. Depends

Despite what some rights-holders say,

hyperlinks themselves should not be copyrighted. Copyright rules are already broken and should not be applied to everyday linking on Twitter and Facebook. Right now rights-holders can request videos are removed from YouTube where copyrighted music happens to be playing in the background, such as the 'dancing baby case'. Different countries in the EU have different rules on what use of copyright material is permitted, making it difficult for Internet users to know if what they are doing is legal. Uses of parody and humour, such as funny gifs, should be acceptable uses of copyrighted content, but are often removed automatically without any way to appeal the removal of content.

I've seen cases of rightsholders bullying sites. Most cases of content removal have been ridiculous and probably harmful to the rightsholder in the long run.

Yes, they often overreach in their effort and take down completely legal content

Yes, it is all about money

They do have too much say, they should now own the internet.

Rightsholders seem unable to adapt their business models to the changing times. And they want legislation that will save them from having to make the effort. Trying to ban links to content is way beyond the line of acceptable, and would cripple the web as we know it

they are all about the money, and will take as much as they can get... they would charge me for my thoughts one at a time if they could put a meter in my head...

Rightholders unfairly limit access to protected works, stifling innovation. Takedown requests appear to be random and sometimes made for content not owned by the claimant

YES, they have too much say in removing content. NO. Content should only be removed by court order under legal due process

They have too much say. My own home videos were removed because there was music playing. Probably not even copyrighted.

Yes to both

Content should only be taken down with due process. Nothing legal should be taken off Internet, I don't understand how something can be taken off in a jurisdiction different from where the content is physically located.

1) Not really because reality is that almost any content can be found in Internet rather easily, specially music and videos irrespective of the copyright situation. Nevertheless the problem is mainly in some companies (You Tube is the main one) that have a business model based in the massive use of pirated content. Perhaps the solution is not in enforcing additional copyright laws but in making sure that companies like YouTube respect the law 2) Yes but we need to consider as different issues the removal of pirated content available legally in other Internet sites and the removal of content because of political censorship

Yes, Yes.

YES. Far too much power is given to the film and music industries - the internet belongs to the people - ALL people - not corporations or government. Copyrighted content that would hurt an individual artist can be removed, but only at the request of the artist.

Yes they have too much say but I also understand why content is sometimes removed

Yes, it is completely ridiculous to remove links to content on the internet which is publicly available anyway. If people have given permission for their pictures or videos to be posted then I don't see the problem.

Yes interests

I think it's bad business to not allow people to access things like YouTube videos of your music but I don't necessarily think they shouldn't have the right to do so.

I think as is with existing copywriting rules, things are fair. If the performers do not want their music shared, they're ultimately limiting their exposure and that is their choice. I totally understand why some copywritten or personal private content gets removed

Yes to first part. No to second part

In my opinion, we need a whole new system of intellectual property rights that heavily favors freedom of information.

yes, too much power, when you make something and you send it to the world, it belongs to the world.. stop being so greedy!

Yes, I do believe they have too much control. And Yes I do understand why some material gets taken down.

Yes I understand but not when it's regional locked I do not think websites have to pay money when using snippets of text to preview other content online

Yes they have, and I don't always understand

Yes their copyright is not being breached if no money is being made

yes. everyone will find videos, pictures, etc offensive to some degree. however, opinions stated without bullying or

threatening others is just that, an opinion. because e.g. if christians find something offensive because it points out why they are wrong, it should not be removed. facts are facts whether people want to agree or believe in them

Rightsholders clearly have more control than is ethically permissible. And no, I don't always understand - I can only assume that certain lobbyists, powerbrokers and 'political correctors' are being appeased

Is it to do with copyright infringements?

Yes, they have too much say.

Yes, I do understand

Yes too much say and no real recourse to argue via facebook etc. Judge and jury bypassed. Fair rights, CC rights are all abused. Of course rights of content originators should be respected but there needs to be dialogue and not automated pull downs or unaddressable pull downs

Yes I understand why and can understand why they want to protect their work

Absolutely, the quest for profit is slowly eroding the rights of others

Yes, but too much power has been given to these people instead of listening to the man on the street.

I do not understand everything about this, but I do know that although a perfect copy of eg. the Mona Lisa is just a copy, a slight change makes it 'new work'. Alternatively, many such 'new works' can be created to cover a wide area and stifle other people's creative talent if a big or well protected industry got something there first.

Yes hyperlinks should not be copyrighted.

yes too much influence, no I don't understand. (why have two questions here?)

Yes. It seems that things are taken down to protect profit.

I am not at all familiar enough with subject

Not only do they have too much say in what is taken down, but the extent to which the industries are involved in policy making is just plain wrong.

Yes, especially since most of these people are not making money from this content

Yes. Yes.

Yes they do. Understand that some rights-holders want the links themselves to be copyrighted, meaning that existing broken rules, around what content can be shared, could be applied to any common link on Twitter, Facebook, etc. For example, as of this moment rights-holders can request videos to be removed from YouTube where copyrighted music happens to be playing in the background (see the 'dancing baby case' against Universal music). Different countries in the EU have very different rules when it comes to the usage of copyrighted material, giving rise to a climate of uncertainty for Internet users about the legality of their actions. The use of parody and humor, such as funny gifs, is often removed automatically without respect for different laws, or any way to appeal the removal of content

Yes, rightholder have too much saying.

Yes. Copyright is extended for too long a period of time on content that should have already long since been released to the public domain

I have some sympathy for film and music companies trying to root out outright piracy to ensure the basic royalties can be maintained for actors /singers etc. However much sharing is of snippets only - surely this encourages people to

go see /buy the whole film /album etc.

Too much content is taken down, for example parody and humour, like funny gifs are taken down automatically even when there is no need for it

As a professional working in the creative media sector I believe that there should be no limits as to what content the Internet provides. If I want my products to be seen on the Web then I should be fully prepared that they are distributed further without my knowledge. Obviously, website operators should have systems in place to restrict certain content and to remove content when asked to do so by the original owner/producer

It seems vague and complicated to understand what constitutes fair use and what is copyright infringement.

Yes, rightsholders have a powerful grip on which content can be shared. It's expected that content should be withdrawn if it's infringing, but currently it seems the film and music industries are especially zealous with their powers.

Yes. Rightsholder should be able to protect their work and get paid fairly but they should prove that infringement occurred

I understand why they get taken down, but they take it too far.

If they release it into the public domain, then it is public. Simple as that. If the content is 'smuggled' onto the net by other means, then I understand their concern - but only to a degree. There is such a think as promotion - and a viral video, or piece of writing etc. can promote the original content owner in a way that no marketing campaign could. Maybe rightsholders should start thinking about embracing new methods of promotion (that is free) as well as new business

models which would severely reduce/cut out this method. Their model is antiquated. Newer business models such as Spotify, Pandora, Netflix etc. attempt to do this. This is about bigwigs wanting more money, typically not the content creators making any more than before

I understand that if they are selling some product and you can own it for free from some source, is not right

Yes, I feel that the media companies have ridiculous amounts of power. It shouldn't be their job to police the internet, especially due to their money grabbing nature.

Yes & Yes

Yes, but i do understand when content is illegally published.

To the first part of the question Yes. For the second part of the question Sometimes it is not clear why some content is deleted when it forms part of the cultural record.

It is ridiculous that rights holders are able to disrupt good content with for example background (copyrighted) music is heard incidentally, in the background of a video or similar

The 'dancing baby case' was just silly. Nobody would have downloaded poor quality music. The legal situation appears confusing due to the worldwide nature of the web. Restricting links seems unworkable to me

Yes, they have too much control which can be abused... for example - removing the material of a competitor. The only things I see removed from the internet are reports of corporate crimes against humanity... ones that they are trying to make happen right at that time. For example - any news or activist posting regarding the TPP, which could not be shared on

facebook... it was obviously blocked

No, and yes

Yes, but definitely disagree with this

They definitely have way to much authority over what people share and post online. I hope that some content is removed because it is racist or unacceptable to some people, but I know that most times it is by those that want to keep certain things from the public, and they want monetary compensation for the use of it. They need to realize that once it hits the internet, it is public. Who puts personal stuff online?

Yes!

Yes & Yes.

Yes, though I do understand why done content is taken off the internet.

Absolutely

Yes, and No

I understand why some content gets taken off. Copyright holders tend to be a bit overzealous with their takedowns, though

I think that people need to be paid for the work they do. Therefore, I think it's right that viewers of film and music should only get products from official sites. I can understand that extreme violence/abuse/abusive content should be removed. However, this must be an agreed line, not one based upon arbitrary decisions that could be fuelled by the popular press tabloids.

copyright violation

No. They have to pay to rightholders

I do understand why rights holders do this, but the restrictions can seem clumsy.

Yes - removing things that are clearly fair use or just a summary of the content. Yes.

Yes - I understand that online platforms do take down copyrighted content, but I'm not sure that there is enough protection for fair use (such as using short clips for humour or study) or whether there is the opportunity to appeal.

Yes, far too much say. Rights-holders should not be allowed tools which they could use to censor the kind of discussions and cultural exchanges which internet users expect to have. A high threshold should be set for when rights holders are allowed to intervene and force content to be taken down. They should not be allowed to remove parodies, or tributes, or fan-made extensions, or unrelated works where snatches of copyrighted content happen to be audible or visible in the background. They should not even be allowed many of the unconscionable rights which they currently enjoy, such as the right to extort money from public spaces if those spaces want to play background music. It also badly needs to be recognised that existing copyright law is outdated, and fundamentally at odds with the way that computer systems work. "Copies" of any digital work are made dozens of times, invisibly and without human interaction, in the course of sending that data over a network link for any purpose. Copies are even made by the computer hardware when displaying media on a screen!

Yes. I don't understand

Yes, I believe rightsholders have too much say in which content is removed. Legitimate use of copyrighted material can often be prevented by rightsholders

don't know, it isn't a simple issue

Yes. Often automated tools are

being used to remove content without reason or justification

Far too much say. And often the legal "rightsholders" have little actual rights to the content. They are not the same people as those who actually produced the content. Content gets taken off the internet due to greed.

Those who have copyrights for the content do have the right to control how it is used. There are some pictures and videos which should be taken off the internet when they are harmful to others

All they want is protection for their profits, Once up should stay up (apart from child pornography)

Rights holders are only interested in the financial return from web activity - issues of free expression, etc conflict with this fundamentally.

On balance large rightsholders to have too much say. Rightsholders can ask for content to be taken down, and that happens as standard. If anything there should be more balances to help insure that this is not abused, and that fair use is protected. And that smaller and individual rightsholders and creators are not penalised because large rightsholders have too much power. Hyperlinks are a form of referencing, and are essential to the very foundations of the modern Internet. Much like the traditional library can not work without a catalogue saying where works are located the Internet can not work without free use of hyperlinks. A far bigger problem is the lack of protection for fair use, and for proper referencing and linking. These are essential not only for end users, but for rightsholders themselves. It is vital that copyright not only protects rightsholders, but also allows everyone the ability to access material under fair use and to use

materials legally to ensure the continued ability of individuals and companies to continue to produce new works. And to ensure free speech, a fair and free trade market, evidence based science and many other foundations of our society.

yes - and they do it automatically, sometimes wrongly

Absolutley yes. Censorship will lead us back deep into the darkness.

As a musician, I understand why some music, film and video content is made unavailable because I have to pay for recordings but as music shops have diminished it is increasingly difficult to get hold of some recordings. Also many local venues for playing live music have been shut down by people whose complaints have undue influence which means that it is very hard to hear new music - sometimes you tube is the only place where you can explore these artists. That makes it a cultural space.

As a rightsholder myself (professional composer) I think that rightsholders, in particular non-creating rightsholders such as multinational publishing houses, have too much say on what can be removed, and what can be hidden (via search engines etc) on the Internet. There is a balance to be struck, but at the moment it is struck too far in favour of excessive censorship. This needs remedied, not exacerbated

Copyright is obviously a big thing online. I believe media companies have the right to take down content that is deliberately being stolen, however they should also consider the fact that their songs, films etc will be used online by people in their own content. As long as people explain that the copyright is not owned by them, it shouldent be a problem in my opinion.

Damn right they have too much say. I can understand individuals who want their work to exist only in certain forums within certain time frames, such as a comedian who wants to finish their new tour before uploading all their new jokes to Youtube. But I definitely can't understand the power given to companies to simply attempt to deny the world access to the creation of the artists they fund. The reasons why content is removed vary of course, though they generally fit into 1. Reputation 2. Perceived effects on profit. At any rate, I think if you want your art, e.g. a film, not to be on the internet, the only way to do it, is NOT TO UPLOAD IT IN THE FIRST PLACE. Or NOT TO SHARE IT WITH ANYONE WHO MIGHT UPLOAD IT. Otherwise, it's essentially in the public domain. I think in the end the sharing is a good thing, it's just that the rightsholders have thus far been too stupid to work out how to make money out of all the free publicity. This is an area in which Netflix is doing a great job.

Definitely. If I use a file storage service on the Internet to backup my files, I don't think a third party, whether a publisher or an ISP should be able to deny me the right to access the service to retrieve them

Do not understand

Every new content contains elements that have been used before. It really depends in which proportion. When a museum displays counterfeit art the road signs leading to the exhibition are not removed. Links are not part of the exhibition

First question: Yes Second question: Yes

For direct copyright violations (aka entire films made available, or excerpts that are shown for commercial gain) rights holders should be able to take down - However fair use should still be allowed for comedic and educational uses. Currently rights holders

have too have power to take things down

Hell yes

I am rarely informed as to why material is removed from the web. I may sometimes agree with its removal but I would like to know.

I can well understand why the producers of films like Star Wars don't want their films viewable for free on the internet. I also know that music sales have suffered because it's so easy to download music for free from the internet & some well known musicians struggle to make a living out of producing music. On the other hand I think that parodies & spoofs are original pieces of art & should not be removed if they use a well known piece of music as part of the parody of that music / artist etc

I do and I do. Fair use and parody exist, but the automated bots that crawl for content can't tell the difference.

I do think they have too much say in what gets taken down, and I do understand why of course infringement should have to be proven.

I think content should be accessible as long as the rights holders are given sufficient credit. It is not always clear why some content is removed from the Internet.

I think copyright holders should have the right to determine fair internet use of their work but this should be within sensible guidelines. These guidelines should be clear, simple and widely known. Owners should be able to request infringements be taken down.

I think corporations as a whole do not act with integrity and only act in self interest.

I think rights holders have too much say in which content is taken down from the web.

I understand why some content is taken off.

I think the profit model for the entertainment industry is outdated and flawed

I think the right balance is important, it would be great if we didn't live in a capitalist world, everyone was equal and artists just created free music because they loved it, alas we do not.

I think the rightholders have way too much say in which content is taken down from the web. They often go too far in their attempts to protect their IP, especially the big companies.

I understand copyright laws etc. But the Internet was meant to be a platform without "masters" or "rulers", it was all written down. The different industries are trying to control it as much as possible though, it is wrong! It is not theirs to control or regulate.

I understand it when there is copyright infringement

I understand that companies have a right to protect their property, but allowing a few powerful groups to exert a stranglehold over creative acts is detrimental to the freedom of expression and freedom of creativity.

I understand that some content can be removed if it has been legitimately pirated. However, that has to be proven in a court of law before removal. Rightholders deserve a say in what is used otherwise their industries (music, TV, Film etc) will suffer. But there are incidences where this is abused to unjustly stifle creativity.

I understand the copyright implications. But there is also such a thing as "copyleft". And trying to copyright public domain stuff like "Happy Birthday", or the word

"Bluetooth", is simply petty and childish, IMO. So there needs to be a more mature balance between what should be available for everyone, and what needs protecting.

I understand this is their business in order to make a profit.

I understand why copyrighted content, e.g. upload of TV episodes or movies, is taken off the internet. However, we must be careful of overreach in this regard - such as with the 'dancing baby case'. We MUST NOT institute laws that penalize individuals for fair use. I have seen other cases of fair use being blocked or penalized.

I understand why some things need to be removed, but sharing has to be taken in account in some fashion. I can share or borrow a DVD with a friend, why can't I do it with a file?

If no-one paid for copyrighted material, there wouldn't be any to pirate. Creative artists need to be rewarded for their endeavours.

Infringement should need to be proven in court not simply removed on suspicion of it, this gives too much power to corporations

It is often not clear why something is taken off the internet.

It is their livelihood but the courts should make the decision

Many time privately taken pictures etc are blocked because some Greedy Corporation claims rights to it

No, not always

No. No

Not at all.

Not sure and yes

Not Sure that I know enough about this aspect?

Obviously complete films should not be shared. However trailers and content no longer available to buy should be allowed. I think the rightsholders should only have power to take down content which they are currently producing and selling

Rightholders have gone far beyond their rights, intruding and interfering with the way each individual interacts with art and spiritual content.

Rightsholders should be able to protect their content, but they should not be able to unilaterally decide what counts as a violation

Rightsholders should have some say about which content is on the web, but this must be balanced against other concerns. I understand why some content is taken off the internet.

Some rights-holders want links themselves to be copyrighted, meaning that existing broken rules around what content can be shared could be applied to everyday linking on Twitter and Facebook. For example, right now rights-holders can request videos are removed from YouTube where copyrighted music happens to be playing in the background, such as the 'dancing baby case'. Different countries in the EU have different rules on what use of copyright material is permitted, making it difficult for Internet users to know if what they are doing is legal. Uses of parody and humour, such as funny gifs, are often removed automatically without respect for different laws, or any way to appeal the removal of content. Also, the issue is treated differently online than in other media, even though the web is a newer, likely more progressive medium

Sometimes have content removed for reasons that I am not aware of.

The artists should have the right to have content removed, not the film/music industries. I don't understand why some content is removed from the Internet

The rules governing these removals tend to be DMCA requests, these are not stringent enough and can result in fair use content e.g. comment and parody. There is no consequence for companies incorrectly taking down valid content and there is a lack of appropriate appeals mechanisms.

The simple answer is: The world is waking up to the reality that the morons in charge are now very frightened. They know we are onto them and their time is limited so they are trying every trick to limit communication between us all.

There are too many false positives.

They do have too much say. They are not required to prove whether something is infringing material, and fair use is only a defence, and thus not *prima facie* established

They have far too much say

they should be able to look after their intellectual property

To a point. It is understandable to remove entire films/music tracks, but not to attempt to stifle reviews

To some degree yes. example: if they are not selling or releasing that particular version of a work, then they should not have any say in its display or use. Sure, they may own rights to another version and so they may feel revenue is under threat if the version they don't own is available. C'est la vie...Get ownership of the offending version and promptly offer that for sale. But for

far too long we have all been denied the vast panorama of art & creativity that is truly magnificent and makes life on earth such a rich and rewarding thing...denied it for the sake of somebodies bottom line. How sad is that!! To dumb down and make very narrow the whole of planet earths creative vastness for the sake of some money!!!! Please, get creative and think of smarter more intelligent ways of gaining from this WONDERLAND

Understand copyright

Unsure of what these companies do take off.....

We need to limit the rights such as copy write to a period of seven years or less

Yes and No

Yes and yes, and in most cases I wonder whats the harm? Especially if its used in a free manner or for parody or humor. Isent the latter meant to be an exception usually?

Yes and yes. They often try to defend the indefensible based on outdated laws enacted in a different age and based on outdated criteria.

Yes I do - the process is particularly one-sided, and lacks transparency. I understand why some content is removed.

Yes I do. It is not acceptable to copyright a hyperlink. Everyday linking is a vibrant internet and social essential.adoption, parody and humour should be welcomed, it is usually affectionate. Often it leads me to look for and like the original.

Yes I undersstand, however copyright issues are complicated!

Yes I understand but content must be available to critique or parody.

Yes they do have to much influence over the internet, and I am not certain why some content gets removed, although I do understand copyright and piracy violations

Yes, and yes

Yes, as long as what they're taking down is proven to infringe on their rights

yes, but how long should some rights remain?

Yes, content creators need to have rights but they should be fair to users as well

Yes, rightsholders have too much say.No, I don't understand why some content is taken off, especially fair-use content.

Yes, they are over reactive to the use of images and music.

Yes, they are part of a dying regime.

Yes, they have far, far too much control over which content is removed from the web. I do understand why SOME content is removed, but there is much content removed that is LEGAL. Content owners do too little to make sure the content they request removal of, is actually being used in an infringing way OR is actually something they have the legal right to remove

Yes, they have too many rights and I don't understand why

Yes, they have too much control. Such content is good advertising at best, and harmless at worst

Yes, while I recognize the right of the copyright owners to limit distribution of their protected works, it should not come at a price of limiting everyone else from free sharing, mixing and remixing works that are public domain. In the instances

where content is taken down, there is/ should exist some kind of notice content have been taken down due to complaint from IP rights holders and whom to contact in case the takedown was not appropriate

Yes. I understand the requirement to protect copyright, but it is over zealous and limiting to creativity. Only outright theft verbatim should be an infringement, and that should be subject to legal proof

Yes. Intellectual Property regulations are far too extreme, and should be modified.

Yes. It's none of their business what I post. This simply allows corporations to censor and control the way they are perceived online.

Yes. Laws have to have a sense of balance, not be weighted too much in favour of controlling innocent sharing of interests, which is not intentional stealing of intellectual property for profit.

Yes. Of course they should have the right to take down complete episodes of new shows but fan videos (and other forms of fan art) are free ads for the show and should be allowed (it brings them more money for goodness sake)

Yes. Rightsholders have serially abused takedown systems, without suffering any penalties.

Yes.Yes.

YouTube is in constant violation of fair use, free speech and parody laws because of this. Someone makes a news video with a 10 second clip of copyrighted content, and it gets taken down! Nobody takes down the TV news! I know why content gets taken down, and it's almost always for the wrong reason: an algorithm decided it needs to go.

Yes. The fewer people know

it, the better for them

I think so. I don't know the criteria applied for taking off some content.

Yes, I think the rightsholders have too much power, and I hope that situation changes

Yes these companies use their financial power in an unfair way. I do not understand why some content is taken off the internet, unless it is illegal.

Yes - often on Youtube rights holders abuse the DMCA to stifle criticism or creative and transformative use of their media

Rights holders have too much possibility to take down content. They can mandate to take down any content whether justified or not, without having to fear problems for unjustifiedly taking down content of other right holders. Currently the rights of Larger right holders trump those of smaller right holders. Hyperlinks don't infringe on anyones "rights" on the content. On the contrary, each link to a specific content increases the visibility and is indeed purely positive for the rights holder of the particular content. It increases the visibility of the content. Just like the (physical)address of a store or a venue is not infringing on the copyrights of the store owner or of the music band playing on that venue on a particular day. Publishing the address is on the contrary purely positive for the store or the venue. It is not even possible to check the status of the copyright of a place being linked to. The status could change every millisecond and could even change during a session of a user. It is technically impossible to exercise a check every millisecond, just to be sure. Apart from that, there is no algorithmic solution available and even possible to check the copyright of some content.

Yes, as organized interest group

they bully. And sometimes it is very unclear why something is removed

Yes, they are taken to serious. I understand their reasons, but don't agree with them.

If personal photos are such content, then, yes. There is a difference between copyrighting the content and copyrighting links!!! Beware of "dancing baby case", strikt copyright rules may stretch too far.

Control of mega-sized star vehicles
music and movies deserve to be controlled by their masters

Yes. While sometimes this is justified, there has been quite a lot of abuse on this.

Yes right holders have far too much power

Content should only be removed when harmful or offending

Yes they have too much to say. Clearly, they only represent their own profits and not the artists off of which they leech, and of whom only the most successful ever see any real reimbursement. The standard music industry companies are mainly extortionists in a suit, really. They don't care about art or content, they only care about money. And thus, their influence on what should or should not be taken down will only serve their own pockets, regardless if it is a legitimate claim or not. I do understand why some content is taken down, but at this moment, the reasons for taking something down are highly inconsistent. Hate speech and racial violence is allowed but nudity (ie. even nursing mothers) isn't? And this is just one example. Despite what some rights-holders say, hyperlinks themselves should not be copyrighted. Copyright rules are already broken and should not be applied to everyday linking on Twitter and Facebook. Fix the copyright laws first. Listen to Richard Stallman, he has some good propositions on the case.

way too much say & unclear agreements
sharing is not theft! yes to screws
not glue & drm-free content

Even if it is fair that copyright is respected, it sometimes goes too far. I am much more in favour of "copyleft" policies, which allows the utilisation of content under more flexible conditions.

yes they have too much in some cases.
yes i comprehend why this happens,
but a blanket or automatic approach
is not reasonable or acceptable

The question about «ownership» is something we should begin debate in school because it is a very strange stuff... and mostly in a digital world. Maybe changing our relation to money (the why we want to own) or its creation process may change the way we are doing stuff in the entire world. Sharing is caring!

This is too complex a subject for a small response block. Rightsholders should have rights but there should also be fairuse so some correspondance and arbitration may be required

1) I think they have too much say. Especially because it is often the case that the original content creator is not the one demanding the content to be taken down. 2) I understand that right holders want to protect their revenues. However, the content is taken down once and put back up ten times again by different people (thankfully so). There is obviously a need to find another way.

in some cases, they have too many rights, for example when only small pieces of music or images are re-used to create a new work.

Yes. Rights-holders too often treat potential customers as potential enemies and are too aggressive in taking even

harmless pieces of their works offline even though this can help getting more people to know of their product.

Yes I think they have too much power

Yes, I do think so. I think that the sharing of most content on a non-commercial basis should be allowed in general without making the “perpetrators” criminals. I do understand the reasoning that is typically used to justify taking content offline, but I think that it is almost always flawed and heavily skewed in the direction of giving too much advantage to the rightholders as opposed to the general public. I think that laws such as copyright are supposed to exist for the common good: give incentives to authors so that the general public receives more works or art. Fair use provisions and especially reasonable copyright expiry times (e.g., 5 or 10 years as opposed to “50 or more years after the death of the author) should be instituted, because the “deal” (trading freedom for the creation of more works of art) is currently struck in a way that is heavily disadvantageous to the public at large.

I believe that rights holders should be able to request that content which infringes on their copyright be taken down.

Yes - fair use is a reasonable practice.

It depends upon the context of each case. More often than not rightholders commit to overkill instead of reasonable consideration. Parody should always be granted immunity from take down notices provided the individual(s) behind the parody have taken the time to declare their intention thus.

I understand it, but I don't think it's necessary. The only thing spreading your media can do, is get more resources.

Gebruik jullie gezond verstand en

maak de juiste keuze. Meer wetten en restricties zorgen voor meer wrijving in de maatschappij. Toegang tot het internet en zijn inhoud maakt de wereld slimmer.

Rightsholders have way too much power: there are too many false-positives resulting in legitimate content being automatically taken down, regardless of whether they own the copyright on that content.

They act too quickly, often resulting in wrongful removals.

I agree with this statement. I believe I do understand why certain material is removed: because people in certain positions of vested interest are losing money, and use outmoded laws to protect their incomes and positions

Understanding the difference between popular culture and what is in the public domain, vs expropriation of intellectual property, can be subtle and hard to judge fairly, there is a difference, but in general social use, there has to be some leeway allowed when “theft” is clearly not the intention.

They have too much say. Screencaps, short clips and gifs should not be seen as copyright infringement.

Yes - I understand that films etc. need to have royalties paid in order for the work to be worthwhile. But the media should be figuring out ways of combatting the competition as opposed to applying blanket bans. Look at how well Netflix is doing!

I understand why some things are removed, but reasons should be given

Yes. It happened to me as well.

yes, they have too much say.
No, I do not understand.

I only understand they take down the content on their own websites.

Definitely, they are basically violating our constitution. And the website owners are scared and remove stuff without questioning.

Two different questions here. Yes, I understand content gets taken off the Internet, though who benefits from that action remains a puzzle to me. Yes, I think rightsholders have too much say in what is taken down. We should be very careful in letting any party decide what should be on the internet and what not, as the wrong kind of censorship is only a step away.

We must respect copyright. They may request taking down content that their copyright applies to but no more and no less. Any regulations/laws must not put burden those who want to share own work under permissive (copyleft) licensing or public domain.

yes they have too much to say. I do not understand in some cases.

Film and music industries refuse to adapt to the advancement of technology. There is plenty of money and jobs for them if they develop new business models. Instead, their lobbyists are actively trying to cripple progress in the name of corporate profits. Please stop it.

The rightsholders have too much say in which content is taken Down and too much content is removed that I don't believe should be.

Anybody with too much money and an opinion has too much to say in content regulation. It shouldn't be up to the money stream what gets taken down and what doesn't. I do understand why some things are taken down, however, and some people do cross a line.

Yes, they have too much power, but I do understand the importance of not infringing copyright or IPR

They have the rights to do so according to laws.

I understand the right of copyright holders to remove content that is presented whole or in parts designed to fit together into a whole. However, the principle of fair use must be maintained, and should be more inclusive, not weakened

Yes and yes. There are obviously cases where content is truly pirated and should be taken down. But copyright currently lasts too long and covers too much to be in the general interest. There should be mandatory licensing and wider fair use provisions for much material

YES. The capital organisations of (copy) rights are a menace to free society. Copyright means the right to copy. Again agencies and companies act like Pavlovian dogs in their hypocritical and bigoted auto-pilot banning. No better than the IS

Way too much. Copyright is the reason and it excludes fair use or the copyright is lost. Idiotic reasoning is at fault

I understand that content creators and publishers want money for their work, but I think some companies or individuals go too far in taking down fan-made content or non-commercial content that they feel are too close to their products or may be using their products. It should be allowed as a private person to show appreciation for content by using it to some extent, if it has no commercial gains for that person.

Absolutely. Free speech and self expression are being trampled on in the name of copyrighted material. People should not have to turn off all media devices before recording their family

and friends for fear that something in the background will prevent their ability to share that picture or video

At the moment they appear to have too much power, yes. The trouble with the legal world is it's tricky to get visibility. I'm sure end-users would be shocked if they found out how much pressure social media sites are under from big multinationals and powerful industry lobbies. I understand that it's tricky to run a media producing business if people just copy and distribute the material without any payment. However the Internet has disrupted many businesses over time, and it's time that the entertainment business aligns with the Internet, not the other way around. Services like Netflix are a good example of how consumers are happy to pay for a decent entertainment service

Obviously, rights-holders should have some control over how their content is used. Removing YouTube videos because of a song that happens to be playing the background, or removing parody or humour content, seems silly to me.

Yes! See above. We need unfettered access not curated content.

Yes and although I can understand why I still think they should be less in control.

It's their content so most of the time I understand if they want to take it down.

I support some stakeholders such as film and music industry in protecting proprietary rights of artists etc. Yes, I understand why some content gets taken off the web

no, copyrights should be respected

I think rights holders should be allowed to remove content being used without consent...although as an artist it can

only benefit the artist if people shared their work as it increases awareness of the particular artist. Provided that it is not presented in a way which is not consistent with the artists vision

Yes they do have too much power, making stuff unavailable or muting it just because it has some background music is too much I would like to strip them of that right. this could also be seen as a way of promoting the music piece. I have had my own videos blocked in countries because they had a minor piece with background music.

YES, i have seen this many times. They have too much power - and it is very often abused.I understand why bootlegged movies gets taken down, but they're going too far with still pictures and simple animations.

Yes. The business side of music is taking advantage of both the artists and the public in an unfair way

I do understand why some gets taken down,

The music industry must learn to give ground. It benefits nobody to take down Wedding videos etc, that have background music from discos (that have possibly already paid for the music rights). All it promotes is hostility towards the industry which is going to hurt their cause.

Yes. Posting an entire movie on YouTube is obviously illegal but the principle of 'fair use' must be upheld when the content serves a purpose. Often the rights-holders simply shoot themselves in the foot regardless by depriving many people of a chance to learn about their content.

I can understand

I think the existing systems errs too far towards protecting the interests of copyright holders. The copyright system

was originally intended to strike a balance between the interests of producers of content and the public. Over the years content producers have lobbied to extend copyright unfairly in their favour, and ultimately against their own interests. Making content widely available raises public awareness, ultimately increasing rewards for content producers. Secondary uses of content such as criticism, parody and humour should be permitted without interference. Only where there is clear intent to deprive copyright holders of their rights should content be removed and then only after due legal process

Yes they would definately have too much control if the proposals were implemented. This has the potential to totally stifle the legal internet, and would drive online life underground, as is currently the case in most repressive regimes around the world

Their right to make money does not trump my right to a simple life. They may wish to be Draconian but must not expect me to pass laws that favour their industry at the cost of other social benefits or liberties. When content is created with the sole purpose of making money then it has to fight to survive, it must not expect special treatment.

Yes. Some content is copyrighted, and the holder of that copyright should have the right to determine when and how it is used. Others should respect that right

I believe rightsholders are extreme in their actions, bet they've sung "happy birthday" and never once paid the copyright fee for using it every time they sang it. This song was actually copyrighted by two sisters who were the creators. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that copyrights are broken by the rightsholders themselves. Yes I understand why some content is taken down, I am an academic

student who uses hyperlinks in her blogs to ensure no plagiarism exists, all materials used can be traced back to the original site of use. Artists for example, usually require to be contacted with a request to use their material. Open source means that anyone can use it without having to cite where the work has come from

I think the take down process favours the film/music industry and other large corporations too much and results in the unwarranted removal of legitimate creative or critical works. I fully understand the value of copyright, but we are losing the balance between protecting the intellectual property of the copyright holder and promoting the public good. Trying to copyright links themselves will stifle not only innovation and the sharing of knowledge, but the inherent value of the internet itself. There's a reason addresses start with http - without it, there is no 'internet' as we know it today

Yes, once something is uploaded to the internet copywrightholders should understand that their artistic work has become property of society!

Not necessarily too much, but they should consider how many more people their content reaches when people share it. In some cases I understand why content gets taken off, for example if it is used in some way that it goes against the beliefs of the makers. Not always tho, sometimes it feels like content is taken off with little to none actual legitimate reason.

I understand copyright concerns. The issue should be commercial gain, not fair use.

Yes. Rightsholders often submit frivolous complaints and because the costs of going to court against large corporations can be enormous, many sites have removed legal content instead of fighting for what is right

I do not understand why they would like to take down photos that have no private material in them. The film industry goes to RIDICULOUS lengths with their censorship, taking down videos with a small clip from a movie, which should be protected by fair use. Same thing with the music industry.

Yes...for example, that Italian guy has the rights to the 'Che' picture, but if it is used in a creative way it should be fine & I don't think companies should get a cut either

yes yes

Yas they do

They are private companies and they try to earn as much money as possible. That's what companies do. But they do it without a blink of compassion, regards for human rights, or even decency. It is up to the regulations to keep them in the right path. Work that is not a mere copy of their original content should not be removable without a court order.

I think rightsholders are struggling to maintain control of their intellectual property rather than have too much say. Yes, I understand that inappropriate content is taken off the internet.

I do not always see the reason for certain content being removed. While I understand removing entire movies, etc, I think it's pathetic to remove a video in which the background music is copyrighted when nobody is turning a clear and obvious commercial profit from it, and it considerably lowers my esteem for the artists whose labels do this. Likewise for parody and humour content - these are essential elements of our culture and summarily removing them is thuggish

No & Yes

Yes, they have far too much say. I

understand why illegal (as CLEARLY defined by laws made for everyone's good, not just for the good of corporate money), deeply offensive, or content that breaks a particular site's code of conduct will be removed, but corporations have no right to dictate what information gets shared simply because they have money. The argument that their businesses are suffering if they don't is pure garbage

I understand that there are certain things that are offensive or violent that should not be shown but censorship has to be objective.

Les auteurs/créateurs doivent pouvoir gérer leurs œuvres en fonction des licences qu'ils choisissent.

The rightholders have definitely too much say in which content is taken down from the web. The culture must be free

yes they overuse their money and influence to corrupt politics instead of reviewing their business model

yes and yes

The only case I can think of where I think the rights laws were abused was with "The Innocence of Muslims" where there was a clear political agenda

They clearly have too much rights, as evidenced by YouTube's automated DCMA takedown system being far too frequently abused, and legal content being removed because the person uploading the content does not have the money and resources to dispute the industry in court, effectively creating a sort of corruption as the big companies can use their influence and money to deny people the possibility to have their case tried in court, and even "buying" their way out of court. While I do understand certain content being removed, I think the laws on

this are outdated and outright damaging consumers, and needs a redesign that mirrors the developments of the internet era, and that is less focused on giving the industry power over the consumers, instead protecting both consumers and intellectual property. Today's laws are damaging for everyone, and the proposed laws would only make matters worse

I think that to a certain extent, and to a certain extent only, living artists (but not dead ones, obviously) have the right to decide how their work will be or should be distributed. As for commercial "rightsholders" and their turf wars, fuck them!

Once a content has been released, with an associated license, there is no reason to take it off the internet, as long as its usage respects the terms of the license. Concerning derived works of an original work, whether such a license should diffuse is not as simple. License of an artwork should probably not diffuse when the derived work does not have the same appliance at all. For example, it is normal that a remix music should conform to the original music license, whereas a video where an artwork happens in the background should not be subject to the license, nor should be a parody.

Rightsholders are failing (again) to understand what is happening. People are MORE likely to pay money for something if they are confident it is worth it. They simply will not be tricked into paying money in the hope that something is any good. We have moved to a new model. They can either adapt, or wage their foolish Quixotic war and be left behind.

Yes to part one of the question and no to part two. I must say the question is not at all well formulated. Ighly confusing.

I do think that the rightsholders (such as the film or music industries) have too much say in which content is taken down from the web? I don't really understand why some content (e.g., pictures, videos, gifs) get taken off the Internet?

Yes, the "rights holders" are not always the creators of the content, let the artists decide

no... but censoring abusively is the way for some content to be deleted

I think it is ridiculous that when availability could be global from a technical viewpoint, the market is still segmented into areas where you may or may not access the information, based on DRM. There is mandatory free circulation of services within the EU it's great time that same principle be extended to the world (with exceptions remaining... exceptional).

Yes, they are too restrictive on culture

2. Their film, their rights. Why should swe see bits for nothing.

1) originators should have the right to control their inhouse produced content, but not to block non commercial use and sharing of content provided this is done without meaningful alteration, full accreditation and disclosure of origin and a transparent "poster string" including the first "sharer/web poster".2) yes and both commercial interests and social mores/cultural sensibilities should be respected, though non transparent and non debatable censure from a state/regional governing body can never be acceptable.

I do understand, and I worry about criminal and terrorist use of the internet, but I worry MORE about censorship. France has always been so proud of its free press, and it is terrible that they tightening down on this. Very wrong.

I don't really know about these issues

I haven't noticed.

I understand the need to remove very offensive videos but without checks to financial / political interests content will be removed simply because it doesn't fit into a particular agenda

No. Yes ofcourse I do.

yes indeed!

Yes, for privacy

Yes, rightholders have far to much to say regarding what should be displayed on the web or not. The users are sometimes considered as guilty by default, even when they are sharing their own content, and there are far too much contents removed from the web without reasons.

Many takedowns seem abusive, a.o. because their rules are not clear.

I do think that rights holders and industry groups have too much say in online content. The stupid thing is (to use music lyric videos as an example), even if the person uploading the video posts details of the song, the artist and copyright details, the content can still be taken down because it was "not authorised", which inadvertently stifles or reduces knowledge of the song/artist, which impacts legitimate sales. They are affecting their own bottom line in the pursuit of profit.

They have way too many say in that matter. The Internet has no borders and instead of blocking content in some countries rightsholders should instead come up with a service which legally allows you to consume thier content regardless of where you live e.g. it is sad that netflix for example wasnt avalabe in Austria until about a year ago and there was no other

service where you could watch movies or TV series in their original language legaly

I don't always understand

I appreciate Them taking some commercial content down, but common sense must be used and acceptance of credit given by small private users who have the inability to pay large licensing costs.

I think it ok. to have copyright and the right to restrict the usage of SELF PRODUCED COMMERCIAL stuff. Such as music for sale and movies for sale, books for sale, paintings for sale etc. - from professional artists. EVERY other thing made public must be AND STAY open source. Additionally the private user must have the right to withdraw every bit of his own self fabricatet data without exception - like a private copyright - only other private persons should be allowed to save these public private data for their private use without permission of the owner. Companies should NOT in ANY CASE be allowed to use data of any kind of private origin without especially expressed permission of the owner. Terms of use must NOT in ANY CASE be allowed which restrict users with global phrases to allow changing automatically the ownership of private data.I understand why some content is deleted when company owned copyrights for comercial products like mentioned above are violated. I do agree with deleting this data. BUT: Commercial copyright should end after 10 years without the possibility to prolong this ownership or selling it AT ALL for company owned copyright for products they have produced themselves (like mentioned above).Private copyright should NEVER END! AND private copyright should be allowed to be sold only ONE time. The buyer should NOT be allowed to sell ANY KIND of copyright bought from private entities.Copyrights should NOT be a trade good. NEVER!!!

Yes, & yes

No, what I read gets curiouser and curiouser - my tech knowledge gives no reason for most

I understand the right's holders point of view and understand that they don't want to give away expensively produced content for free. Still, I hold the opinion that they are extremely slow moving and that this is damaging to the creative industry itself. If you can't see what others do how can you improve on it? In other cases, I also noticed some overreactions or absurdities like the birthday song license

yes!! the laws concerning that are out of date. is it not possible to consider "sharing" to be a new form of distribution? in that model the *creators* should get some money for each "share." meanwhile the work is exposed to a wider audience. PLEASE NOTE that I said creators, not necessarily the "owners" of the work.

No, I think it's reasonable that the rightsholder, whether it be a company or an individual author, should absolutely have a say in whether or not a creation used or posted online without the permission of the author or the rightsholder, should be taken down. I may not agree with the share the agencies and the producers take off the authors' income, but in sharing copyrighted content, you're not just screwing over the company, but the author as well, and that simply cannot be.

These are two separate questions but yes to both

I sometimes understand but I certainly don't agree with some content being removed for poorly applied reasoning

a) Yes.b) Yes.

As I am an content creator myself I

understand the reasons very well. And copyrighted material should be removed if someone else makes a profit out of it. But the industry can act ridiculous sometimes, and way too restrictive and harsh for the sake of potential profits.

Yes. The overreach of copyright protections for rightsholders is malignant against average content users, and often skirting or breaking the law in its abuse of censorship-by-copyright

I do understand these reactions. They are trying to make money from it. But sometimes gifs and pictures which are being shared help to spread the knowledge of any franchise that is being distributed like that at a very low cost for the owner. So it is mostly just a matter of perspective that is needed.

no, unless it is that the story they tell doesn't fit the official narrative? I guess some might be removed for reasonable safety concerns, like protecting the identity of children, or something like that

Yes, I believe the film and music industries have way too much say in which content is taken down from the web. It's very petty when a home video is removed because it has a song from a commercial band

I gave in trying to understand why which content needs to be removed while other similar content doesn't seem to be a problem. Sometimes I think the big companies have too much power

I think that's just too petty. Yes they probably do have too much say

If it contravenes copyright it should be permitted to remove it. A person (or company) has a right to their intellectual property. However, if it is only removed because a particular industry does not approve, then yes, I

do think that they have too much say.

Yes. So often legal content get taken off. I do understand that material which is clearly illegal have to take off the Internet

Large media organizations collectively the rights holders for the vast majority of the web content have too much say over the mater. They arbitrarily cause important content to disappear without providing proper public explanation in plain language. This all causes me to question why some of the pictures, Videos etc. get taken down from web sites I visit frequently.

Yes i understand and support the ownership of rightholders and believe there should be respected incl. allowing ways like removing own content if this is mine. Having said this still those groups of rightholders should not be over representant in committees who decide about the way the internet works

In certain cases, yes. Especially in Germany with GEMA - we are unable to see many videos available elsewhere around the world.

I actually understand the rightholder. The creators of content, the artists, need to be protected

I think a fair balance needs to be struck between protecting intellectual property, and the freedom of individuals to share, create, innovate etc. Heavy handedness is not the answer

They should be allowed to take down their own content, yes. And yes, I do understand it

They have too much influence in this case

I think that copyright holders have a right to prevent free distribution of their copyrighted work.

Yes they do have too much say. The internet should be free for all to share and learn.

I understand the rightsholders positions, however changing copyright laws to ruin and take away public domain is wrong, and those involved should be penalized from removing public domain property. All for the sake of making them more money. The internet is there for sharing, and those that like what they see or hear, end up buying the rightsholders content. Especially with the legitimate avenues like iTunes and Google's Play Store.

(A) No. (B) yes

Yes, they are attempting to monopolise and censor what is freely shared and discussed online and must be stopped. I understand they may be attempting to protect their copyrights, but there is no reason why their copyright to limited information should be given priority over and above the free speech and sharing of knowledge and information in wider public, which is crucial for democracy and free-market capitalism to function.

I respect the copyright wherever it's necessary, but some ppl. overdo it sometimes. If something's not available anymore on CD/DVD and there's no way to buy it regularly, posting such content is rather "fair use". What's the sense of removing i. e. "The Chipmunk Adventure" from YouTube, when we Germans aren't even allowed to buy it from the US because the DVD or BluRay ain't available here in Germany (and won't for the next years or decades, whyever it's so)?

they are violently trying to hold on to a dying system.

Yes I do think they (rightsholders) have too much say over what content is taken down from the web. Sometimes it's hard

to understand the reasons behind the decision to take some content down

Righsholders should be in charge of their rights and decide themselves when they make them available online

Yes, the default appears to be a "shot first, get confirmation later" type of mentality

As far as I understand it, content gets taken down because the companies think, that leaving the content up will cause them pecuniary losses. At least that is always the argument, as far as I understand. I think they are wrong, and they will not have any losses. And yes, I think they have too much of a say. I think that the artist's opinions and preferences concerning their creations are also violated. Film and music industry do not serve the purpose of the artists, protecting their rights, rather they only work in their own interest. I think artists should have more control over their work, even if they use the music industry to produce and sell their work. Of course the music industry deserves a share of the profit, but the larger part should go to the artist, not to the industry as it is now

In some cases, censorship is too much

Usually the entity requiring content to be taken down is the company that pays the artist, not the artist himself.

I understand why some content is taken down, but I have also experienced situations where legitimate content has been removed by big companies who have no right to do so

They do have too much say.

If someone holds copyright then they logically should control its use on the web. Whether the copyright is overzealous in the first place is another matter. Sometimes copyright unnecessarily

restricts freedoms, sometimes it protects someones work. Don't know

Up to a certain point yes. People should get paid for their work, but the way it is usually being prosecuted and imposed the content the rightholders propose it's frightening and dangerous in a not so long term. This kind of policies are easy to turn into laws and force people to do things their own and only way

It is understandable that artists authors and those representing them need to make a living and that not all content can be freely accessible.

Yes, big business has to much power. The people are the ones to suffer from this. It kills creativity and cultural exchange. I have seen translated content from Asia been taken down as a consequence no one in the western world will ever see this content. That can not be a good thing! I have no problem with tackling straight up criminal piracy, but unfortunately it doesn't stop there.

Oh yes!

Yes, at times I do

It's getting more and more ridiculous. You can't even take pictures anymore without the risk to break some copyright laws.

Rightholders definitely have way too much to say in which content is taken down from the web. Only recently Sony removed content from Youtube that they didn't own, but only licensed. The original publisher had to fight back to get his own content back on the internet. These are not incidents and for original content creators there is hardly a way to fight those huge organisations

I understand, that those who hold the rights to a piece of media have the right

to defend it, and thus ask that unlawful uploads be taken down even if in many cases this has nothing to do with the interests or will of the creator of said media. And in quite a few cases this is not even in accordance with fair use legislations. With that said: the hyperlink structure and links themselves are NOT something you can own. That notion is as ridiculous as claiming a Road belongs to you because you painted a picture on the pavement

Yes they do.

Content already taken down too often for no good reason, don't understand why some things need to be taken down at all

in part, yes. i see the need to somehow suppress the sharing of complete works that are the base of revenue for the rights-holders, but there already are cases of restriction that are more than questionable. the case of hyperlinks – the online equivalent of pointing your finger and saying 'this one, over there', or calling a thing by its name – would mainly target discourse about things, not infringement on the rights to things. given what a touchy subject legal action against speech is already when based on law to uphold human rights, it's clear how unacceptably infringing it would be to allow rights-holders the ability to disallow speech they find inconvenient.

Producers should have a certain control of their material. Shure. I am a producer myself. But I consider it wrong that somebody in the USA may see something, I might not. Frontiers are not that relevant in the internet, that's a fact. So a video free to USA on Youtube should be free in EU as well. But again: Producers of images and films should have certain control about their material. But Snippets of Text in a serach engine is just necessary to make a informed decision where

to go. That should always be free.

Yes, they have to much say and content often gets unfairly removed.

Sometimes content is removed for no apparent reason

I understand that some copyrighted content gets removed, and I understand that. However, I do not understand why news material is deemed «unavailable» in my region.

Copyright rules are already broken and should not be applied to everyday linking on Twitter and Facebook. Uses of parody and humour, such as funny gifs, should be acceptable uses of copyrighted content, but are often removed automatically without any way to appeal the removal of content.

yes, they have too much power online and I understand why some content can be removed

I understand that Youtube videos featuring content copied or adapted verbatim, through tactics as adding a frame around a video, or having some unrelated 'cover art' accompany a music track that is licensed, should not yield profits for the infringing uploaders, and should yield profits to the rightful owners, or be taken down. However I'm going to have to draw the line on citations. As per Dutch law, discussing an article, or voicing an opinion on a creative work usually involves a reasonable form of citation. 'Citing' in video form often concerns using a fragment of a licensed work. Commenting on such a work is a unique creative work in itself, and in my opinion should be possible as speech. Overreach on behalf of the content owners of content cited usually stifles the work of critics and commentary in general. Shows, especially concerning political subjects and opinions need to be able to be discussed.

This often requires citing or referring the subject matter itself. I often find that criticism (say a bad review on a game accompanying footage of a game failing) is valid and valuable, and have seen that footage of games has been used to censor such criticism and review. This I consider to be gross overreach. The line is often very clear in distinguishing what is a derived work 'in name only', fake criticism to mask the illegitimate upload of a licensed work. Works that only 'coincidentally' happen to contain other works, such as home recordings with radio or TV broadcasts in the background, tend to degrade the original work to such a degree, that I do not consider these to be 'usable' to pirate an original work. Taking them down on that basis, is something that I consider to be rather heavy handed, as often the home recording itself would be it's own work. A compromise for instance could be reached, if an 'offending' work in the background could be blocked out, which is especially simple in the case of audio. It can also be said that radio broadcasts are usually already paid for by taxpayers via some separate, older tax, such as is the case in the Netherlands (kijk- en luistergelden) by all citizens. Although this does not cover (extensive) retransmission and broadcast of the original work by its listeners, it is somewhat fair to assume that when something is broadcast over the medium of TV and / or radio, that it will be present in a pervasive manner, that replaying / recording the work unintentionally cannot be regarded as an infringement. I could, by those strict standards, claim public space by broadcasting my own privately licensed works in public space, and then have all public recordings censored citing my content rights.

Two questions: Yes- Yes

YESNO

yes and no,

I have a rough idea of the reasons, but I don't think taking off legal content from the Internet is a solution to the copyright problem.

Yes, definately

I think that these publishers have far too much influence over the web. All they have to do is make a complaint, and hosting services (like YouTube) instantly comply, with no scrutiny of the copyright claim

Yes. They have way too much say already and don't need any more rights online than they already have. Yes. Content is taken down due to intellectual property rights

I get why content is taken down. If it obviously infringes copyright and hurts the creator and this creator is not credited for the work, measures should be taken. But the way music and films are consumed today is so much different than it was 10 years ago, it appears the rights holders still live in the past when it comes to availability of content. It's much more their own fault than the fault of the user.

Rightholders stifle free speech and a free evolution of the Internet. I never understand - from a legal standpoint - why content can be removed.

•Different countries in the EU have different rules on what use of copyright material is permitted, making it difficult for Internet users to know if what they are doing is legal.

All this copyright discussion is not about the rights of the authors but about those who market content. They should vanish for ever together with their old business models.

Copyrights are important, nevertheless these should not be an excuse

to limit internet access

Fair use must be respected

I can see this as the “anti pirate bay” legislation, which would prevent websites that share links to copyright content without hosting the content themselves from hiding behind the “we don’t host the content, just a link to something available elsewhere” argument all the time. However it’s a dangerous precedent, and won’t solve the problem, DHT (distributed hash tables) already provide a link-free way to find such content by the use of so-called “magnet links”, and even the aged “.torrent” file format, is a link to a link to something that is copyrighted, not a direct link, so would arguably not be covered. That leaves regular web links, and publishers such as news papers, and whistle blowers such as Aaron Schwarz, who have, or link to publicly available content - and then question becomes one of liability, vs. visibility vs. accountability... If people make web links public for the benefit of search engines, but try to block humans from using them, or try and sue journalists who expose information that is public. The responsibility should lay with the provider of the content, to make it available securely, and selectively... and in cases where content is stolen, or being distributed illegally, other laws are already in place.

No I dont really care about that issue as regards rightholders

we need to create universal fair use rights to balance the rights of the public and the individual rightholders

Yes I do. On the other hand, the Internet never forgets. Once it’s there, it’s there forever and any attempt to remove it only increases the popularity of the content.

Yes these rightholders have far too

much power together with all these secret services and governments all around the world. Otherwise there would not be this passenger name record in Europe. Otherwise there would not be this outrages trying to reinstall Safe-Habour and otherwise there would not be this sniffing around in our financial transactions and bank-accounts! And also otherwise there would not be all this downtaking of the music-platforms which we Linux-Users set up (Spotify, Groveshark and others) and otherwise these film-lobbyists would not try to buy our courts and abusing them agains us filesharers!! Stop these lobbyists!! Stop the EU-Commission! Stop the us-government and the british government from spying out our data and abusing our data!!

yes, although much content is removed unneccesarily

yes, I respect that content must be protected but has become to expensive and controlled.

Yes, I think corporations have too much say in this matter, which is a matter of public concern and ought to be decided by public consent. I understand that there are rules about what can and can’t be shared on the Internet and how things are shared (see creative commons) and I think common sense ought to apply which does not mean the common sense of corporations and politicians or some elite but the common sense of the vast majority of humanity who are using the internet to create a better world for us all

Yes. I am a copyrights holder and I understand the system clearly. It is flawed as it currently exists as virtual media is clearly not the same substance as printed media, being transient and temporary. Copyright laws need to be updated to insure freedom of

speech and flow of information

They do have too much say and I do not understand why some content (e.g., pictures, videos, gifs) get taken off the Internet.

I'm too ignorant to have an opinion.

I don't understand the process

Yes to both questions

I understand why some content get taken off the net, but most of the times the reason is not fair

Yes, they have too much say. For instance, taking down unfavourable reviews or parodies

Yes, in the sense that they have too much say in how expensive and legally risky it is to keep certain content on the web. While the law may allow the content, it can be far too expensive to get a court ruling saying so, and can expose the webhost to unreasonably large liability should the court find the content infringing. Thus, upon a complaint, most content is treated as guilty of infringement until proven innocent

Yes, I believe corporations have too much say in which content is taken down from the web, and I don't understand why some content get taken off the Internet.

I do not understand why some things get taken off the internet.

I don not think that rightsholders have the right for this

this is not something they should have 100% permission to do! A short explanation with a link to the original content should be left behind each time something is taken offline. Also there should be a systematic way to "count" and aggregate each action so that we can get a big picture.

This is the type of thinking that belongs to the previous century ... There are new business models today that can very well make the right holders more money and there are many capable people out there who can help the rights holders in this direction Look at Spotify, etc..

Yes, I believe that rights-holders have been given too much say. On the contrary, regulations should be in favour of the public for ensuring freedom of expression and access to information and knowledge for everybody.

Yes, they do. Yes.

Yes. And I think they often abuse that power.

Yes. For example, it's way too easy to take down a video from youtube if you are a rights holder. There is almost no way to even contest the claims.

I do think they have too much say in that. If a content is to be copyright protected it should never be published. Otherwise this kind of policy towards protecting rightsholders (usually not the real creator or owner but some bigger company publishing the work) can give rise to really unfair behavior from rightsholders. An extreme example is that it could even come to the point when a publisher of a song could demand everyone singing (not as performance but even in their own home by themselves) or listening to their songs a fee or tax. It might seem far-fetched but currently if you buy any physical media (writable CD/DC, memory card, etc.) that is capable of recording (in any format) any copyrighted material you are required by law to pay an extra tax (in Hungary). This implies that you are going to use the media to store material on it for which you have not paid. Therefore it is automatically assumed that you are planning to violate copyright laws in a way or another. The

second thing is not strictly copyright related but still about rights. There has been abuse of its rights by Monsanto to get someone pay for something they never intended to grow on their land (Monsanto crops were grown on the land next to the person in question and some of that crop spread to his land therefore giving the legal right to Monsanto to sue this person). The moral of the story is that any company or individual might impose something unfair if rightsholders get even more rights and they can lobby for whatever they wish to achieve. This whole system is flawed because we are all entitled to rights as well as the rightsholders (that is using our senses and living our lives without having to pay for everything that suits corporate agenda). Whenever they lobby for their rights the rights of everyone else seems to be forgotten.

I think it depends on the situation and that's what copyrights and trademarks are for

I understand that they need to control their content, but at this moment they have the right and the practical waz to remove, but they bear no practical responsibility for false removals. The average person cannot defend his own content against large companies and copyright organizations.

To follow up to question one, very often I have seen acceptable or legal content removed by automatic systems ("bots") that remove content regardless of context, permissions or other mitigating factors. Often there is no way to appeal this process or be informed or contacted ahead of time it is creating a culture where large IP holders can more or less bully the public into doing what they want with very few repercussions.

Yes, I feel that rightholders do have too much to say.

I do because no longer can we say listen to my music to someone else, even if we buy it legally. They sell us something and then tell us we can't even use it on another of our own devices. Imagine if a Sony CD could only be played on a Sony CD Player. This is what is happening to the internet. My friends can't lend me music for a party because it's tied to a only their computer

How and why would hyperlinks be copyrighted? Uses of parody and humour should be acceptable uses of copyrighted content.

The problem is that the rights-holders are all old-men that fail to understand the value of the free advertisement they're getting off people. They get their way just because they have money

I do not believe that links should be copyrighted, only content. If a portion of content is peripheral to the item posted it should not be cause for removal of the post. At times there may be legitimate cause for removal of content but there must be a mechanism in place fair to both sides. Rights holder, the more powerful they are, intimidate providers and posters

Sometimes they do but I also think an adjustment is needed when it comes to our (mine included) attitude to and respect for original creative work and the individual who created it. If the music industry in particular however hadn't been so greedy for so long (pre internet) perhaps people would have a different attitude now.

Yes, they have too much say, and no, I don't fully understand

I do indeed believe rightsholders have too much to say in a number of matters. Although I see why things get take off the web, I disagree in how it makes them lose money. There's numerous that provide

their content for free, to let people hear or see it, before deciding whether it's worth purchasing or not. I am one of those that like to view/hear/experience videos, music, or similar things to know whether it's worth the money or not

Yes they have too much say and although I can of course understand why some content gets taken down, legislators pay far more attention to the wants of rightsholders than they do to the electorate - which is unjust, and means that would ultimately result in the ability and freedom to use the internet being negatively impacted upon for socio-economically disadvantaged internet users. It's blatant elitism/classism. anything else is simply pandering to vested interests. vested interests have more say than the individual citizen.

I understand, however fair use should be possible. Also, blocking content will not get them more profit. On the contrary, it will create a bad sentiment for those companies

I understand that many artists need to make money based on royalties and liscencing sometimes, but it still seems unfair I can't see that content and often don't know why

Yes. I understand why it is removed in the case of copyright, but most often

There's a line between Fair Use and copyright infringement. All too often I feel rights holders feel their intellectual properties or copyrights are threatened, or will be threatened, and take immediate action instead of considering the situation. Do pirates exist? Does copyright infringement of many kinds exist? Yes. But it's not excuse to label content creators and boogymen and commit to an extreme prejudice policy of stifling

the usage of any kind of material. But this action is so inconsistent one has to wonder why right's holders bother the way they do when a dozen uploads of a song on YouTube can exist for years untouched and a gameplay video from a videogame gets flagged. There's a modicum of moderation to be found here

The real problem is that the rights holders are never the actual creators but rather big corporations.

Yes, reasonable uses of protected material (e.g., incidental use) should not be vilified

Yes they do. There have been many stories of content incorrectly taken down, without genuine investigation

Yes and despite what some rights-holders say, hyperlinks themselves should not be copyrighted. Copyright rules are already broken and should not be applied to everyday linking on Twitter and Facebook.

Yes they have far too much power

I do understand that right holders want to protect their content, they should have the last word in taking down content from a site if they own the copyrights. However I am against preemptive taking down of content as it often prevents creating derivative work or fair use.

I think that content on the web should stay on the web, unless there is a good reason to remove it. Not just political, or to keep the public in the dark

Too much is taken down, but some rights must be judiciously preserved

I think there is a lack of counterbalance if material is blocked despite being legal. I do understand why some content do get removed but I also think the current commercial

copyright terms are ridiculously long

No, I believe in democracy more than the wish of publishers to control the use of public comment, examination and communication of what occurs and is expressed online.

Yes. This can result in people getting unfairly penalised despite using content fairly

not sure bout that ...intellectual property rights i imagine,

They do have too much power, yes. I don't understand.

They hold all the cards as far as content creators go, they have the back up from legal teams worth millions of euros that normal people who, under fair use should be allowed to repurpose with respect to the original, wouldn't be able to pay for at all

Save the Link question 3:

Do you believe platforms such as SoundCloud, Twitter, or YouTube should face regulations requiring them to monitor your Internet activity, or filter and remove content you produce and share? Or should alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs?

European Commission consultation question:

Mere conduit/caching/hosting describe the activities that are undertaken by a service provider. However, new business models and services have appeared since the adopting of the E-commerce Directive. For instance, some cloud service providers might also be covered under hosting services e.g. pure data storage. Other cloud-based services, as processing, might fall under a different category or not fit correctly into any of the existing ones. The same can apply to linking services and search engines, where there has been some diverging case-law at national level. Do you think that further categories of intermediary services should be established, besides mere conduit/caching/hosting and/or should the existing categories be clarified?

Total number of responses: 1833

Unique responses: 1456

"No, I am strongly opposed to internet platforms being required to carry out monitoring or filtering of users' content. This is a quasi-judicial role that private companies are neither competent nor empowered to carry out. It ignores the due process of law, of any description."

Monitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression. • When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for, and are very likely this delicate balance wrong. • When individuals monitor content they apply their own individual quirks and morality, often inconsistently.

"Infringement" shouldn't be illegal

Court of law, or at least some serious user protest

I oppose censorship by platforms and am in favour of the latter option.

should be decided by a court

Monitoring should not occur without proven infringement

I do not believe in supervision by anybody, unless there is a legal requirement, proven before a legal court.

Websites should not be required to monitor the internet activity of their users. The amount of people using these services and amount of content uploaded every hour would make this incredibly impractical.

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before applying censorship. The EU Commission has proposed an idea that would require platforms to censor the web by monitoring and removing content posted by Internet users. I do not support this so-called 'duty of care' provision in the Digital Single Market plan. When individuals monitor content they apply their own unique quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity.

I do not believe in the censorship that will happen if say twitter has to enforce, at will, as they will err on the side of caution, stifling free speech!

They shouldn't face regulations of that kind. This would only serve content marketing but not the common public. Therefore it's in the interest of the public to keep this as free as possible.

No, they should be focusing on making their service better for their users. Whenever they remove content that is not inflammatory, racist or morally problematic. This is probably more important to be on the lookout for

No and Yes

No Yes

No, platforms should not perform this role. But it should if possible be undertaken by an independent institution. Postings which incite to hate, terrorism, discrimination etc. should be taken down automatically, with a right to judicial review for those who posted it. Others may need to be put to a court before removal.

no censorship

second

yes, I do think that some kind of monitoring is ok. If a violation is suspected, initial takedown should be quick. But if the takedown is challenged by the uploading user, it should be reverted immediately and, upon demand of the alleged copyright holder, be proven in a court of law.

While automated processes may result in unfairly removing/blocking legal content, if it is monitored by humans, those who monitor tend to exercise their "value judgements", so that there will always be a risk that their decisions will be biased, prejudiced and inconsistent. Example provided by "savethelink": Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity. The question is also whether it is appropriate for the websites to judge what is legal and what is not. They are not courts of law, after all.

It should be proven in a court of law.

Court of Law. Too often unpopular not illegal points of view have been monitored or removed

They should not be forced to do this themselves

sounds right

No. Infringement should be proven

before a removal could be forced.

I am against all regulations that monitor. I strongly believe in free speech as a necessary way to deep democracy and higher awareness for all. Even when I disagree to certain views that are published. I cherish the freedom to express ourselves.

there should be no censorship!

Privacy is equally valid on the internet as in anywhere else.

Not sure

The EU Commission has proposed an idea that would require platforms to censor the web by monitoring and removing content posted by Internet users. I do not support this so-called 'duty of care' provision in the Digital Single Market plan. Monitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression. When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for, and are very likely to get the balance wrong. When individuals monitor content they apply their own unique quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity. And settling these types of disputes in courts is just a waste of juridical resources. The courts should be prosecuting and punishing criminals instead of enforcing broken copyright laws that haven't been actualised since the times of the printing press. Society has changed fundamentally since then, and so should copyright laws.

no

no, alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law

I don't think it is the role of companies

to filter and/or remove content. It leads to inconsistencies which can be viewed in Facebook policies, for example.

no. the best monitoring and control is done on a broad scale- every person making their own judgement and response, then these either adding or not adding up to some consensus

Monitoring is a waste of energy and it gives «monitors» a huge level of power that is unfair

Arbitration maybe before going to a court would be fair

1) The internet has allowed for a mass content creation. Such regulations would limit possibilities offered by the creation and sharing of content. Additionally, it would be very possible that platforms over do the monitoring and filtering to avoid problems, and that in turn could make people refrain from posting content if it is only to be taken down soon. It is a vicious circle that should not be fed. 2) Alleged infringements should be proven in a court only if it can be proven that a remunerated illegal activity is taking place. By expanding copyright exceptions, many currently infringement cases would not even be taken to court

no, the internet should be kept open, the producer should be responsible for the content, not the platform.

It is impractical in almost every way for the owners of platforms like Twitter and YouTube to monitor all of the content that users post. An enforcement of this will inevitably lead to overly broad filters that will impede people from using their freedom of speech.

I think it has to be proven in a court of law. Otherwise they can remove anything they disagree with whether others do or not

Alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law before censorship is allowed.

Not required!!! The companies do self regulate and often use political correctness and not reality. Self regulation should be subject to open and even fielded protection for those who they censor and the 3 strikes and you shut out will fester a sore known as a class system which leads to loss of free thought. The censor and the privately ran process for reinstatement of removed items must be open to liable challenge in legal courts of the country of the listing persons origin

No. This is spying. If there is an alleged infringement, take it to court

I do NOT believe that social media should be able to monitor internet activity not directly connected with their service. And if content is blocked or removed, there should be an appeals process possible. But having to bring every "infringement" to a court of law is not sensible.

No, as with any infringement, it should need to be proven.

no they shouldn't monitor our activity and alleged infringements should be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

No, I do not believe internet platforms such as the above should be required to monitor user activity, because it will inevitably be taken out of hand and ultimately result in a Zero Tolerance Policy across the board. Fair Rights usage would be threatened, and even minor instances where no harm is intended would be turned against the user(s) to unduly punish them.

It should be proven in a court, obviously

legal action before infringement

should be proven

No platform no matter how big or small should be able to censor content based on unreliable data, as often provided by media corporations. Furthermore, no one's data should ever be monitored, no matter the reason.

In the Commission's Digital Single Market plan, they proposed the idea of a 'duty of care' that would require intermediaries to proactively monitor, and remove content posted by Internet users on their platform. Monitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression. When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for, and are very likely this delicate balance wrong. When individuals monitor content they apply their own individual quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity.

NO!

Court of law ofcourse

Yes

infringement must be proven

Any alleged infringement MUST be proven in a court of law. Anything LESS is nothing more than hearsay and censorship!

Of course alleged infringement will have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs. Free speech is both a fundamental right in, and a foundational characteristic of, [a] modern democracy.

The rights holders should need to prove that they actually own the rights before content is removed.

No they should not filter or remove, and should be proven in a court of law before

Alleged infringement would need to be argued at court. Suppliers and providers can't be engaged in the business of censorship. If anything, offending content is the responsibility of the poster.

They can filter but mot charge me for the content I place on there plateform. They are juste a tool, a récipient, a plateform NOT LÉGI\$LATOR\$!

Infringement should be proven first

No. There must be no censorship of the internet. Any alleged infringement needs to be proved in a court of law! This must not be left to private companies to determine

No. Infringement should have to be proven in court before censorship is enacted. If content is censored before it is ruled by an impartial and official party, the censorship is unfounded

No, and yes

Proved in court

Any alleged infringement must be proven in a court of law before a link or content are censored. Freedom of speech and communication must apply everywhere, including Internet. It is not acceptable that either content-producers (publishers, media, etc.) or intermediaries have a say in what we say or transmit.

NOT AT ALL.. So called infringement should be made to be proven

responsibility should land on the poster - give them (via the website the post is on) the request to take it down so it can be challenged fairly - sharing platforms only responsibility should be passing on the request

ABSOLUTELY NOT. The current policing system works well enough, and giving

corporations permission to track individuals is an incredibly sticky slope for Human Rights in general

Unless content blatantly flaunts human rights or is degrading or indecent, infringement should have to be proven in a court of law

No. I should be proven on court of course.

No, they should not monitor internet activity. Yes, it has to be proven in a court of law.

Should be proven in court. "Innocent until proven guilty" should mean something.

Any platform shouldn't face this type of regulations.

Although I have no belief in the court being fair, it would be better than the despotism that is in place now.

It should never be up to the judgement of companies what is legal or illegal that is not their task. Having to go to court of law first might be a step too far, but I imagine there can be a middle way. Also, I don't think online activities should be monitored at all, again, censorship is only a step away. Content can be reported on afterwards if deemed racist, illegal, etc. by anyone.

No, no censoring. Gathering of personal data such as results of such monitoring is insecure such requirements by government are unacceptable. It's publisher/platform's responsibility to show content only appropriate to their audience.

Infringement has to be proven first. All platforms must not be held responsible for what the users share.

No. Yes

No. Proven in court.

no, and have them prove it

That would be a good system only for small services, where qualified individuals could go through content case-by-case. However, with huge platforms, like Youtube, that is impossible to achieve. Automated systems will have a huge margin of error on removing content that is still not infringing anything.

I think that Internet platforms are not the court of law, and that they should not under any circumstances be given the rights or duties of a court of law. Censorship is a very dangerous thing and any case related to it should be deliberated on by the court. Also, making Internet platforms censor content will shift the burden of legal proof disproportionately to the Internet users: they will have to go to court and prove that their content should not have been removed. Most companies have a legal department, most Internet users do not. In any case that concerns human rights there should exist a presumption of innocence, and the issues of censorship certainly fall under that category

The latter

No and a resounding yes. They must prove their case first otherwise it is the same as tyranny.

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

Nobody should monitor my internet activity. I'm tired of being spied on wherever I go. Especially, as most of the spying results in more ads and commercials targeted me especially. And yes, alleged infringement should be decided by a court, not people with money. They don't have more right, just because they can apply more pressure. On the

contrary, they are more in the wrong.

Well, it depends whether it is non commercial use or commercial use. If it should go to court, it will often be very expensive for non commercial users, both if they win or lose.

Biased

No one should be allowed to monitor innocent people. Infringement should be proven in court.

You can't have algorithms replacing due process in courts, but I don't know how this would work in practice. We can't have courts being flooded with millions of website infringements. That would be a panacea for lawyers

It has to be proven by court of law.

alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

Corporations should not be given (or trusted with) this kind of oversight responsibility without some legal process that is transparent and open to challenge from interested parties

Big Brothers' surveillance whether state agencies or private enterprises is a curse to free society and should be banned and hunted down forever

It is an impossible task for the platforms to police net activity and will shut them down if they are forced to comply

I don't think companies should be forced to monitor all our activity on the internet. Some services do track a lot of activity, often to improve services, but for people, who like less tracking, no options would be left, if tracking user activity is mandatory.

The latter. Internet services should not

be required to monitor user content as that quickly leads to censorship.

My opinion is that social media platforms should provide tools for the community to flag up inappropriate content (eg. pornography, child abuse, animal abuse), and any semi-automated or automated systems should have human oversight. I believe these systems are already in place on Facebook and YouTube and work pretty well. I believe that infringement from a legal point of view should definitely be aligned with the offline world, where the infringement must be proven through a legal process before action is taken. Obviously any user who faces a legal challenge still has the choice to remove any alleged infringing material if they feel the challenge is legitimate

I don't believe individual websites are qualified to make censorship decisions on users' content. This will result in inconsistent censorship.

Do not regulate my activity. Period.

Prove it

I think that's a hard problem..

Some content is simply not fit for a site like youtube for example, and youtube should have the right to control what content is on their site. Taking every censorship to a court of law would be too time consuming

Of course not. Yes, definitely.

I do not support monitoring of my internet activity. Such alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

They should establish clear policies and only enforce those policies (aka terms of use on their site)

No...unless the content is promoting hate and violence

Alleged infringement have to be proven before they can gain acces to change our content.

No service provider should monitor its users - and such regulations is just a power grab by the mafiaa and like-minded entities.Court process should be mandatory for censoring anything.

No, the Internet has to stay free. Sharing is caring.

Absolutely not ! If the politicians and the bureaucrats can't cope with free communication and transparency, they should step down from their self-centered "high heavens" - notice the quotation marks !

No censorship without prior proof in court of law

Yes, please!

Prove it in court of law

It's unreasonable to expect websites to monitor all user-created content, and requiring them to do so can and will effectively kill many small players in the game

I think that if the content is obviously not my own, it should be taken down on request (like sharing a current run movie) Otherwise, yes there should be some sort of dispute resolution

Proactive monitoring would have to be implemented by machines due to the number of posts. If this was then filtered by a website, they are more likely to remove content and play it safe. This will have a chilling effect on freedom of speech.

Absolutely not. 'Innocent until proven otherwise.' Each individual case may not need to go through the court but the rules must be clear and the same for everyone.

Online platforms must NOT be required to monitor my online activity. Of course most platforms collect some logs about user behaviour, but requiring a comprehensive monitoring scheme by law would be outrageous.

All censorship should go through legal channels

To protect freedom of expression it is essential that content should only be removed as following due legal process. Content hosting platforms should not be required to monitor and censor content even in the most extreme cases. Automated systems will not be able to make accurate judgements on what is or is not acceptable and as hosting companies will wish to avoid potential liability this will result in excessive censorship

No they should not have to monitor my internet activity. Any infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before any censorship occurs

Monitoring burden should be done by those that care and not be foisted on others (unless they offer). However if a court determines something is infringing then those that are distributing must stop.

No. Illegal activity should be proven before actions are taken

No.No. Something between.

I think that perhaps a court case would be better suited, such as a dispute tribunal or other such mediation process. Litigation is not a good way to deal with censorship. Litigation will instigate a war on the rightsholders, much like what happened

with Lars Ulrich from Metallica, when he went to court with regards to people downloading their music for free from the internet. No one likes antisocial behaviour. In the case of censorship for the sake of limiting knowledge shared between users (i.e., keeping people in the dark), that is just blatant fascism, which is intolerable and will result in the aforementioned resistance to those preventing people access to information and the right to transparency. FB is a great example of hypocrisy when it comes to selectively removing content. Female nipples are banned, yet male nipples are fine, and hate-speech is perfectly acceptable. I understand the hate speech from the point of view that it breaches the right to freedom of speech, but all in all, we are at the same time banned from exercising our freedom of speech on FB by expressing ourselves with pictures instead of words. There are FB pages inciting violence against minority groups, rape violence against women, and animal abuse to the extreme. Seriously screwed up. And this is right up there

If I want to express how I feel, or get my point across, on Facebook, by using a music file from another website, I don't want my freedom to do this debilitated. Corporations should find ways to make money, that don't limit freedom of speech, listening and reading. In what case, there'd be no reason for such activity in legal court.

The latter...innocent until proven guilty, and only with legitimate grounds.

No platform should be forced to monitor activity on behalf of any third party except under judicial review. Any alleged infringement needs to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs. It is not acceptable that the principle of guilty until proven innocent be applied to internet content or its users. Corporations should not have the ability to dictate what can/

cannot be viewed, consumed, created online based on the individual beliefs of individual shareholders, who generally do not possess the legal expertise necessary. This is a fundamental principle of the internet that needs to be upheld

Any sort of mass-monitoring should not be allowed. Any content taken down must be proven to have been infringing on some law, and the decision must be disputable

It should be proven, especially as active regulations by companies could easily lead to censorship of politically unwanted material while claiming copyright infringement.

NO! However most all courts of law are corrupt, and ultimately will NOT make the difference. The very best protection lies with the organizations created and run by the people. Questionnaires like this, and the voices of the masses need to be presented at the highest levels.

Privacy is every European constitutional right, only when it involves terroristic threats an exception should be allowed to be made

No they should not have the right automatically, I think it would have to be proven in the eyes of law first.

Legal proof in a court of law should be required. The game of account deletion is an abuse of power and should be condemned.

No.

No. Privacy and the ability to speak freely are fundamental requirements of freedom in society

Obvious Pornography should not be on face book, but the other is more a matter of a person searching for it..

Alleged infringement should absolutely have to be proven in a court of law before any censorship occurs, to do otherwise would be plain criminal.

Definitely NOT

Alleged infringement should absolutely have to be proven in court before censorship occurs: that's what a legal system is FOR, after all

No regs

No censorship. Caveat Emptor & self due diligence

Companies that host content don't represent the law and don't have tools to judge. They shouldn't be the ones ruling what is "acceptable" or not. Especially when this ruling is set in automated rules that cannot grasp the complexity of human communication and unnecessarily censor information, while they are so easy to bypass.

no and yes.

every infringement should be proven before any measure is taken.

I think platforms such as those mentioned should monitor content for obvious inappropriate activity (porn, erroneous material, etc.) to an extent and remove content when notified of an outright violation of propriety. In some cases, infringements will lead to court action, when a party needs to pursue its cause or feels ingregiously attacked.

How many times I saw educational content blocked because of a rights-holder request? How cynical they are? We were university students, not thieves. Please stop harass freedom of speech: citation, parody, humour, etc. rights are fundamental to sustain our Democracies. And these come

far above any kind of private interest. Please read Victor Hugo again. If somebody broke my car, I can't just say « it's John » and get money from John's insurance. There're rules, laws, attorneys, judges, courts... It's not the far-west. Internet is not a far-west neither. The same rules and laws should apply. Nowadays, some rights-holders are just acting like cowboys.

I believe all content should be allowed, except for (1) hateful, terrorist inspiring trash with no redeeming content, after a thorough review and (2) copyrighted works used beyond "fair use", as determined by a court of law

I ABSLOUTELY DO NOT think SoundCloud, Twitter, or YouTube have any business whatsoever monitoring anyone's Internet activity! If there seems to have been an infringement of the law, it must be proven in a court of law and a decision must be handed down. Vigilantism is a social poison to be avoided at all costs!

No & Yes

The latter, surveillance has too many points of failure

No, requiring sites to monitor everyone is ridiculous and invasive. And like all crimes, they must be proven legally in court before any punishment is meted out

I understand that monitoring must be done in order to protect young people or to stop incitement to violence, sexism or hatred of any kind(including terrorists' values). I have not idea how this can be done without some form of monitoring.

Aucune censure sans procès

No censorship, unless mandated by a judge

It has to be proven by a court, otherwise you are not in a free country

If a copyright holder can prove to an IP that protected information is being used without consent, they can ask it be taken down. If it is not, then the copyright holder should have to use the courts

Needs to be proven

If the content is criminal and proven to be so it could be removed following a justified complaint. If not, there should be no censorship. The platforms should be monitored only by their users.

Yes, it shouldn't be up to the companies to remove things for subjective or vague reasons

These platforms should absolutely not be forced to monitor and filter our content. There's already far too sweeping and broad laws on this, which can cause rather serious problems for YouTube content creators, as a DCMA strike on youtube will result in restrictions on your account, regardless of whether the DCMA claim is legitimate or not, and with people making a living off of making content for the internet these days, this could have potentially disastrous consequences. We've already seen this happen multiple times. I believe a better system could be put in place, where alleged infringements are reviewed, but in the end, the responsibility of proving that an infringement is actual infringement and not just a company or intellectual property holder abusing the power given to them by today's broken laws, lies with the holder of those rights, not with the person allegedly infringing and certainly not with content distributors like YouTube and soundcloud - the core of our justice system is, after all, "innocent until proven guilty"

I think there should be some monitoring of content but I don't have an opinion as to who should do it and why that group, organization, institution, platform and

not another. There is online bullying that should be stopped somehow -- no idea how. There is also lots of recruitment for jihadism and that must be stopped somehow too. I DO think Twitter should be required to take down jihadist accounts but, beyond that, I don't think platforms should be required to monitor or filter activity in any way shape or form.

Yes to court-- no to automatic regulation.
Very badly worded question

Platforms should not ever have to monitor users' activity. Whatever the reason. On the other hand, whenever an offending content is reported, it should be manually inspected. People inspecting the content should follow a determined written policy, and if necessary, should be able to ask the assistance of legally recognized advisors. For example, nudity should not be a banning reason, unless the platform specifies it clearly in its user conditions. On the other hand, racist, insulting or anti-gay speeches should not be permitted, as they are not even legal. If an offending user keeps recidiving after being warned, it is normal to ban him.

NO. It is not possible or desirable for them to do this. That would be like making the phone company liable for nasty phone calls

When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for, and are very likely this delicate balance wrong. When individuals monitor content they apply their own individual quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity.

No to first part, yes to second part.

Alleged infringement must be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs?

No, if those who claim infringement are willing to cover court costs, and nuisance suits are dealt with in the spirit they are presented (a farce).

If it's related to any Criminal or Terrorist activity, it should be removed without recourse to a Court of Law

Computer-based monitoring of content is regularly inefficient and irrelevant. Policing content ONLY by legal action in court is not practicable either (lengthy, costly). Some middle way has to be found.

No and yes, how can you know it's infringement if it's not proven.

No, we don't need the thought police. No need for censorship either

No to regulations requiring monitoring. Yes, the alleged infringement should be proven in court

Always in court

Difficult - some content is just not right and should be removed. There should be a very good reason for removal.

No, I don't believe such monitoring is a good idea.

The law should be there to protect everybody not simply those with financial 'muscle' therefore I think infringement should be proved in the courts

No, DMCA and similar regulations are broken and often abused,

Court of law prior to censorship

They should be tried in a court of law. I would consider it acceptable to have a fast track for this sort of disputes, but it should not happen as a routine administrative task - there should be clear rules for the obvious transgressions, the rest should go to court

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs. Please don't facilitate censorship. Corporations already have too much political power - they don't need any more.

FREEDOM!

I prefer a court of law, justice and equality.

no censorship, freedom of information sharing between users (kids should not be allowed unsupervised access to internet anyway as they have loads of other activities to do during growing up), that's THE ONLY thing guaranteeing freedom. Not some bullshit regulations 'to protect' this and that, no thanks!

No, duty of care amounts to censorship

No, I don't believe there should be such controls

NO. liberty before law.

beyond obvious, fair, and legally sound house-rules, censorship should not be the task of platforms.

No. I believe that if no profit is being made from the sharing of content (in the case of bootleg DVDs), and that all rights are attributed to the content creators, then I think there is no problem.

We live in 2015 this question alone shouldnt even be asked! What you do on the Internet should not be monitored until a court sees it necessary for an investigation, I dont think we want organisations like the Stasi or the SS back. The freedom of speech and privacy is very important in a Democracy and we should never sacrifice it for some illusion of safety.

Infringement should be proven in court

Absolutely not.

These platforms should not have the right or the obligation to touch or monitor these data AT ALL. The user is responsible for his stuff. The user owns his texts and his self produced data. If laws are violated, only the user should be taken responsible for it. NO kind of monitoring should be allowed. Only a court should have the right to allow the monitoring of persons in special cases - and this person should be made aware of it. If to many other user complain about an especially rude user, nude content or any other kind of content, this account should be allowed to be deleted. But NOT the person be restricted/ thrown out of this platform. Bullies will get disciplined by the community.

Outside regulations should not require them to monitor activity. All alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

Copyright infringement needs to be proven in court, like any infringement in any other media

Socalled "social media" is dangerous enough - legalese and corporate "RIGHTS" trick human brains out

I believe that content creators and right holders should be viewed as equals and that we need strong laws to protect freedom of expression through whatever means, including remixing existing content, as long as it is not outright plagiarism. I feel that the feedback loop would have to be shortened: For example, if I post a video that contains infringing material, I should be noticed immediately and then get the opportunity to change the video or to contest the infringement statement

It is the automated monitoring of the internet that results in machines deciding what we can and can not see. Allowing censorship on this level is a very large

part of the problem. Imagine a time when robots patrol shopping centres blacking out entire shop windows

don't be silly. see my answer to the previous question

YouTube etc. should be monitoring what is posted on their website

They should not monitor anything! Personal rights count higher than copyrights.

I don't think platforms should be monitoring my Internet activity.

a) No.b) Yes.

Proven in a court of law.
Censorship is unacceptable.

The second, but as this is costly and complicated to do already, I understand the idea to get a new law on the way. But I think it is the wrong way nevertheless.

No to question one. These Website-Host are not nearly qualified to act like they are in full authority to interfere with anything that is posted and not liked by them. When this is given through individuals they most likely ban things from websites on their own behalf based on their morality.

Difficult question. There are reasonable concerns, like when somebody broadcasts beforehand that he intends to go and shoot up a school, or invites others to join in something like that. But equally, I don't like the thought that relevant, possibly true information that is against an "official narrative" can be taken down, so that I no longer have access to a broad spectrum of information and points of view on world events

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

I don't think the platforms should be held reliable for what the users are doing and they should not filter and/or monitor. Surely a reliable way to protect content owners has to be available but no new regulations are necessary - only the big companies will benefit from this, and they are already very well able to protect themselves!! We don't need more restrictions - the internet has to stay a free place for free responsible citizens!

Yes I agree on the latter. Alleged infringement needs to be proven before censorship occurs

A difficult one this. Where there is obvious infringement of a law (for example, inappropriate pictures of minors) then this should be monitored, however, if a post does not contravene any law then a court of law is required to prove that a post should be removed. If content of a post is deemed to be inappropriate, even if legal, then the law needs to change, if necessary, rather than a person's freedom of speech being removed arbitrarily.

It should be proven on court

No, they should not be forced to participate in spying on their clients. Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

Immediate censorship is an abuse. Anyone posting offensive material must be contacted first and requested to remove it

Must be proven before

Alleged improvement must be proven in a court of laws before censorship occurs. Further the burden of proof in such cases must rest with the party doing the censorship to prove that the content in question infringes on their intellectual property as a direct result of the actions of the individual in question. Again subject to

standard copyright prior to TPP legislation

There should be no monitoring allowed for nobody for profitable reasons. Having guidelines in place in general (like monitoring hate propaganda) is an O.. thing to do, but there is now need to monitor my private activities

There is so much content produced on a daily basis that this kind of regulation will seriously damage these platforms. Perhaps they should simply focus on improving the ability to report content that is considered against standards.

No platforms should monitor my Internet activity, or filter and remove content I produced and share. Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

Free speech no controls please

The EU Commission has proposed an idea that would require platforms to censor the web by monitoring and removing content posted by Internet users. I do not support this so-called 'duty of care' provision in the Digital Single Market plan

They should not be forced to do the monitoring, any more than a library should be forced to interrogate you as to whether or not you photocopied pages of a book you borrowed.

They should not be required to be judge, jury and executioner of any activity on the internet. That is the purpose of the law and the court system.

No, this is unacceptable in a free democracy.

not sure, information that is deemed negative, hurtful, dangerous, injurious, by the person it is about, should be able to be removed

Definitely not.

Stop monitoring us

I believe that any alleged infringement be proven in a court of law before censorship is to be taken. It is unfair to people who produce content on youtube that may use only a fraction of someone else's intellectual property. Like Gaming Reviewers, they pour hours of their blood, sweat and tears into making a high quality review, and use little to no footage from a game, but still receive a copyright strike from someone on behalf of the game's publisher. Even if the reviewer has had full public consent from the developer and publisher prior to making the review.

It should be proven in court

No, firstly because it infringes on our right to browse anonymously (just as when watching television, going to the library, or walking in the street observing shop windows, or doing just about anything in this world). Second, it will lead to people finding and developing alternative websites. Third, it will be prohibitively expensive to implement and increase the cost of shopping online. Fourth it could increase the traffic on the Internet, slowing down overall connections, also increasing the cost of ISP services to everyone. As with any other part of human life in the modern world, any censorship MUST be authorised by a court so that there can be a PUBLIC hearing and an impartial decision otherwise the dictates of one group could drown the voices of the many

No. A definitive "No" to both.

Alleged infringement should have to be proven

I don't believe so. "copyright" in the age of the internet is D.E.A.D

I don't think platforms should have any role in monitoring my internet activity or interfering with any content I wish to share. Censorship is anathema to a free society

No, we don't want censorship

Content providers should not replace the courts

Courts of law tend to take a long time until a verdict is cast. So waiting for a court is not an option in most cases. Maybe the content is blocked first and then court decides? But that is not very good either. There need to be tight rules to which everyone can agree and the platforms can adhere. I do not like the platforms monitoring my activities. And even less I like if they share this sensible information with others, say the NSA or any other Security Agency or even any other third person. The rights of individual privacy protection need to be strengthened again. The use of the information that I provide needs to be more strictly regulated, and it needs to be more transparent than a sentence in the too-long terms of use

Only if content is illegal or not appropriate (like criminal activity) should censorship be in question

Should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

No it shouldn't be routinely monitored, only prosecuted when copyright infringement damages artists income (not copyright holder's)

Where prevention ends and starts oppression? It is a difficult one but I believe in freedom of speech from the respect from one to another. I don't think the current tendency of imposing the

order instead of educating people on it. This needs a lot of effort and patience but in long term pays off. Monitoring all the activities in those networks haven't improved the situation, just produced more opportunities for other parties to obtain "clients" that seek alternatives to censorship. I think education about the consequences of our acts should be a priority

No, certainly not, and yes, of course.

Everybody is innocent until proven guilty. I guess that is just in the USA and not in the EU. Let multinationals and eu politicians prove it in a court of law. If there is one thing we don't need is more censorship. It will the death of democracy, but maybe that is exactly what the eu is after. The eu can be called a lot of things, democratic is not one of them!

Internet has to be free, as long as nobody is personally hurt. There should be no right for people, especially in high positions, to control the internet and therefore to control the people

No one should monitor anyone's activity on the internet, with the exception of those already found guilty of the crime in which is being investigated

No, of course not.

No censorship without court action first

No regulations or proofs of hyperlinks at all. They are the heart of free surfing over the world wide web.

If we want to uphold our law where everyone is innocent until proven guilty this question is a non-issue. Putting those powers into money making companies sells our laws to the biggest wallet. Filtering content is against freedom of speech. Even if some voices should not be heard, there is no reason to forbid

certain ideas from the beginning.

Monitoring all activity of all users on such platforms amounts to the assumption that every user is a criminal which is unlawful by itself. Innocent until proven guilty is one of the core principles of any lawful society. It is a huge invasion of privacy and on top of that, as the service providers will easily confirm, incredibly impractical from a technical side. They simply do not have the resources to implement monitoring like that

When individuals monitor content they apply their own individual quirks and morality, often inconsistently. Free expression and free transmission of information contributes to democracy.

No. Immediate takedowns amount to unfettered censorship

These platforms should not have to monitor my internet activity.

Has to be proven in court, too much potential for abuse otherwise

naturally, a general preassumption of guilt is unacceptable. access to and collection of individual data must only be granted on a case-by-case basis, via a probably cause against the targeted individual.

No immediate censorship, but first prove alleged infringement.

Alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law

It is not up to YouTube to play Internet Police. Let the courts decide if infringement has taken place

Monitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression.

No, they already have their own system, and severe action need to have a court approval

Automation is unfortunately, regarding the scale of these services, necessary. Especially for 'new' services starting (start-ups) the manpower required for manual filtering is simply not present. I however do believe that there should be an appeals process in place, with some rules, especially with companies of size, as these are the new 'media' that pretty much monopolize the internet landscape. Parties that are large enough (think Google, facebook and subsidiaries) can afford to have a much more intricate filtering and appeals process. Still, for them, the amount of incoming material is huge, but the current hybrid of 1st line automated filtering and a manual, human-staffed appeals process, seems to be the way to go. Mandates to ensure fair treatment in these appeals processes, in my eyes, can be enshrined in some kind of general law (as long as it is one protecting the 'small man', not one to only serve large content holders' rights) Smaller parties should have some leeway concerning these rules, as services starting out can't afford this, they need to focus their small team on getting the tech right, first and foremost

alleged infringement has to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs?

it has to be proven in court, that the content in question is illegal or harmful to civil society. automatic censorship oof unproven legality is unlawful in itself with most civil codes.

need to be proven after investigation of any allegations

No thyne should not monitor my activity and yes, they should be proven in a court of law but one created for such matters

First question: no, except for clearly illegal content (as already in practice). Second question: Yes.

No, that would be frightening

They should just get to host files. We have bigger problems to solve as a society

Required monitoring is completely unworkable in any way that would be fair to the users and owners of these Web sites

No, platforms should not be required to monitor activity, filter, or remove content. Alleged infringement should be reviewed by a court and removed/ censored only by subpoena

Leave Internet Users alone. Web is for everyone, not for companies. #freeyourdata

No. No website has the right to monitor my Internet activity. That would be an invasion of privacy. They have no rights to censor what content I post either. It is up to, entirely, the intellectual property rights owner to prove infringement in a court of law to censor anything

prove it in court

No, infringement has to be proven in a court of law. Obvious violations should be taken down by facebook without the need of a court, e.g. reuploading YouTube videos on facebook.

I agree, infringement must be proven before court of law.

No algorithm is perfect. Automated filters make mistakes. Proactive censorship is unfair and unjust, especially when victims of false accusations have no chance to rectify the case. And most of all, it denies a right of Fair Use and greed belongs to the seven Deadly Sins (in case you pretend to belong to a party

or organization which upholds "Christian values"). Furthermore, greed does not optimize profit. The mass purchasing power is finite. What people can't afford won't be sold and will reduce profits as "dead articles". If nobody links to your publishing house websites anymore, they will drown in insignificance. adaption in means of art and creativity, all for greed's sake.

Alleged infringements should be proven before action is taken. Content filtering only favours large companies. They can afford to wait, many independent content creators cannot

Censorship. That is exactly what this is about. It is only in the interest of selfish rich fucks trying to control everyone on this planet and a bunch of bought and paid for politicians. So no, NO REGULATIONS!

Infringement should be proven in a court of law. That's the democratic way

No, there are already laws to protect intellectual property, the owner should have to go through the proper court proceedings before a censorship accrues

Definitely an alleged infringement must be proven in a court of law. But really I think for all content posted on the internet by any company or individual there should be a rights tag along with it so that people know from the getgo whether they have permission to link or post in anyway regarding that material

I believe platforms like soundcloud, facebook or twitter should only be required to take content down onc eit has been proven by a court of law to infringe on the owners rights, not just based on a allegation by some third party

don't know

Instead of bluntly censoring alleged

infringement, maybe the content creator should be contacted first to reach a mutual agreement.

No I do not think that You Tube has any right whatever to monitor my internet captivity, nor do I think that it is appropriate that they should be required to do so under new regulations. A "duty of care" is required of medical staff, and teachers, it not a suitable concept for a company running an internet platform. There are rules about censorship in this country and I believe these rules should be adhered to

no, never

no... relax some of the rules for creativity

Infringement needs to be proved in a court of law before censorship by an anonymous corporate bureaucracy

I am aware there are practical issues with saying everything should go through a court of law, but the current system doesn't work either and the proposed one is ridiculous. Perhaps there should be a separate body dealing with these cases which has the time to dedicate to doing this properly?

whats the point of courts if you can bypass them?

Infringement should only be considered when commercial use is involved. Private use does not cause direct damages to the copyright holder. It is an overreach of property law to consider such

Let's not turn corporations into the police force and gold miners of the Internet. The Internet belongs to all the people!

Never. The Net must be free.

No and no

No. I believe in the right to privacy.

No. The only fair way to prove alleged infringement should be through proof in a court of law, with the burden of proof on the accuser.

These sites should not be required to monitor the vast amount of content posted to them

This would place a huge burden on the ISPs

I believe platforms such as SoundCloud, Twitter, or YouTube should NOT face regulations requiring them to monitor your Internet activity, or filter and remove content you produce and share? Alleged infringement has to be first proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

I believe platforms should face minimum regulation

My Internet activity should not be monitored

Most importantly - it should be possible to take the rightsholders to court for abusing take-down systems (like DMCA requests). Millions of requests where only a few percent are valid - should be illegal

The infringement should be proven first, or at the very least should be treated as non-infringing if the claim of infringement is disputed. Only after a court has ruled on it, if the complaint is not withdrawn, should it be removed. Most importantly, platforms should never be exposed to risk for hosting merely allegedly infringing content, otherwise they will take the safest route and remove all content that has received a complaint. Furthermore, acquisitions of platforms by media owners, or their mergers, should be closely scrutinized, and only very rarely allowed, since the resulting merged company will likely remove all content

that it believes reduces the profitability of their own copyrights. While a company certainly has the right to decide what to host on its own platform, such removals impact free speech just as much as if they were the result of a take-down request

A court of law should decide for filtering or removing content from internet, but with as quick procedure as possible.

A very few clear and simple guidelines for censorship can be effectively used by platforms to filter internet activity that obviously promotes bullying, terrorism, and other forms of crime, but most internet activity falls into highly subjective grey areas that should require a court of law to establish infringement before censorship can occur

No. Yes.

Of course alleged infringement have to be proven before every censorship.

No. It should be proven in a court of law

I believe in innocence until proven guilty. Absolutely they should have to prove it in a court of law

they sure have to be proven

Shares should be monitored, but CI is not the greatest problem here. While it is important, that these channels not become a tool for piracy, consumers should not be bullied for trivial infringement.

Absolutely not. It should be proven first.

I think they are not authorities so monitoring us is saying that our authorities, government wants to force them to spy on us (for whatever reason). There are certain and well equipped government agencies to do just that. We don't need another layer of spies... We also enter a community

with the assumption that our data/info is only shared with whom we intend to share it (I know it does not work this way but it should be so). If and only if removal of infringing content is not possible or the person/company is not willing to cooperate in doing so then bringing the case to court should definitely be the first step and censorship should happen after that.

We have legal proceedings for a reason. Providers should never be judge and jury in one. They should be neither of them

NO! It shouldn't go to court either, no one should be monitoring my internet activity and preventing me from seeing anything I would like to

No monitoring at all, and no pull-downs before court order

The alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

Court of law, definitely.

The current categories appear to be functioning correctly. The duty of copyright protection should fall on the hosting site, not on search engines which act as content aggregators. We must be careful not to censor free speech or give authority to unregulated, unimpartial bots.

I feel that any form of infringement should have to be proven before a court of law

Proven in a court of law

No. I think that this should remain within the law. If an offense is being investigated such as abusive/threatening behaviour. Once reported to the police, they should be able to within the law ask for this information and get a warrant, even for large data captures. They should have to explain the criteria and the necessity for it. Get a warrant, then

pull peoples data. Shortcuts never worked out before they won't now

Alleged infringement of copyright should have to be proven to an established independent body.

No, because they're run by old men that just want to shut everything new down

Absolutely not should they be required to monitor internet activity. However that should not mean that they should not keep an eye out for obviously unacceptable content and take seriously complaints

Not sure about this one.

NO MONITORING. The infringement needs to be proven in court first

not at all!

I've seen too many cases where content by Youtubers have been taken down before anything has been actually proven. I agree fully that alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law before action is taken. In all social medias

I don't believe that kind of monitoring is necessary and IF it was then alleged infringement should definitely have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

Should be proven in a court of law

Definitely not. However as it stands proving every infringement in court is impractical.

They should not face regulations and alleged infringements should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship is imposed.

If infringement is proven by law or suggested and confirmed by the two parties via some outside communication then it is the media platforms' responsibility to

remove them, but surely not before. There are also many cases (parodies, educational materials, etc) that are legal in which one can use copyrighted materials and it would be a limitation of the internet as an open source as well as for creatives, comedians and teachers to take these things down on accident or otherwise

I do not think that social media should have to self monitor free speech, in much the same way that I do not think any social venue should be required to monitor and police the speech of patrons on its property. A healthy society regulates itself without need for artificial constructs. Any alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law. Or else we should simply realise that information has become too available, too pervasive, too transmittable to be constrained by traditional concepts of copyright and a different reward needs to be found for creativity

Alleged infringements should be seriously considered before action is taken. A robot detecting a piece of music and immediately flagging a video is a sloppy, lazy and unfair process. Regulations need to exist to label what is and isn't an infringement. These regulations need to be applied to a human process, who is able to make a call on the situation, with minimal activity from automated programs. If the case of serious, take it before a court. Do not automate this process. Monitoring Internet activity simply isn't the answer. It's inefficient, it's fear-mongering and inconsistent

99% of copyright claims actually fall under fair use. It's just that the people in charge of YouTube, Twitter and the like are too lazy or spineless to actually investigate.

No, I should not be censored or followed/spyed on. who is to choose/Know what they decide to censor? freedom of speech?

Regulations requiring services like Twitter to monitor and censor user activities are unreasonable and will cause more problems than they solve

No internet activity monitoring by private companies! If there's a problem, let the law take its normal course

alleged infringement must be proven in a court of law before censorship can occur

No, youtube and soundcloud should be free and open.

Absolutely not there is a huge amount of original content by independant content providers on Youtube. Policing such regulations would make the cost prohibitive. The current system of right owners being able to flag and take down original content may not be ideal but it is working.

Censorship should not be carried out other than by a court of law

Only a court should act like a court

They should not be monitoring individuals. Alleged infringement should be proved beyond doubt there should be no censorship.

Infringement should be a matter for the courts.

The platforms acts as conduits - this is similar to demanding that the phone company listens to all conversations and blocks out any unlawful speech. Alleged infringement should have to be proven, possibly in court, and if the court finds in favour of the poster then the rightsholder should be liable to make the poster whole - that road have to go both ways

No. Allegations should be proven as in all things in the courts. I believe in democracy

more than the wish of publishers to control the use of public comment, examination and communication of what occurs and is expressed online. I support Free Linking. Anyone who says they believe in the benefit of facilitating the communication of our democracy should be supporting and aiding a cheap accessible internet that lets us express ourselves to each other and comment and link to other expressions and realitys occurring online. We must be free to speak and document our world and what is happening and been communicated in it to each other. Linking is a way of doing this, it is a simple means of resperating what occurs in our world, information enables and is the circulation of the wit and reason of a functioning and thriving democratic body. I support the free use of linking on a free cheap accessible internet that facilitates the better functioning and growing of our democracy. Linking on an open internet of comment and access is a service for democracy. To stop or restrict linking is to stop or restrict the 'currency of our democracy' which 'is information' as Tomas Jefferson wrote while he was writing USA's Constitution.

no, maybe

No. Must be proven before censorship

In a court of law, no question.

no. let there be prrof

No, my privacy is mine. I do not want anybody to be snooping in on what I do. It might not make waves now but if "First they came...." becomes a reality then freedom as a whole will be gone.

No, infringement should be proven in court of law first

No, monitoring will add too much overhead to an organisation adn will be open to abuse. Courts are

the right and only way to go

Monitoring citizens private internet activity is deplorable.

No, Yes

I think that, if it were a requirement for a company to check through everything its users create, the companies would either cease to exist or stop being worth using. If they have to hand-police us - and why should a company be in that position anyway? - then it becomes unworkably expensive in terms of employee time. If they do it automatically, you'll have problems with censorship of things that shouldn't be censored (like Scunthorpe). When it comes to discrete content (videos, music clips etc.) I think the companies should be able to take it down. It shouldn't be a requirement for them to do so unless it's court-ordered, and I definitely don't think it should be encouraged. I also think exceptions should exist for things like hate speech and bullying - those should not need a court order to be taken down. My other concern is that this could lead to increased name-policing, which is bad news for anyone who isn't using their legal name. This strongly affects trans people in particular, but also internet personalities and anyone who doesn't like the name their parents gave them enough to use it. It also has the creepy factor of making it somehow OK for companies - I'm looking at you, Facebook - to demand ID from their user base without any evidence of wrongdoing, which is disturbing. I don't want to have to trust them with my passport number, date of birth or any of a variety of pieces of information that they really do not need. Routinely being called Sam instead of legal-name Mark is not something they should be able to claim is a bad thing when no-one knows your legal name because you always introduce yourself as Sam!

I agree with the second option

Infringement should be PROVEN IN COURT. I'm sure that these regulations will then be shown for what they truly are: a way to impose monopoly and restrain human creativity. Censorship has no place in Democratic Societies

No way. They're not watchdogs. Censorship should be no task of the platform owners

NO. The internet belongs to the people and should be FREE not controlled. Monitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression. When individuals monitor content they apply their own individual quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity.

No regulations

Service providers are not police institutions. They are only providers. Any alleged infringement of the copyright should firstly be proved in the first place, and only then censorship may occur

Platforms should not be allowed to monitor me in any way without a warrant, and alleged infringement should definitely be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

No to monitoring of my internet activity. No censorship

No Prove it first

I don't believe both. I think every website should act like a forum: a democratic decision approved by the majority of users based on a user-requested dispute.

Do not believe in internet companies acting as judge, jury and executioner. There is no transparency nor

accountability. Usually the media industry wins due to big media bucks.

No, they should not. It needs to be proven not alleged

100% no NO! and if they keep pushing we will push back, maybe shut them down. The people rule not the mpaa or others a like. WE LET THEM HAVE COPYRIGHTS, its not a human right. regulations requiring monitoring your Internet activity, only with a warrant on a per person use usage.

I'm not aware of this being a problem for me but YouTube and especially Facebook should not be monitoring my content.

Infringement should have to be proven before action is taken against posted content. Without proof, users could lose the tools to effectively collaborate online.

Online platforms should be required *not* to monitor my Internet activity and censorship should come only as a consequence of a court decision. We live in a state under the rule of law, after all.

THEY SHOULD MIND THEIR OWN BUSINESS

No, platforms that share content should not be required to moniter, filter or remove content. Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

Only blatant copyright violations should be considered and removed, only after a pronunciation of a court

Absolutely not. Any instance of alleged infringement should first go through a mediation process, where an agreement can be reached without recourse to legal assistance, then if this does not work than legal action prior to any take down

Alleged infringement should have to be

proven in a court of law before censorship occurs, never just on their say so

The latter provision makes more sense

Once again, if these proposals actually go through, people won't want to use the internet the way they do now. At the very least, it would make people use it less often and most likely, only for essentials. People don't want their activity monitored. They will start to look around for an alternative to this new "corporate internet". Perhaps some sort of uncensored, underground internet alternative would emerge. That wouldn't surprise me at all.

A hybrid version should suffice, using the platform tools first, and if a compromise cannot be reached, then going to a court of law.

Every removal must be approved by a court before the contents are removed.

neither, a "report" mechanism and then the right to remove after verification

Infringement should always have to be proven in a court of law before censorship. Otherwise it's not justice, but rather just corporate fascism.

The latter, of course!

The content should be censored or removed only after the action is taken by the official party/copyright holder.

Regulation or censorship of Twitter etc would be dumb. Let every internet user breathe free!

All these platforms contain huge amounts of materials, and forcing them to censor the content would be highly damaging to their business, as it would rise the prices an order of magnitude, forcing to implement automated content filtering,

that would without any doubt be full of errors, human and computer. Users would simply stop using that shit and move on to some open source sharing activity. Quite probably, all the business would move to Asia or Africa or Latin America, where there is very vague notion of copyrights.

Regulation of this kind of platforms would limit severely the capability to distribute information and/or content. No platform should block people's content if that same person is willing to share it freely. Alleged content should be proven before censorship

Surely alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

In a court of law. Obviously

Proven in court, according to the laws of your own country

A Digital Single Market Plan should be favorable to free speech and not hinder it. Many Europeans want to think for themselves and for this they need as many different viewpoints as possible as long as they do not incite to violence or perversion. Abuses should be proven and prosecuted individually

They should face regulations. It has to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

Absolutely not! Prove allegations of infringement before censoring content

I think, generally, someone monitoring my internet activity, or any other activity for that matter, is official violation of our human rights and constitutional rights in most countries. Internet should remain public property and public space, and users should filter content based on whether it offends/abuses/harasses their identity or

not, like the option of reporting something that Facebook provides. There should be regulations, made only by these platforms with the information and help provided by users, independent of governments and rightsholders, that establish clearly what they should consider when taking action following a report. Of course any alleged infringement should be proven in court!

Innocent until proven guilty, content stays up until infringement proven

No to part 1 and yes to part 2

no i dont believe so, alleged infringement has to be proven before censorship

no.proof of infringement needed before censorship

court of law

No it's nothing to do with them they are just a conduit.

This should have to be proven in some way, original content belongs to no other than the producer.

Proven in a court of law.Of course. This is touching the 'innocent until proven guilty' doctrine we've fought 8 centuries to get.

No/Yes

Prove in court

Preferably court, since we already have evidence these kinds of systems avoiding the courts favor businesses big time.

The second one. Definitely the second one.

No it is against freedom of speech & information

alleged infringement should always be proven before any action gets taken. Otherwise we are all guilty until proven

innocent. That is the wrong way around!

NO! to first part of the question and
yes to second part of the question

In no way does hampering your privacy create a better environment for the every day user, I don't need Google their assistance for providing the 'perfect web'

I have no desire for online platform providers to be forced to interpret and adjudicate the law. They are first and foremost businesses, working to protect their reasonable profits. Any requirement placed upon them will be implemented in the way that is most cost effective to them, and which primarily protects themselves from legal action: and that will essentially mean automated systems adopting the most restrictive interpretations. They will be very unlikely to adopt an interpretation that champions the rights of small content providers to fair use, parody, reportage, free speech, teaching aids and other acceptable use of copyrighted content. Adopting such a position, under such regulations, would expose the online provider themselves to the possibility of legal action, whether the content is acceptable or not. No online provider is likely to wish to expose themselves to such a possibility. Where a rightsholder believes their rights are being infringed, the claim needs to be assessed by an independent adjudicator, with the content provider being provided with equal ability to defend their rights before any judgement about content removal occurs

No. Courts. No censorship

No Alleged infringement should be proven in court.

Excellent idea! And while we're at it, let's start the Fourth Reich too and let people wear yellow stars when they use the

internet as well. An independent court of law has to decide if censorship is warranted, this fundamental democratic function cannot be performed by the industry who is a direct party in a process.

No censorship and monitoring

Giving them the right to remove what they want without any rules is a bad idea

No, this is against common human rights

No. Websites should not be forced to monitor their users. Just as much as a mail company should open envelopes.

It should be proven in a court of law, monitoring the content I produce often is either privacy infringement or plain unnecessary, filtering and removing content without due process is plain censorship. If it is not proven in a court of law, then this opens up a way for these companies to not just censor illegal and infringing content but any content under the guise of copyright

I strongly believe any sort of infringement must be proven in a court of law, before any censorship occurs.

Should be proved in Court!

No. They just provide a service.

Alleged infringement should be proven in court before censorship occurs,

It should have to be proven.

No I do NOT support this.

alleged infringement should have to be proven. Forcing the companies to do places an unfair burden to their business model. Also, they are not scholars of the law such as lawyers and judges are and will be prone to more mistakes and erring on the side of caution - to the public's detriment

I believe that the alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs. You are innocent until proven guilty in a court of law with everything else so why not this?

Proven in a court of law, of course. If I change content, it is my right to post it for I have created new art with pre-existing art.

Platforms like Twitter should not face regulations requiring them to monitor internet activity, filter and remove content I produce and share (there is too much of that monitoring and filtering already by many parties). Infringement has to be proven in a court of law first before removal, filtering and monitoring is allowed.

There should be proven infringement

It's not the job of any platform to regulate something because an outside party tells them to. The law and the law alone holds that right and it should remain in the hands of it. If any rights holder deems something to violate their copyright, they should take it up with the person in question in a proper court of law and not force the platform to be their stooge and middleman. That's not their job. It's up to the rights holder themselves to protect what they create, not said middleman

I believe even an informal court where alleged infringement must be proven would be an improvement to the current system, but this assumes the position that the individual has the finances or necessary legal assistance to effectively argue their case. It's said "a man who represents himself, has a fool for a client". Indeed, in the age of recession and poverty, few can afford proper legal assistance, and those that try to represent themselves run the risk of falling for common legal traps and loopholes. In a court of law, a single individual, who is in want of knowledge

of law, with no access to an appropriate lawyer, is fighting an experience corporation with paid lawyers who spend their days and nights studying all sorts of similar cases. The disparity is obvious. The original purpose of copyright laws was to prevent people from manufacturing counterfeit goods and stealing another person's idea and profiteering off of it, but these days it's no longer used against mass manufacture (which is now housed in China, far out of the legal reach of many), but against individuals who make minor infringements - showing images, quoting particular excerpts. This is not the original purpose it was intended for. I believe that websites should not be required to monitor internet activity, to filter or remove - as they are commercial enterprises whose original goal was to sell a product. They are quickly being molded into become the 'policemen of the internet', but being a commercial enterprise, their main focus is finances, not fairness, and therefore the cheapest way for them to solve any problem is to permit all copyright claims to stand, censor the content and close any accounts. How can an individual with no knowledge of law sue them? They can't. It might be the cheapest option, but its neither fair... nor right. The commercial enterprises of the internet - SoundCloud, Twitter, Youtube, etc - should not be the guardians of information. Too much is at stake in the freedom of press, of the right to voice concerns and criticisms, to allow profiteering companies to dictate content policies

They have not such rights unless in case of clear criminal use

I believe sensorship and mass monitoring are bad. Copyright infringement should be proven in court.

Not any private organisation, nor any politician, should have anything to say about what's available on the

web. A judge in a proper court of law is the only one. Forbidding everything does not stop it from existing.

be real give me some kind of a private life now.....

It should be proved in a court of law

Infringement should have to be proven in a court of law. Otherwise, the little guy (internet users) has to expend resources appealing potentially absurd decisions.

It's not their job, nor should it be, to monitor me to make sure I'm following the law. That is a matter for law enforcement, government, the courts.

Many of these services are simply too large to be able to effectively regulate this content. Automated systems will not suffice, falsely flagging a lot of content and missing many others. Doing it manually would in some cases literally take hundreds of thousands of people. The responsibility should lay with those claiming the copyright. While some infringements should be obvious, such as posting full works, unaltered, anything that falls under Fair Use should be left untouched. Anything inbetween should be handled on an individual basis, either through a court of law or an independant organisation specialising in copyright laws. Under no circumstance should companies automatically be placed in the right. As mentioned, on websites like YouTube this has already been abused on a regular basis.

Yes and no. Things to do with violence -- violence toward nonhuman animals, like the "I Hate Cats Page" that encourages sadistic behavior, and toward women and people of color should definitely be monitored and reported, not just removed, to the authorities

should be proven in court

No they should not. material should be removed once an item has been proven in court to be illegal

No regulations.

They should be able to remove offensive content eg hate speech as defined by law, extremism in all its forms, animal cruelty Etc but only after a certain amount of complaints are received.

absolutely not. use the courts, folks WE have enough of surveillance and censorship in the government to require it in this way

Infringement must be proven. This is how democracy works. Otherwise it's not democracy

The law should decide

No, I don't think mentioned platforms should monitor such activity. If rightsholders want to monitor it by themselves (for example checking newly added videos on youtube), they can do it and platforms should allow reporting such content. But I don't think it is the problem of platforms to monitor their content

Such monitoring has a strong big-brother smell and is totally out of proportion to the harm it is supposed to prevent.

Infringement has to be proven. Fair use needs to be expanded. We're all just people trying to live fair lives, we're not thieves out there trying to steal everything. For every single internet pirate you potentially undermine with this kind of idiocy, you hurt a thousand average internet users who have no intention of abusing copyright, let alone have the knowledge to illegally acquire anything.

It's completely outrageous that websites get that task. Not because I care about their amount of work, but because it makes

them censoring organizations. They are totally unacceptable at such a task

alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs. What about dev'l. a specific court for this particular situation

Yes, practical concerns should not take precedence over freedom of speech, a basic human right.

Get a warning like on youtube... After that u choose consequence if its copyright... The rest is freespeech or free images :P

Copyright owners like all other property owners should have to enforce their electronic rights the same way that they enforce their non electronic rights: thru the courts

Q3 No, users shouldn't be monitored no platforms shouldn't be forced to. Where is the freedom of information and expression?

No, let users report inappropriate material to proper authorities (police, court)

Infringements must be proven.

Censorship should never be left to individual people or corporations. Any claim of damages should be settled in court

NO regulations to monitor individuals internet activity! No censorship, period!

Nobody should track my internet activity or filter and remove my content which I choose to share and produce. It's a violation of my privacy rights.

No, and yes. Plus, a warrant must be required prior to any searches. This is all about political control of individual access, which can be taken to the extremes of unwarranted censorship. In the case of corporate politics, facebook bans

female but not male nipples. Ridiculous

Platform such as SoundCloud or Twitter (for example) should NOT be legally required to monitor content. The responsibility of enforcement is with the so called owner not the platform

Alleged infringements should be proven in a court of law

No, You may have signed an agreement with them, and whatever they might change they do not have the right to do it. There are certain moral boundaries one should not cross.

Infringements should always be proven in a court of law.

No, platforms should NOT face regulations requiring to monitor what users do.
Alleged infringement SHOULD be proven in a court of law BEFORE censorment.

Always via a court of law. Openness and transparency are vital. The web is a communications tool, a crucial enabler of voices and creativity in an ever-increasing security-conscious, paranoid world

Removal of the content should be done after legal procedures or a settlement between the parties

No one deserves to suppress the freedom of speech/opinion in any way without being completely right in a logical, humane way.

This is an insane idea, the technical implications are disaterous for any but the largest companies. Additionally, it would mean constant infringement in the privacy and right of free speech of hunderds of millions of people on a daily basis. This has never been good for society.Questions of infringement, guild and legality are complicated issues. They should not be decided by an

automated system or a mere individual.

no they should not have the right to monitor our internet activity.

NO. Social media platforms already invade my privacy to much and this would give them power (if they want it or not) to do so even more. Any breach of law should have to be proven in a court of law in the country where it happened (not where the content is owned).

A takedown should be preceded by a discussion among the concerned parties. Blanket takedowns are happenibg too easily and often already, without the poster having any recourse or consultation. A court of law however, only in the case of legal action.

I don't want people to decide what content I view for no reason!

I think obvious infringements should be allowed to be removed right away. For instance, if a movie has been uploaded to youtube. Where it gets into 'grey areas' (clips of movies game-play) then it should be reviewed.

Under the 'duty of care' that would require intermediaries to proactively monitor and remove content posted by Internet users on their platform, the only way that they could monitor billions of posts per day would be with automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression. Having websites make decisions on what is legal content sets them up to act as courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for. As a result, they will often make poor decisions. And of course, when individuals monitor content they apply their own individual beliefs, quirks and morality, often along cultural and religious lines, and inconsistently

Yes No

in court unless completely inappropriate like depicting something illegal

I believe that alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

It should be proven if there is an actual infringement in a court.

¿quién decide que es legal? ¿o moral?
si yo decido subir mi trabajo gratis a la red y compartirlo para que otros lo reproduzcan ¿cuál sería el problema? es mi trabajo. Who decides who is legal?
O moral? if I decide to free up my work and share the network for others to play what would be the problem? it's my job
no, never infringement has to be proven in court

No, as it has to be proven in court, first!

Everyone is innocent until proven.
Also, I think the use of anything should be completely legal as long as it is not for commercial purposes.

No, the "proven innocent until found guilty" should also apply here and these platforms should have to prove the infringement in a court of law

Never! No one can take the right or take permission to monitor my internet activity. It is a great violation on humanity!

We have to be able to say and write what we think and of course alleged infringement has to be proved in a court of law before censorship occurs

I thought they were already filtering and removing content, but it should be proven in a court of law, like everything else.

Of course not.

The law decides or are they afraid

of facing the courts??? PROVEN IN A COURT OF "LAW"

Alleged infringements have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

It should be proven

No. Prove it in court.

No. I have both promoted AND slammed businesses that I like and dislike, respectively. SoundCloud, Twitter, and YouTube should have NO authority to censor the internet via removing hyperlinks

No. This puts an unfair and unnecessary burden in the hands of social media/content platforms, even more so for smaller competitors. It is impossible to watch every video and recognize every copyrighted work that may appear in it, or analyze the melodies and samples of every single song uploaded. Protecting a company's IP is that company's (or individual's) responsibility, and theirs alone.

Regulations by platforms should be proven in court of law, otherwise they become tools on the arbitrary preferences of banks.

Platforms such as Twitter and YouTube should not face regulations that require them to remove content based on regulations of any type other than judged by a court of law. There is no reason for censorship by those outside a legitimate court system

When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for. Monitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression.

proof is needed

Why should anyone be monitoring anyone?

It is those with vested interests and power trippers who want it. Censorship is the result of Fascism. Voltaire said to the effect that look to who you are not allowed to criticize to see who is running things

Absolutely not. Of course the onus is on censors to prove alleged infringement. Doesn't the rule of law apply here? innocent until proven guilty.

Absolutely not!

SoundCloud, Twitter, Facebook and YouTube and all the rest should be held accountable for what they are doing and Any Infringement they ARE doing must be proven in a court of law.

Censorship should require a court judgement. However, it is reasonable that copyright owners can ask for infringing content to be removed, and reasonable website owners will comply with requests if the content is indeed infringing

Court only

we shouldn't be monitored on those platform

Alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

This should always have to be proven in a court of law with due process

There should of course not be such regulations. What a crazy idea... Such infringement should, as any other infringement, first be proven in a court... OF COURSE!

When individuals monitor content they apply their own individual quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity. I think these choices are too arbitrary and should

not be made by companies

No. I don't want to be monitored

Internet messages should never be monitored without a court order and because they may be linked to police or government investigation of illegal activity.

No, that should not be their task

It should be proven in a court of law, our system is that you are innocent until proven guilty. That has been deteriorating for a while. We (people) have rights, not only the big companies

The latter option

Alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

Alleged infringement should be proven

I believe people have the right to manage their own cloud environment. As it currently is designed to be personal. The creator of this cloud platform must respect the actions/opinions of their customers. It's one of their responsibilities to maintain a safe environment. So yes they may monitor the user activities. However only when it's necessary and not by default. This needs to be established by mutual consent. And clear platform house-rules.

I do not believe platforms should be required to monitor Internet activity, or filter and remove content. This is creating a climate of suspicion and self-censorship which could lead to criminalizing everyday activities.

I don't think they should, as I feel that would be compromising my privacy.

I want a free uncensored internet

Infringement means there is no freedom of speech. Alleged infringement, is not

actual infringement. since 9/11 was a false flag government coup, US government set up, known one year in advance, all US laws since 9/11 2001 are meaningless.

It is not the role of intermediaries to check content on their website. Making websites responsible for what is or isn't legal seems very inefficient since we already have a court of law to make these decisions.

Let evidence speak in a public court before removing content

No regualtions or censoring internet and internet platforms.

No, i d not!

Open platforms should not be required to monitor content. History has proven that this leads to too much removal of fair use content.

Unless it's something already illegal (like trying to hire a hitman), the alleged infringements should be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

Censorship as a necessary evil can only be the prerogative of a court of law

No monitoring should be mandated. A takedown notice should be filed if content is illegal

I do not believe platforms such as SoundCloud, Twitter, etc should face regulations requiring them to monitor users' internet activity. In order for them to do this, they would have to use either automated tools or individual scrutiny. Automated tools will not catch everything and, much worse, will erroneously mark legal speech and expression as infringing, individual scrutiny means that a normal citizen, not a court, will be making decisions as to whether content infringes, and they will apply their own moral biases and

potentially inconsistency to the process. They are commercial companies and have no place in deciding what breaches or does not breach copyright law against another company / individual. I feel the company that believes their copyright is being infringed should first contact the user that placed the possibly infringing content on the platform. Possibly the platform could aid with this, providing tools for rightsholders to contact users, especially as this could be done without revealing personal information about the user at such an early stage. The user then can argue their case to the company / individual that believes their copyrights are being breached and hopefully come to an agreement and act upon that. If this fails, and the company / individual still believes that their copyrights are being breached, then they should approach the courts with their complaint, who can make a much more correct decision as to whether the content actually infringes copyright and, if so, order its removal. This keeps the decisions in the hands of the courts, where it belongs

No, various platforms such as SoundCloud, Twitter or Youtube should not be able to invade my privacy and monitor my Internet activity. Alleged infringement should have to be proven with evidence, in a court of law if necessary, before censorship occurs.

Prove it in court Blanket law can be abused

Absolutely not. This is a violation of users privacy and basic human rights. This is literally a fancy word for shooting on your users.

no yes

I do not think it is reasonable for my behaviour to be monitored and censored as a matter of course. If I am not uploading material clearly owned by someone

else or infringing on the rights of others my activity is nobody else's business. I should be able to link accordingly. Courts ensure that adequate proof is required rather than accusation being enough

They should not have that level of censorship. If something is contra societal norms the web citizens will deal with it. Baring that, it should pass through the courts

I think it should be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

Neither - there should be an independent arbitration process

Absolutely not: an uninvolved and innocent third party should not be held liable for my actions and opinions.

NO TO THE FIRST, YES TO THE SECOND

It would be impossible for different organisations to impose a huge variety of standards across many jurisdictions. It would also give private parties enormous discretionary power over what we could and could not see. Any copyright infringement should be proven in a court of law

Social media should not be monitored and alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

No to the first part, and yes to the second part.

Absolutely. The justice system goes that you are innocent until proven guilty

The responsibility for monitoring internet activity should fall to an independent body not beholden to corporate interests

No censorship without court action

I don't think there should be laws requiring companies to act as judges. Freedom of expression should be preserved and only reduced for specific cases, as decided by a court of law

Infringement must be proved before removed.

Platforms should not have to face regulations requiring internet activity monitoring. Before any form of censorship occurs, infringement should have to be proven in a court of law.

Infringement should always be proven in court, and the person posted should be responsible for it, not the service provider

No, unless it is plagiarism or belongs to the hate speech, pornography, or terror category

No private company should monitor anyone. This is fascism. This is a path best avoid at all costs. Law enforcement and execution of it must be left to their rightful holders in the bodies of police and courts.

If it doesn't have to go through a court of law, it is CENSORSHIP, a tool of tyranny, dictatorship. Censorship is a sign of tyrant fear of its people.

A court of law is the only real way to ensure all parties are giving equal consideration.

No. Allegations need to be proven, not just alleged

No! That is insane. Alleged infringement should most certainly be proven in court before any form of censorship occurs

That should definitely be proven in court. I do not understand how commercial interest should be more important than freedom of speech, privacy and creativity. Also, these companies should not be the ones

exercising law, that's what the court is for.

Too much regulation already

Content should be filtered only for criminal activity, e.g. child abuse pictures, race hate speech etc... Freedom of speech, thought and expression should be inviolate. Guidelines need to be applied consistently. At the end of the day, I would rather a free internet where sometimes I may see or hear things I would rather not, than an internet hobbled and constrained by lawmakers. It is to a degree self policing with users reporting the worst cases.

no. Definitely no.

No, I believe the courts are the cornerstone of a democratic society and as such should be consulted at all times.

Regulation is more commonly used as censorship and I think courts are still useful and we shouldn't bypass them. Some stuff shouldn't be allowed (pedophilia, drugs and other contents), but we can't use that to forbid everything and censor everything

Monitoring leads to censorship and the death of the Internet as we know it.

They should not face such regulations. The telephone providers are not required to monitor all calls just in case someone is playing copyrighted music over their lines, nor should ISP's have to filter all email attachments in case I share a song or video clip. The argument is that my examples are one on one (very small audience) and no one is making money off of the song or clip, but while eventually we're likely to see an end to torrents due to the fact that those downloads indeed do not provide any revenue to the copyright holders, there's a vast difference between mash-up songs and short clips/gifs than sharing entire songs or movies.

It's impossible to monitor this amount of content. If websites are forced to do this, they will do it hastily and carelessly. I think it would be best if the following system was in place: service providers can block content, but if user whose content was blocked clicks "it's legal content, please unblock it", then the service provider has to either unblock it instantly or prove infringement in court

Yes.

Legal matters should be decided by legal experts, not online business people

The EU Commission has proposed an idea that would require platforms to censor the web by monitoring and removing content posted by Internet users. I do not support this so-called 'duty of care' provision in the Digital Single Market plan. When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for, and are very likely to get the balance wrong. Monitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression.

Infringement should be proven first. It's up to the copyright holder to enforce the copyright

I believe that the very fact that the internet is open is what makes it so special. And the fact is that the growth and success of the internet is owed to the very fact that it is a place where all information may be shared, and people are free to voice their opinions and share content with others. Alleged infringement should be treated no differently than any other crime, and should have to be proven in court before action occurs.

Definitely disagree

need be proven in court

No to both censorship and bureaucracy.

court of law but that's biased too based on who's court it is.

Should alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

No platform should monitor the user's internet activity. Infringement should definitely be proven in court before content is taken down.

Platforms should not be made responsible for monitoring internet activity or permitted to filter or remove content. Alleged infringement should be proven in court prior to censorship

Monitor? no, blatant for-profit sufficiently unchanged content should be possible to make a copyright claim and be taken down. This should be informed to the uploader and the uploader should have ways to dispute the claim without having to go to court. That should be the last resort of the copyright holder if the uploader disputes the claim after the uploader have been informed the alledged copyright holder is ready to go to court

I don't want them to monitor my internet activity

Freedom of speech! That's all I have to say and I don't believe that this kind of decision shoul be made outside of a court of law.

No. I don't believe that the platform should be responsible for this. If companies want their interests protected, they should be the ones who pay for it

They should not face regulations

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs at the very least.

If content if properly licensed for the entire world, all regions, then this would not be an issue. Instead, content producers restrict content so not everyone can view it legally. This has created the problem users face today and it's simply, remove the license restrictions by licensing for the whole world. then no removal or censorship or court cases would be needed. Think of the consumers, for a change, we want to view or listen to your content, why ware you making it more difficult to do so?

Online platforms should do minimal monitoring.

Alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

I have my own blog, so NO! I have chosen to publish on the blog so that folks have free and easy access to my material

I believe those platforms shouldn't face legislation

Definitely (soundcloud, twitter, youtube,...) should NOT filter and remove my content. Yes, alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

INfringement should be proved in a court of law before censorship

proven in court

Do not use these service

It is unwise to give content providers the right to monitor internet activity

no,no

Warrantless monitoring of internet use should be illegal, and actionable. In other words, if I can prove that a group or a corporation is surveiling my use of the web I should be legally allowed to launch a law suit against those doing the watching.

And yes, the courts should be brought in to rule whether or not a citizen is infringing upon the copyright held by the creator of the article having been copywritten

I do not think platforms have any right to monitor any users Online activity nor filter or remove content. It should first be proven in a court of law

The internet should be a level playing field for everyone. Therefore, no regulations

Censorship without a judge ordering it seems like illegally breaking freedom of speech to me. I understand that every service has their rules to follow. If they say "no porn", then it makes sense to take down a porn video, but the ones reporting the video and taking it down should be real human beings, not software. I had seen pictures of female tribal people been taken down in Facebook by automated software.

Absolutely not. Prove it in a court of law

No monitoring

First part: no. Second part: yes.

Yes to the first question, definitely

I think this is very complicated, because for example, I did a search on Bob Dylan the other day and with the new privacy laws, only 5 pages came up. I can't see how they can implement this fairly without overdoing it.

Definitely not. Right now Habeas Corpus is dead on the internet with the current approach, they basically take down everything, no questions asked, even when it's not their content, and the onus of proof falls on the creators, who usually don't have any recourse to fight back.

If this results in requiring platforms to monitor user's activity, i.e. filter

and remove content, I think it's a bad idea. Alleged infringement have to be proven in court before censorship.

Only a court of law should have the power to remove publications of any kind

These companies are not judges or courts. They cannot decide by themselves. Freedom of speech is essential in our countries. It is very rare that freedom of speech has to be monitored. Why would these companies be able to decide what is right and what is wrong?

No, a Court of Law should do it

NO monitor of my Internet activity, or filter and remove content I produce and share. alleged infringement must be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

No monitoring. Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law

Obviously the less censorship the better, and the burden should be high with copyright accusations, and there must be built in protections for Fair Use and non corporate use of content. Of course, politicians and corporations love censorship, because it gives them more power and control over society, and prevents the dirty truth about their activities from getting out on the internet.

I really thought that these companies already do monitoring of some kind. I have had Copywrite notices from YouTube that did not actually apply to the song in question. There is ample room on the internet for 'legal' content filtering rules specific to each form of media.

please let me share on the web what I want without censorship or regulations. I'm an responsible adult

Just as with any copyright infringement

there should be some kind of framework and procedures in place to ensure a fair and just decision.

alleged infringements have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs?

The EU Commission has proposed an idea that would require platforms to censor the web by monitoring and removing content posted by Internet users. I do not support this so-called 'duty of care' provision in the Digital Single Market planMonitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression. When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for, and are very likely to get the balance wrong. When individuals monitor content they apply their own unique quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity.

Censorship should never occur. Any "illegal activity" (ie. posting of copyrighted material) should be deemed as such in a court of law before removal.

I think sites should not be given power to decide such things. The infringement has to be proven in court

I am against all kind of censorship or monitoring, privacy is very important, as well as freedom

No. Companies cannot be made to act as police or judges. Rightsowners ought to defend their interests, if they are harmed, proactively, and not ask others to do it preemptively in their name, least this would be automatically overapplied. Besides, what I do in the web cannot be monitored by a service provider (be it an ISP or Google or Twitter).

Alleged infringement should be

proven in a court of law before any censorship takes place

nothing will be shared anymore if they have their way...people will be unable to get a wide perspective on the world we live in... poor people might as well move back in a cave.

Content platforms should continue to have a Safe Harbor provision, insulating them from content added by end users. There should be no filters short of blocking obvious malicious software. Courts should be the only bodies allowed to take down or limit content after a presentation of the facts and arguments for/against

They should not monitor my Internet activity. They should not remove content I produce unless infringement has been proven in a court of law

No, because that's "vigilantism". Vigilantism is bad because it's police and judges, the legal system, the best one to know when and how to apply the law.

A crime should be alleged before action is taken or greater crimes would be committed by not doing that.

I believe they should have clearer policies on what they will share, thereby preventing some of the disgraceful things they currently allow.

No, they should not monitor my activity. Infringement MUST be proven! We are innocent until proven guilty, theoretically.

prove infringement in court

Should be proven in a court of law with a panel of jurors who do not represent the interests of the prosecuting company

No other than racial, hate, extremism etc

Platforms like YouTube have a business model based in the massive use of pirated content. This is unacceptable and these companies should modify their behaviour rather radically. There are no technical excuses for not doing that. Again we need to consider as different things the fast removal of pirated content (that should be done by companies like You Tune without going to a court) and the removal of really private material (that of course should not be done without going to a court). How to separate these two sets of contents is rather easy in most of the cases

Well, there should be some soft regulation, but not too rigid. It depends if an account is constantly violating private property rights for his own uses, or if the account is distributing the content further or even creating new informations out of it

No way

NO i dont want them monitoring my activity
anything alleged should be proven in a court of law

No to monitoring Yes to producing proof

Should have to be proven, or the "Infringer" should be informed first.

If these platforms are to act as agents of the law, then I suggest they do so in all terrains. Thus, they should have the same training, education, and accountability in law that a judge does. Else, let judges be judges.

Infringement should have to be proven in court. Regulations requiring service providers to monitor my activity is intrusive and privacy invading.

NO, there shall be no monitoring, infringement should be proven beyond any reasonable doubt in a court of law

before any action could be taken.

Q 1: No Q 2: Yes

no (part 1) yes (part 2)

No. A easy analogy is a market place where the owners are being held responsible for the actions of clients or a intruder. it's not fair

Alleged infringement should have to go to Court! AND net providers should not be exempt from law suits if they give information on you and your web behaviour to government or other businesses. The former should have to have a court order.

These things should never be decided outside of court.

Infringement should be proven in court before censorship occurs

No. SoundCloud, Twitter or YouTube are tools for freedom of speech. The monitoring are a "speedbump" and a collective punishment for the community. Let the law do what the law is tended to do.

Censorship should only come after the courts have ruled against a perpetrator and deemed their activity illegal

No one should have the right to remove content except if it is proven in court to be illegal, or is clearly illegal.

No, they should definitely not monitor my Internet activity, nor filter and remove content I produce and share. They don't have the competence to act like judges.

No, no systematic monitoring should be done. It should be proven in court before censorship occurs.

Of course it should be proven in court

We need regulations. I believe courts are

unnecessary in most cases. They should only be needed if it is not clear if there has been an infringement or not. The platforms mostly follow blindly and remove content much too quickly. Many times it's even automatic and results in false positives.

Censorship should not occur on a regular basis and platforms should definitely not have to monitor what their users do.

Yes I do. See the answer to q2 for more info.

Absolutely not! I am an aspiring content creator, and I would not want my work to end up being censored just because I happen to use an Intellectual property as basis or part of my work! When it comes to complete and total copying of films and movies into YouTube, that is when regulations can step in. Otherwise I believe alleged infringement must be proven in court first!

I believe that it should be proven in court if it is the individuals content

Well, it should go through a court, I think

Of course not. You can't do that at will.

Absolutely no. I have the right to privacy, free speech and expression. I live in a democracy, or so I am told what right has Twitter for example got to spy on me?! Alleged infringement should always have to be proven in a court of law because otherwise this is a dictatorship with no recourse to the law

2 questions: 1) No 2) Yes

No. That is a breach of privacy and people's personal integrity.

No, such mass surveillance is inefficient and targets innocent people. It might have a negative effect on people, and might, in the long run, lead to more self-

censorship. Twitter and YouTube should be very careful in removing content.

Infringement have to be proven first, blanket censoring is way overkill

It's complicated. As much as I appreciate individual freedom, I do accept the responsibility that I need to exercise a reasonable 'duty of care' to ensure that our society works well for most of the people most of the time. I do not believe that it's unreasonable for massively wealthy and influential organizations to be held to reasonable standards. Reasonable accommodations, no matter what form they take are going to require money. Which means collectively we need to have tough conversations about how we differentiate "free" as in speech and "free" as in beer" in a globally connected world

Should be determined in legal process of some kind - perhaps not court

no no no yes yes yes!!!

Obviously no monitoring of my activity should be required.

Preemptive monitoring of the public (or a large portion thereof) should never be acceptable. Also, in addition to the above monitoring would not solve any problems but would introduce new ones. Having a court determine the correct course of action may be slower, but will not harm innocent people in a misguided attempt to curb infringement.

Requiring platform providers to monitor users' activities is utterly unreasonable. Some level of vigilance against cyber-crime is justified, but requiring platform providers to be the copyright police would put a burden on them which they are simply not fit to carry.

Court

should be proven in court of law before taken down

No. The onus should be on the “owners” and there should be a proven violation before content is taken down

I believe it needs to be proven first. The sheer amount of work it would take a company to monitor content intelligently is unfeasable, and automated means have proven to be too scattershot over the years

Social media platforms should not have the power to monitor internet activity without due process i.e. a court of law should be involved before censorship occurs, rather than the website having the ability of direct censorship

The court must decide, NOT censored by businesses in the ‘business’

I will fight it with whatever means possible. The fact that these rules are written by people who don't have a clue and proposed by companies with an endless sack of gold and an arsenal of lobbyists is just crazy.

No. I believe that only proper courts of law should have the power to censor.

I have mixed feelings about this one though I agree it should be fair

NO, I don't agree with this. This would be a repression of freedom

No they have no right. Proven in court.

The alleged copyright infringement must be proven in court before any content can be taken down.

No, platforms should not act as a police

If an idiot is driving his BMW in 250 km/h, do you ask BMW to monitor their cars? Or remove the possibility to drive faster than a by BMW selected speed?

Part 1: Absolutely not. Part 2: Yes

No, that would limit the flow of information and is against public interest

there should be no censorship, except in extreme situations that threaten the public, ie violent pornography and jihadist propaganda

Proven in Court of Law first

Alleged infringement needs to be proven in a court of law since, as seen commonly on youtube, the fact that its not required to do so is abused commonly.

Absolutely not, no one should monitor internet usage. Infringements must be proved in court.

Infringement should be proved in a court of law

Infringement should be proven before censorship

SC, Twitter and Youtube should do an initial pass but ultimately it should be proven in a court of law

No one should be required to monitor anyone unless there is a court order behind it.

To the former: No, to the latter: Yes.

A filter functionality is automatic and will automatically not be able to understand the difference between quotation of someone else work in order to share a opinion so this restricts our freedom to express ourselves (freedom of speech).

alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs!

Hyperlinks are the foundation of the Internet. No link tax, and no censoring links online !!

Innocent & uncensored until proven otherwise

It should be proven in a court of law.

Of course every platform has to be free!
Who can claim to be the owner ?

The ability to link is what makes the web a web, and is fundamental to the

..Proven in a court of law to publicise incompetance.

•The EU Commission has proposed an idea that would require platforms to censor the web by monitoring and removing content posted by Internet users. I do not support this so-called 'duty of care' provision in the Digital Single Market plan. Monitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression. When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for, and are very likely to get the balance wrong. When individuals monitor content they apply their own unique quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity.

1 No 2 Yes

I do not believe that providers should monitor my internet activity. I believe that infringements should have to be proven in a court of law. This would (I hope) cut down on the number of occasions that large companies attempt to bully people.

It is absurd and infeasible for these platforms to monitor all content pro-actively. They do have a duty to remove illegal material, in response to complaints, after due investigation. Copyright infringement on such platforms should be handled proportionately and based on clear evidence

That proposal is completely unreasonable, unworkable, and totalitarian

I don't believe any internet "platform" should be made to monitor our activity unless a court of law decides this on a case-by-case basis

No, they should not have regulations requiring them to monitor my activities. Any censorship should require proof of infringement in a court of law.

The alleged infringement should be proven in a court.

No! No censorship under any circumstances

Any action must be preceded by the judgment of a court of law!

I think that the monitoring of internet activity is completely insane. You wouldn't have little camera bots follow every person around and record everything they do at every moment of every day and send it to whoever, so why do that to people when they are on the internet? And as for filtering and removing content, that's equally ludicrous. That's like if in addition to a camera bot you had a robot follow you around that zapped and disintegrated everything you made that someone disagreed with, regardless of if you or anyone else thought what you made was fine. News flash. People are citizens on the internet too

Absolutely not. Alleged infringement has to be demonstrated before making any accusations, and IP addresses should not be used as evidence. If you think that, then you should also request mandatory opening of all your correspondence and mail. It's the same thing

No, I do not think that they should receive external regulation. Certainly a court of law or a consumer/producer agreed

forum should be the arbiter if necessary with appeal for both sides in any dispute.

No. The internet must be open and free to all. Any infringement must be proven before action can be taken.

Dear GOD no.

No to first question.(Q3) Yes to second (Q3)

There should be no monitoring of social media or online sharing. Any alleged infringement of copyright should be pursued through the existing legal process.

It should have to be discovered and proven. There's no need to make website owners the nannies and enforcers of the content owners

No and yes it should be proven in a court of law

Censorship should be confined to cases where photos were taken and/or shared without the subject's permission (i.e. revenge porn), or horrifying content like ISIS beheadings. Otherwise, infringement should have to be proven in court.

Not sure about this one. Going into court sucks, not to mention the amount of money it costs. You're asking if a broken system should be monitored by a broken system.

most have be proven

No, I believe people can monitor each other when given tools to report illegal behaviour and bullying

No, they shouldn't monitor activity, except for hate speech and child porn. Infringements must be dealt with by the courts, otherwise we live in a vigilante world

No, such monitoring is censorship. It should be proven in court of law

There should only be censorship when material is offensive e.g. racist, sexist, homophobic etc. Political opinion respectfully expressed should never be censored.

Should have to be proven in court of law.

Alleged infringement must be proved in court before censorship is allowed. Platforms should not monitor internet activity, national security forces appear to be doing this already and there is no need to further erode civil liberties

when it leads obviously to the suffering of someone else, it should directly be effected by the said companies. courts usually deal with laws.

No, they should only act under complaint, provided the complainant can prove they hold the copyright.

There should be no "gate keepers" or "police" deciding what links and content will be allowed, this should be done by courts and a thorough legal process. These are not procedures or decisions to be decided by algorithms / businesses / corporations etc. The wishes / needs of publishers do not outweigh those of the rest of the population.

This is a tricky one. If someone without the copyright uploads a whole episode of a series, a whole movie, a whole song or something like that, then yes, they should be filtered. If it's only a part of the work, like some funny scene, then no. That's just positive for the rightholder, as it increases interest in the work at no cost for them. If it's a song in the background, in such a way that it's clearly not the purpose of the video, tweet, or whatever, to "show off" that work, it's just silly to filter it. Remixes, which essentially turns a work into another work, should be legal. In

short, a court should absolutely be the one deciding if something is illegal

Regulations, of the type suggested, are too difficult to monitor. Let those alleging infringement prove it in a court of law - at their cost

Removal for copyright infringement or hate content should be summary. Everything else should go to a court of law.

Put it to court first. Don't just take it down and tell us to "forget it and get on with life"

Alleged infringements should be proven in court

No, I do not believe that my internet activity should be monitored. Removing content leads to censorship, and should be considered carefully. Obviously there are exceptions, such as hate speech and indecent images, but this should be monitored by law courts and new boundaries and laws created.

alleged infringement must have to be proven in a court of law - otherwise the potential for abuse are vast, limiting free speech and human rights.

While censorship is unwelcomed there is a need to protect the vulnerable and maladjusted the latter whom tend to feel that if the information is on a public forum that it is okay to act in that manner. This is a difficult question to resolve

don't know

Dont use twitter or soundcloud but I do utube. Watching activity should not be monitored. However posting activity should be.. to try to keep down terrorist recruitment and philshing scam theives, + anything promoting racism, violence or crime and disguising it as art or politics. Though genuine eccentric and

unconventional speakers and thinkers should not be interfered with. Who the hell is going to police that lot??

No i think i should be allowed to be a free thinking human being who as long as I do no mental or physical harm to a real person should be allowed to do as I like

Removal of content should only be done following due legal process

Court of law.

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in court, just saying that's mine etc is not good enough control

Throwing allegations around will become easy for PR firms acting for clients and create an industry. However real dissent and freedom of expression will be totally suppressed. make the rich pay for their courtcases, and also allow people time to change their posted 'offensive' material before punishment

Censorship is a very sticky subject. Provided material is legal, it is nobody's business who puts it up or who accesses it. Questions of good taste are notoriously difficult to rule upon

Need to be proven before censorship

Alleged infringement should of course be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

Software should allow for 'self-regulation' via cyber-juries.

No. Should be proven in a court of law

Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than

creating a new system. When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for, and are very likely this delicate balance wrong

I understand that in the case of apparent human rights violation it is important that the internet should react immediately. E.g. you cannot have videos showing murders, rapes or child molesting be shown freely - this is against human dignity. You can even request for content to go down if someone has taken pictures of you while you were on holidays and you don't want to show your face to everybody in this planet. But these are apparent cases and are very different from having a political speech go down for an irrelevant reason. E.g. you cannot take down a political speech or a view because the one who had the camera happened to listen to a song at that moment and now the video has this song in it. This is again abuse of rights

The unrealistic expectation of billions of daily posts being monitored, is likely to result in a blanket banning approach. This is a terrible infringement of people's ability for individual expression and the sharing of creative thoughts

Alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs - that is the purpose of courts - to protect the citizens from creeping censorship.

I do not trust wholesale surveillance reporting to Government and Government agencies such as MI5, MI6, GCHQ, NSA (of the US), Police. But with the problem with Muslim extremists of Daesh and other terrorists roaming freely it would seem then that 'ordinary' peoples safety/security must be upheld by monitoring to a controlled degree. But who has the qualification to judge so that it is fair and consistent monitoring .

Platforms should not be required to censor, filter or remove content that has not been proven infringing. In fact I would be in favor of greater restrictions on what they are ALLOWED to censor / filter / remove...

No of course these platforms should not be monitoring people's use of the internet.

alleged infringement should be proven before censoring

There must be an assumption of innocence unless proven otherwise

Infringement should be proven before censorship.

Absolutely not, and yes it should be proven in a court before any censorship occurs.

Content management should be reactive, rather than proactive. Content managers should intervene only when complaints from users have been received, and the content is either *obviously* illegal/hate speech. By *obvious*, I mean obvious to any random group of people. Otherwise, it should go to independent assessment. Automated systems should not be used.

Some platforms do have standards they enforce about content, others don't. It should be up to the platform to decide what comments to accept for comment sections and what not. Many platforms have a button comment makers can use to complain about other comments

Definitely not. Every thing should be done with due process like for everyone else.

Content that is patently illegal (pornography, incitement to hate crimes) should be censored - but nothing else

Platforms should not monitor our activity, this is a gross infringement of privacy and freedom of speech! Content should

only be removed if it causes harm (e.g. bullying content), and at the request of a victim. In the case of copyright, the court should determine the law, not the individual platforms who are likely to be risk averse and to lack understanding of the nuances of legal principles.

YouTube already tries to monitor activity on its site, using a system called ContentID. Unfortunately, it is garbage, and results in items being removed due to spurious claims of infringement. Like this - <https://torrentfreak.com/universal-music-hijacks-youtube-videos-of-indie-artist-150317/>

Corporate sponsored monitoring and censorship of social media without resort to legal proof of justification is an abuse of the rights of the majority of law abiding ordinary citizens and has no place outside of fascist dictatorships.

No regulations to monitor my activity, privacy is sacrosanct. It should ALWAYS be proven before censorship

No and yes otherwise it isn't a legal process

NO regulations! Absolutely not.

3a - No3b - Yes

Alleged infringements have to be proven in a court of law before censorship can occur

No. My internet activity is my business and should not be monitored. There is no reason to suspect people of illegal activity. Alleged infringement needs to be proven before censorship occurs.

Alleged infringement claims has to be proven. So-called "right holders" that make wrong accusations should be punished (with fees of some kind) for doing so, to force them to double-check each claim

It should be proven in court before

censorship. Innocent until proven guilty.... When individuals monitor content they apply their own individual quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity. Monitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression

Soundcloud, Twitter, or YouTube are not qualified to determine properly what content is legal, and what is not. Only a court is qualified to properly make those determinations. As it is now, these platforms often remove content without proper cause just because they have been asked to do so by some large company.

Monitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression

Infringement should be proven in court first, not by some automated system

Any alleged infringement needs to go before some sort of tribunal if it is offensive. If it is political I see no harm in it and that is what is taken down in NZ

No censorship! Freedom for all!

No I don't believe any censorship of any kind has any foundation ethically or in law.

A 'duty of care' encourages hosting companies to play safe and apply much more censorship than is legally required. Of course they must -- they need to protect themselves. This completely removes all fair use rights and many other rights (such as freedom of speech) from content creators. We have seen far too many cases of abuse of takedown notices by content owners, sometimes deliberate and sometimes from negligence, resulting in the removal of new works, with impacts on the revenue streams for the creators of those works. The 'duty of care' should

be on content owners to exercise full care before making any complaint! With serious sanctions against any complainants held to be making invalid complaints. Particularly serious penalties must be imposed on notices incorrectly claiming ownership of copyright (whether deliberate or through negligence). In addition, all complainants making invalid complaints must pay the costs of adjudication and of forcing the platform to re-instate any work taken down as a result of that complaint. A suitable approach might be only allowing takedown requests from complainants who have posted a substantial bond to cover adjudication, reparations and penalties for any invalid complaints they may make.

Such decisions should be taken only in court

Nobody should have the right to monitor my internet activity. Any infringement should be proven in a court of law.

No. Nobody should monitor my internet activity at all. After all they don't monitor my snail mail, do they?

The EU Commission has proposed an idea that would require platforms to censor the web by monitoring and removing content posted by Internet users. I do not support this so-called 'duty of care' provision in the Digital Single market. Monitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression. Additionally what court of law would you allow to adjudicate, the legal system in the home of the person who posted, the legal system in the country of the rightsholder, or the legal system where the platform is based? Automatically deferring to a court of law makes the appealing of takedown orders, a costly option out of reach of the vast majority of end-users and thus something which is totally inaccessible. The current legal

system is always going to be behind the internet and as such cannot and will not keep up with what people are doing on/using the internet for Market plan

Requiring providers to monitor activity and censor content makes the concept of a free and open internet a farce. Existing systems for blocking and removing content already seem pretty robust. Tightening legal requirements would only hamstring the internet and destroy its creative potential.

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship.

I think those writing the laws are unaware of the dynamics and volume of content on the web. The question also does not specify the type of infringement, and this is complicated by different laws applying to different countries on a platform that is designed to create an integrated global community. Copyright laws vary from country to country, as does fair use policies. Copyright laws are often updated and extended prior to public domain use of content comes into force. Laws around mature content, what is defined as mature content also varies from country to country. The current situation is complex, but unless the internet is redesigned to operate in isolation per region it will remain hard to police. Sharing is what we as humans do, it's how we communicate. Stopping by nature is not possible.

absolutely not! CENSORSHIP will never work

Platforms should not monitor my activity and only remove content ordered by court decisions

Too confused a question for a sensible answer

It should be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

Alleged infringement should need to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs. Monitoring should be restricted to extremely harmful material.

Private commercial entities at work in the market need to maintain their cold equations of profit and loss - but at the same time, the platform they provide has become seamlessly interwoven with the way the communities of the wider society talk and interact with each other. Perhaps a new category of commerce should be devised to accommodate the conflicting demands on these - our! - global forums.

better would be an agreement/contract when signing up which makes the user aware of limitations of free speech (Human Rights). If something is truly out of order I think it is ok to censor and take a clip off the net very quickly and (like that terrible video of a beheading) immediately and then go to court of law.

They should be held to the strictest standards that can be devised to retain our privacy

Have to be proven first

Court action

No to regulation. Alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law before any censorship be imposed

A tricky subject. I do not like the idea of being monitored. And too much non infringing stuff is being removed

No should be proven in a court

Platforms should not have to act as "policemen". The process of the Law needs to be carried through before the "punishment" i.e. censorship is administered.

Platforms can be regulated but they need to balance rights better than they do, they need better legal training and there should be an independent organ we can appeal to when we don't agree with platform's decisions

Infringement should have to be proven in a court of law of the country the uploaded resides in before censorship occurs.

No censorship unless court proves necessary.

Platforms such as SoundCloud, Twitter, or YouTube should NOT face regulations requiring them to monitor your Internet activity, or filter and remove content you produce and share? Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

While internet service sites should do all that they can to ensure that their site is used in a lawful manner, they should not be censoring user created content unless that content has been proven to be unlawful

Platforms should not face regulation requiring monitoring, filtering and removal of my content. Alleged infringement should be required to be proved before censorship

It should have to be proven beyond all reasonable doubt! People should be innocent until PROVEN guilty!

I don't think these platforms should have the right to remove content I produce and shareWhere violent or hateful content exists it should be frozen and inaccessible but NOT removed until a court of law decides on censorship.

It is impossible to monitor and fairly censor the volume of data passing through the major internet sites today. Attempting to do this through automation has resulted in a lot of unintended consequences. I believe

infringement should be proven before action is taken. This would ensure that only real, harmful violations are pursued

No. The infringement should have to be proven

Alleged infringement should be proven in court before platforms are allowed to do perform such acts.

Yes, the content must be filtered and even removed if it is a foul content, abusive and discriminating

I do not think platforms should be forced to regulate and monitor their users

I don't think they should have to monitor my activity.

Alleged infringement should need to be proven in a Court of Law

If infringement occurs allegedly, it should be proven by correct legal procedure.

Some types of content can be banned by the platform. In general, infringements should be proven in court, but there could also be some alternative means of judging the content, which the platform or service provider could require the user to accept. For example a system of voting, such as used by OkCupid, where users/administrators vote whether some content violates the rules or not. Monitoring internet activity is in general not acceptable, except when required by a court order. The same should apply to any form of filtering

No. Alleged infringement should have to be proven beyond reasonable doubt to the platforms by the industry, and a clear explanation of what the infringement is sent on to the user by the platform before any action or removal takes place. The user should then have time

to respond and take action if required, or alternatively deny the claims. There should be the option to escalate the matter to a court of law if required.

No. Companies should not be responsible for monitoring me. Alleged infringement needs proof in court

I believe a very good reason is required before monitoring. An independent judicial committee should review each case.

It must absolutely be proven in a court of law! That is the only place which can legally determine what is legal and what is not. Giving this responsibility to private companies will inevitably go only in one direction: disproportionate censorship. In an effort to protect themselves from lawsuits, they'll become as trigger-happy as the copyright holders themselves. There MUST be penalties for wrongful take-down!

no, yes

these services should not be monitoring our activity. It should require a court order before censorship occurs

The only monitoring of internet usage should be with a court order, and court orders should be of limited duration. If the suppliers of content want to limit the distribution of their content, they should make it available by license only, a service like Pirate Bay, but one where you have to join and pay a fee for download.

Extreme, anti-social, threatening content should be removed by platforms, but alleged infringement should be proven before removal.

I do not think such platforms should be required to monitor the content hosted by them. They should be required to enforce proven court orders retiring take down. But should also be able

to object on behalf of their users.

Platforms such as SoundCloud, Twitter and YouTube must not be required to proactively monitor users' Internet activity and to filter and remove content. This would lead to automated systems censoring legal speech and expression. A website should not be required to act like judge and jury.

Infringement must be proven in court before any censorship can be considered.

Yes, I think it is fair that a private organization should, of right, be able to censor what people put on its pages

If an infringement has to be proven in a court of law before it can face censorship then the content will be available/visible until the case is proven which could be some time. However, if the only alternative to this potentially lengthy process is monitoring regulations, they would have to be very intricate and extensive to cover all situations. Regulation and monitoring would only be acceptable to people if they could understand what the regulations were and the what they were being monitored for.

No, should be proven

Do you believe platforms such as SoundCloud, Twitter, or YouTube should face regulations requiring them to monitor your Internet activity, or filter and remove content you produce and share? Absolutely no! Or should alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs? Yes, always.

I don't want internet monitoring regulations at all

Again this requires more than a straight 'yes' or 'no' answer. Some content is likely to be inappropriate or offensive

so there needs to be some discretion in what content appears online.

I do NOT believe platforms such as SoundCloud, Twitter, or YouTube should face regulations requiring them to monitor your Internet activity, or filter and remove content you produce and share? Alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

Yes they should face regulations.

I believe information should be freely available for the development of society

It's really all beyond me (I'm 81 !) but it seems that we can't now put the Genie back in the bottle. Even if there were never any political motive for 'snooping' I would certainly find it hard to believe it was so. Politicians act very secretly and duplicitously, which probably was always the case but now we are aware of it, thanks largely to the internet.

No! I do NOT believe platforms should face regulations requiring them to monitor my Internet activity, or filter and remove content I produce and share. Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

I do not think it is humanly possible for platforms to monitor all content, or physically possible to automate the monitoring of such content.

I don't know.

No, alleged infringement should be proven

No, they shouldn't face the regulations

No. This would be a breach of my right to free speech.

I believe any monitoring of my internet activity by these platforms would

be a breach of my privacy. They may remove content I produce and share provided it is a valid breach of copyright. I believe alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law of the users country before any action is taken.

No. Infringement should have to be proven with a right to respond before censorship occurs. In any event, there should be no ex parte censorship

I believe that platforms should have the right to manage their own content but should conform to court ordered removal of illegal content (such and child pornography, snuff content or defamation)

No, never! If censorship is going to take place it must have its reasons proven! It is no more the job of YouTube to monitor the videos I post than it is the job of the highway maintenance people to stalk my car! If my car needs stalking, the police should get a warrant...

Absolutely not, the internet is a free place, but regulated enough, if you regulate it more people will switch to Tor browser and the like, where regulation is nil, and you can have easier access to drugs, guns, anything. People will sail off into the unknown unregulated waters where they don't have these over the top regulations

Websites like Twitter, Facebook and Youtube are the digital roadways we use to get to places. Everything we do today happens online. Being online is not optional any more. If you want to know anything or do anything you have to use the Internet. None of us can make it through a normal day without using it. When a crime takes place on a road we do not sue the owner of the road. One can't go to a court of law and say that the owner of the road is responsible for a criminal using it, you have to go to a court of law to prove a crime has

happened and sue the criminal for it. The same should apply to websites which have become our modern digital roadways

No because The EU Commission has proposed an idea that would require platforms to censor the web by monitoring and removing content posted by Internet users. I do not support this so-called 'duty of care' provision in the Digital Single Market plan

I'm not happy about my internet activity being monitored, or its contents being filtered or removed, unless an alleged infringement has been proved.

no & no

Absolutely and definitely NOT - let's have the rule of law please

Any alleged infringement should be proven in law before censorship occurs - websites like Twitter, YouTube etc. Should not be put in a position to filter and monitor user activity.

It should happen in a court of law

We are spied upon far too much as it is. Personally, I would be happier if *all* spying were made illegal - Facebook, I'm talking to *you*! The distinction between industrial spying (which we now endure) and government spying (which is a growing and ominous trend) is very narrow. We cannot be free if powers we know nothing about know everything about us. So no, I believe censorship should occur - NEVER.

I think all of this is ridiculous. We've had the internet for years and years, and now it's becoming an issue?

I do not believe service providers/platforms should monitor Internet activity. I think the 2 parties should talk it out and if there's no resolution then it needs to

be proven in court. There also needs to be rules in place so Internet trolls don't browbeat the average citizen

I believe the proposed Digital Single Market plan would result in automated systems unfairly censoring legal speech and expression. I believe this should be the duty of judges and courts and not websites. Websites should not act like courts and judges.

These organisations should not remove content people produce and share unless there is well established laws are being infringed.

I do not want my content to be filtered without undue cause

There needs to be a balance between the two as for instance Youtube cannot police every video and the courts cannot take every case. At the moment videos are taken down too quickly for the smallest reason and this must stop in favour of the big copiers.

yes it should be proven before monitoring and censorship occurs.

No, they would be made to censor without following proper legal process. This means that what is allowed and what is taken down would be decided by financial threats from sponsors and advertisers rather than fair and impartial legal decision.

With some subjects it's not a bad idea. I do think if you have nothing to hide you should be ok. But I also don't want to be treated like in the old communist countries. Yes I think it should be proven in a court

Serious common-sense infringement should be decided by the Court, The rest, it should be up to the user to choosing what to use, or not.

It should not be the responsibility of the platforms to police the content that is posted/uploaded by its users. It is unfair on them and more importantly it should not be their decision on what gets censored. Any alleged infringement should be reported through appropriate legal channels and proven before there is any consideration of filtering or removal.

Infringement should definitely be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs - at the very least there should be a way of fighting the decision since there have been many occasions where the decision to censor something was a mistake

NO. Next they'll be wanting all birthday cards and letters etc opened! That is beyond the pale and needs stopped now!

we live by the law not hearsay. so no, i dont need to be spied on 24/7 in case i break the law. its my right as a human being to either live within the law or outside it. its my risk to take if i choose to do so. and no 1 has the right to try and protect me from myself.

1st part: No. second part: yes.

No. No amount of 'walking by' or 'browsing' should be considered criminal. Punish sales not happenstance

Proven in court.

The courts must be the only authority able to authorise monitoring in order to prevent companies, who are by definition motivated by short term profit, from becoming the arbiters of what constitutes acceptable content or behaviour

This regulation is useless: 1. It will create two-step links that cannot be followed by machines automatically - reducing the ability to monitor. 2. I, as a website owner, have to monitor the links I provided to make sure the content does not change.

I either have to implement censor-link redirects that fetch the site before I redirect users OR I need to fetch the site on a regular basis (once a day for a link that is clicked once a year = 365x more traffic). Both are useless if you have to log in. 3. *I* would need to remove the link and look it up in the internet archive to provide the old content. This should be done by the one who clicks the link

In a society where money is distributed unfairly and unevenly, we should PROMOTE ways to help balance out this inequality

If platforms are made responsible for the content then we will have censorship that is even worse than state censor. The platforms will pre-emptively remove more than a court would have removed. Any form of acting on content should occur according to a democratically established set of rules and should hence be the privilege of the state and its courts, not companies.

no they do not have the right to monitor my activities nor do they have the right to filter them nor to remove them.

Noone should spy using the 'telescreens'@ Orwell predicted in his book, "1984" without legal authority from a Court of Law. Courts of Lawshould decide what infringes and what not.

Infringement should be proven in a court of law and not administered by corporations

I believe that monitoring Internet activity is wrong, and that any filtering or content removal should be subject to a court of law if challenged

Only the courts should have the right to decide what is legal or illegal. Delegating this job to platforms sets a dangerous precedent and would almost certainly undermine our legal system.

a. No. b. Yes

It should be proven first

Probably not. Let courts act but act quickly!

I do not support the 'duty of care' provision, the automated systems this would require, and the arbitrary and inconsistent decisions this would produce.

Absolutely allegations should be proven first. My ISP...or Facebook....or whoever is not, and should not be 'Web policemen'.

The presumption of innocence is the cornerstone of modern judicial system. It should be applied in any case of alleged unlawful behaviour including copyright infringement and that a proper court order must be the only basis for any censorship, fines, account termination or content filtering or removal

It is ridiculous to expect such platforms to monitor all content. Only a court of law should be able to censor any content.

I should be proven in a court of law.

The EU Commission's idea to get platforms to censor the web by monitoring and removing content posted by Internet users is wrong. I am 100% against this 'duty of care' provision in the Digital Single Market plan. The internet should not be censored but should be policed to an extent to make sure that activity on it is legal. It is a matter for the courts to decide what is and isn't illegal use of copyrighted material - platforms should not be made to do this.

Why monitor? I see no reason

yes alleged infringement should be proven and content not be removed willy nilly

Infringement should be a matter for courts, as has been normal for

all legal matters for centuries.

No! Content is the responsibility of the person posting and if any infringement has occurred the court should force them to remove it, not the provider

Proven before filtered

Should be down to the courts

Postings should be subject to reasonable regulations regarding freedom of speech, but only in the country of origin.

Platforms should not be required to monitor internet activity.

This is a democracy, there should be no monitoring

Proof in court absolutely should be required, bare minimum. No tight monitoring except for material like pornography or child exploitation

No, they shouldn't. Yes, it should be proven before censorship overrides freedom

No, because they are not in a position to do so fairly. They are likely to overreact to protect themselves

It should have to be proven in a court of law

I think it should be screened for inappropriate content, but copyrighted material should be able to be used for parodies, fan or debates reasons - as well as educational or original reproduction

Definitely not. And absolutely

Courts and the law are the correct way to deal with this, there should be no automatic power to censor anything without demonstrable evidence

No. Try to monitor us and we,

and everybody you hate, will find a way around it.

No. And yes

No, I am strongly opposed to internet platforms being required to carry out monitoring or filtering of users' content. This is a quasi-judicial role that private companies are neither competent nor empowered to carry out. It ignores the due process of law, of any description.

Something like that would ruin those sites as it's impossible to check so much content in a way that's fair for the users. That would just silence the Internet, destroying the best communication tool in existence

Pas de censure MAIS PAS DE TRACKING !
C'est mon droit et ma liberté de bloquer ceux qui se mêlent de ma navigation.

Sensoring is just wrong!!!

It needs to be proven, otherwise free expression will be stifled as responsibility is handed to individual companies.

I do not support this so-called 'duty of care' provision in the Digital Single Market plan. When websites make decisions on what is legally permissible content, they are acting like courts and judges - roles they are not qualified for, and have no legal authority to fulfill.

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law.

Somebody has got to monitor it otherwise how are things like child pornography going to be discovered, you can't rely on the pornographers to report themselves !

Making content providers act as both police and judge runs contrary to modern values, it's going back to how the repressive regimes we love to condemn work

Infringement should always have to be proved.

Infringement should be proven in a court of law.

No they shouldn't have to monitor

should need to be proven in court

No because friends and family often use these platforms to share their own performances.

no in a court

No. Facebook should allow members to self regulate

Common sense and decency should be used

I don't know. I would have to see proposed regulations to understand their scope before I could answer this.

No - I disagree strongly. We have laws in most countries to cover any kind of abuse, pornographic, illegal activities etc, those who uphold the law just need to get up to date. It is only a different medium and that does not affect the law.

No this is a breach of my human rights

No they damned well should not: they are simple platforms, not branches of the secret services. This is pure, cynical, arrogance. If the collective governments are so sodding paranoid about what any given individual does online they should do their OWN bloody research, using their own media, AFTER convincing higher judicial authorities that they have a legitimate need to spy

Alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs as censorship would and often is controlled by those who do not have the public interests at heart, put profit and companies

before the safety of the public and daily break the laws they purport to uphold.

no and it should have to be proven in a court of law

Alleged infringement should be proven before assumed guilty and any monitoring is an invasion of privacy

Must be proven a court of law

I don't think anyone should monitor anyone's Internet activity. Certain sites, blogs, forums, etc could be monitored if they are proven to contain activities, endangering other people (e.g. if they are used by terrorists or other violations of human rights). Regarding the content of larger platforms, social networks, etc - I think it works well currently - when users report content. This is the right way to regulate web sites and platforms. Regarding the rights infringement - there have to be clear rules which action is infringement and which isn't (a party on youtube because some song is played in the background, or small fragment of song used somewhere don't look). And of course it has to be proven in court before any action occurs. Or what happens with Presumption of innocence - a basic element in most legal systems?

Proven. Tho i also think a platform should have clear and easy ways to complain.

should some level of monitoring

Content providers should not be required to be police

No, I think any infringement of freedom of speech that does not involve incitement to violence or has content liable to cause severe offence to others should be unacceptable - it is a natural right of expression- although I would hope the only form of redress does not

involve resorting to the long drawn-out machinations of courts of law.

No, this will censor freedom of speech and expression

Absolutely NOT. I think a content provider should be able to decide, at the point of publishing for the first time, under what circumstances his content should be shareable and to whom. Once out there, it should be permanent, unless proven to be malicious and wrong by an independent body (not necessarily a court of law). Anything that makes profiling people easier for any purpose without their knowledge, or by using information that was collected for reasons other than intended by the person concerned, should be resisted. I can see the value of profiling in, say, combating terrorism, but it is too easy to invade the rights and privacy of individuals for the wrong reasons. Governments and authorities cannot be trusted to use the abilities in an acceptable (to me) way - better if the technology is resisted so that they don't have the ability! Key is not having the ability or right to correlate information on individuals from unrelated sources !

yes they should have to be proven in courts of law

Better to go to court

No because content is censored by arbitrary processes that are more to do with the need for cheap take downs rather than for justice and fairplay over the use of data

Yes Yes

No, they really shouldn't be involved in deciding what gets posted.

Yes, we are all innocent until proven guilty.

should require courts

The Internet is so important as a medium for information exchange that its freedom from restrictions surpasses any possible commercial advantage imaginable. The communication it enables between individuals and groups provides a means of communication relatively unrestricted by political and commercial forces and as such it is one of the most important things we have to ensure the road we travel reflects the needs of ordinary people.

Well, considering I live in a nation where the judicial system is based on the victory of "innocent until proven guilty" in a court of law, I'd have to go with the larger option over the former. Besides, <sarcasm>heaven forbid people have something as inconvenient to corporations as options or free speech </sarcasm>

I don't think they should be able to remove content when it does not involve profits of any kind and is a free hobby

No, and yes, it should definitely be proven in court

No, they shouldn't have to face these regulations.

Bring a legal case in court of law before censorship, please

Any censoring should be possible exclusively on the basis of court decision

I believe that infringement outside the grounds of fan-created content and fair use should be proven beyond all doubt and verified before any removal of material should occur

There should be a legal process that censorship should have to undertake before content is removed.

Should have to be proved. But should still respect the original artist

No. The courts should have to be involved first

They have an obligation to stop terrorism but should not generally be policing copyright infringement

Monitoring internet activity is onerous, very expensive and legally questionable. Producing and sharing materials is how we move forward on innovation and creative content. To limit, tax or censor these is harmful to social progress. It represents a dinosaur age that only hinders development for a limited profit motive

They should monitor, yes, but only if material posted could lead to them being sued. And, to the second question, no. The situation would become impossible.

They should be required to take down material which may be illegal, because it incites hatred, breaches copyright etc. pending court proceedings.

If clear breach of copyright, then it should be possible for owners to request content be taken down as long as they have some evidence of their ownership. If the poster has grounds to contest this, he should have a right to do so, with the decision ultimately made by a judge

Justice should run through court

The second option. Content that I produce gets taken down because it LOOKS similar to others? NO WAY!

Regulations or no, there already is monitoring and filtering. Censorship

No. Alleged infringement should ALWAYS be proven first.

Platforms should not be responsible. Court should decide if there is copyright infringement

no-one's internet activity should not be monitored by any organization - unless complaints were made if, for example, it was offensive (racist, etc)

You should have to have SOME evidence that I have done something wrong before taking down my content, not just some accusation which is most often FALSE either by poorly thought out automation or by DELIBERATE attempts to eitehr monetize or censor MY work

no, providers should not be required to monitor and enforce regulations. alleged infringement should be proven

I believe infringement should be proven in a court of law. My answer to question 1 is also applicable here

Censorship of public content for instigation of illegal activities may be rightfully considered, NOT private communication unless a warrant is obtained

It is dependent on WHAT content they are filtering and removing.

yes and no

no the internet seems to be the only place where one can be truly free (as far as I know because various secret services are still keeping an eye on our activity)

No should be free to research as required. If a wrong doer the moral issue will be self governing repeats can be reported?

No, it should be proven in a court, its dangerous to encourage companies to make these judges in a less clear, cautious and accountable way.

Infringement should be settled with the individual producing / distributing the content, not with the website or internet provider. Only if illegal actions are proven and the individual isn't answering to the court requests should the service provider be involved to remove access to content

I'd expect it to be proven in a court of law before any such action takes place

Now

Of course alleged infringement should have to be proven, just like any other law

IN answer to the first question...
No! Alleged infringement must be proven in a court of law

Absolutely not. Any recording or monitoring of data is a personal security liability as well as an unwarranted invasion of privacy. Policing of the law is not the job of Facebook or other services unless they have received complaints from other users. In such a case they should then notify the relevant authorities.

Absolutely not, we are spied on by everybody who has any official position as it is. Prove the allegations in court before any censorship.

They need clear Terms of Use and clear procedures for what will be removed under those terms. There are cases (harassment etc) where waiting for a court of law would be undesirable, but in copyright issues, there needs to be real clarity about why something is removed

I very much oppose any of my net use being tracked by anyone. Any filtering should be up to me: I can still report anything offensive or dangerous. I don't think rights holders should have to have the expense of court proceedings, but a commissioner could hear their complaints much as the

advertising standards authority does

Surely the courts should decide. The web is for sharing information freely - content owning companies make plenty of money from YouTube and so on already. If companies decide to build a paywall they must realise their information won't be so widely seen. Their choice, our choice. What's wrong with that?

I don't think those platforms should monitor anyone, just as no-one monitors (or does someone?) people in pubs "sharing" their thoughts and emotions and songs. Censorship is not good, but yeah, maybe if a court of law (whose laws?) gets involved it is better.

The only reason for regulations is to protect dishonest government. There should be no regulations and if an individual considers an offence has been committed it is up to them to take action.

alleged infringement should have to be proven in some way before censorship occurs

Proven

No. They cannot put the amount of resource required to make a decision for the number of requests that they would receive. This means they will have to remove content whether it is a breach or not.

It should be proven before removal, the current situation is too open to abuse

Knowing how messed up most courts of law are, especially in terms of length of time to act, I feel it should fall to an independent watchdog to review and decide in most cases, but leaving it open to be taken to court if the decision is disagreed with.

no censorship except by court order

No I do not. If this sort of monitoring increases or continues, more and more of us will need to take our privacy concerns in hand.

.....
absolutely not

.....
No. All infringement should be proved in a court of law.

.....
Yes,

.....
No one should be liable unless damages are proven in a fair independent court or arbitration

.....
Should only be monitored or taken down under court order. No one should be liable for criminal prosecution for clicking a link that takes them to unlicensed copyrighted content that they could not be aware of in advance

.....
Prove it in a court of law, not by censorship and bullying.

.....
No. The internet must be free. A website has no right to refuse to allow you to talk about or link another website unless it violates the T&C. There's no reason for facebook to block youtube, ect. That's a transparent attempt to divide the internet

.....
Of course it has to be proven in a court of law. It is the foundation on which the justice system relies upon.

.....
No, but I understand some activity will need to be monitored to prevent actual terrorism

.....
no! infringement must be proved.

.....
When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for, and will inevitably to get the balance wrong

.....
The EU Commission has proposed an idea

.....
that would require platforms to censor the web by monitoring and removing content posted by Internet users. I do not support this so-called 'duty of care' provision in the Digital Single Market plan. Monitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression. When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for, and are very likely to get the balance wrong.

.....
Websites (such as Facebook, SoundCloud, Twitter, and all others) should absolutely NOT be monitoring user content. On the contrary, they should facilitate sharing of content, without having access to that content themselves -- this is technically possible, and would prevent many abuses of power. If user-created content is to be policed and monitored, it MUST be by democratically elected institutions, rather than corporations. I say this knowing just how abusive our security institutions have been when it comes to monitoring and controlling citizens' freedom of speech. That needs to be reigned in. Yet, allowing corporations to individually monitor and control this, often with shadowy hands-off influence by governments, is MUCH worse

.....
What I do is nobody else's business. I personally would kill all cookies and I would browse freely. People should have the right to block their own content, but not block anybody else's content

.....
Private platforms imposing their own community standards is one thing. Legal censorship or any requirement to spy on their users is another thing altogether - and particularly chilling to freedom of expression in an international context

.....
It should have to be proven

.....
Allegations of crimes need to

be proven before punishment is implemented. It's a simple rule of law which has worked for 1000 years.

Q3 No there should be no such censorship

Q3-NO to monitoring, filtering or removing content produced and shared by individuals. YES to the alleged infringement having to be proven in court before censorship occurs.

Q1:No

Q3....No censorship ever

Infringement should have to be proven in a court of law

There ought to be a process provibg ownership before removing media

No, it is not their responsibility to monitor my internet activity. If content needs to be removed it is the responsibility of the rights holder to pursue this and it needs to be proven in court that the rights holder does, in fact, hold the rights. Furthermore, such measures would mean that the platforms themselves would be performing censorship, and could impose their own censorship. Facebook for instance does not allow nudity, but allows hate speech.

Where extrajudicial censorship takes place, the state should have no part in it. Companies may choose to remove content they host, but if the law requires it, then the judgement must be made by a court on a case by case basis.

I think there can be a compromise, but censorship is usually too pervasive

Proven in a court of law before censorship

Alleged infringement needs to be proven before censorship.

Yes, I do believe that infringement has

to be proven before a court of law

Allwged infringement needs to be proven in court

Infringement needs to be proven before censorship.

Freedom of expression is paramount to a free society. To be offended by somebody's opinion should not give you the right to silence them.

No, there should be no such regulation

Some shared content is copyright protected and should be removed upon proof of same. An initial arbitration mechanism would appear more expedient than depending on a court of law.

Content platforms such as SoundCloud or YouTube should only be allowed to take down content which directly violates copyright laws. For example, I shouldn't be allowed to upload a music video from an artist who is not in my employment. Anything else should be down to the content holders to track down, request its removal and if the uploader appeals then it should be taken to a court of law specialising in copyright law

Expecting total surveillance on automated user-generated content sites is - even in purely practical implementation terms - ludicrous. It would drown out up-and-coming sites and services who lack the manpower to check every single upload, and most likely deny Europeans access to products and services generated outside the EU while strangling them of the ability to set up their own competitors. And all of that is before we get to the potential freedom of speech issues that come with people being allowed to act as their own judges of what constitutes legal content and what standards they apply

No, this would censor and stifle freedom of expression and legal content would end up blocked too. All the rights won by fans for remixes could be in jeopardy. Infringement should need to be proved in court before material can be taken down

As long as what I post isn't offensive (porn or religious hate), no-one should have to monitor anything that I post. Freedom of speech should extend to the internet

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court, otherwise justice is being ignored and people may be unfairly persecuted with no legal ability to seek redress. Automated systems cannot fairly censor people. Nobody appointed websites as decision makers or courts, and they have no legal stance.

Leave it alone. Is there going to be an appeal process? Does the accused get to meet their accuser face to face to make amends or clear the air, or express their defense? The whole thing is a waste of time and resources and leaves the power very lop-sided. Administrative nightmare with no recourse when errors are made. STOP this now

No. Infringements need to be proven in a court of law before any censorship occurs.

Alleged infringement should be proven in court

No regulations that put SoundCloud, Twitter or You Tube in charge of deciding what content I or anyone may share. Alleged infringements should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

Infringement should have to be proven in court before censorship occurs as it's only fair.

People who post need to be non-bullying and respectful of other users, but also be

able to speak freely - it's about being polite and listening, so we can all be listened to, whether or not our listeners agree with us

Infringing content needs a more rigorous process such as court of law because the processes in place are being abused and people who clearly fall in fair use or whose content is entirely original are being unfairly and maliciously attacked via these automated systems for removing content.

Regulations to self-monitor and filter internet activity should not be permitted without very precise regulation of limited removal rules to avoid personal bias judgements, or a court order.

Independent courts should decide what censorship occurs

I do not believe platforms should be required to monitor my Internet activity in order to remove links I wish to share with others. Links are the lifeblood of the Internet. Links make the Internet the unique tool it is.

Always with recourse to law unless removal of specific content can be justifiably identified and enshrined in law itself

It is ridiculous to expect such platforms to monitor all online content. Even if they could do so, much free speech would be unfairly censored.

No, platforms should not have this power. Yes, alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law.

No to monitoring Yes to have to prove infringement before censorship

I think it is an unfair requirement to ask them to regulate the consumer's usage. I think they should be required to educate their consumers but infringement should have to be proven before censorship occurs

I believe that alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before any kind of censorship can be considered. Platforms should not have the power to monitor your Internet activity, nor should they be able to remove content you produce and share without informing you first and making their reasons clear

Infringement should be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs. These platforms should not monitor individuals' internet activity, unless there is evidence to suggest that an individual would be likely to use the internet for criminal activity

No, it shouldnot be monitored but infringement proved in a court oflawif need be.

Censorship should never occur until proven in a court of law

Some monitoring and filter/removal is required without court

I certainly don't believe that platforms such as Twitter should be allowed to remove content that I create or share

It must go to law

There should be no regulations requiring platforms to monitor my internet activity.

Violent and pornographic images should be filtered and removed if they are real rather than fiction. It is up to users to prove they are fiction to these platforms if they wish to reupload them. Other infringements should have to be be proven in a court of law.

Platforms SHOULD NOT be required to monitor our internet activity. Alleged infringement should have to be proven before censorship occurs (perhaps in more efficient ways than court, for small infringements)

If there is infringement, it should be proven in a court of law.

Platforms for posting content should not be required to be in the business of monitoring that content. If a person posts hate speech or infringes copyright, this should be enforced by the courts. Those who host the platform should not be required to decide what is or is not permissible. Those who host platforms should be required to take down illegal or infringing content when ordered to do so by a court, but not be responsible for censorship or monitoring. Making platform providers responsible will (a) lead to conservative judgements and censorship (b) make it hard for innovators to create new platforms.

They should be proven in a court of law

Infringement cases should be settled in court

I don't think a court of law should be required to have infringing content removed from websites and web services, but excerpting, quoting and linking to original content is not infringement

Censorship should be proven before action is taken, or action should be taken as a result of arbitration and agreement from both sides. Monitoring, filtering etc. should be absolutely minimized.

Censorship should only be enforced after infringement is proven on a court of law. Any other kind of censorship is natural to dictatorial states/persons/leaders

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in court before censorship occurs. There is already way too much monitoring and censorship taking place on the web

Court should decide

A court order should be necessary

Automatic monitoring is too error prone, because of the amount of information that needs to be monitored. Even if only .01% of all allegations of infringements is wrong, the sheer number of allegations that will be done will result in many false positive allegations and takedowns. Copyright does not serve the public interest on the internet, currently

Arbitrary censorship is an infringement of civil liberties - always has been, always will be

Alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law before it is censored.

Not one organisation should monitor what I wish to hear or watch. This is a presumption of guilt which is contrary to the rights I have under UK law. If someone deliberately distributes material which breaks copyright law then this should be brought to the attention of the relevant authorities and if necessary, removed AFTER any breach has been proved.

Any regulation to monitor the internet should be subject to prior judicial review before any action

privacy should always be paramount and censorship is very tricky. a disinterested third party should be involved in determining infringement

Current regulations are too strict

No regulation please.

Infringement should be proven in court or at least be very obvious. If someone posts a rightsholder's entire song and claims it as their own, that is obvious infringement but if someone uses a few seconds of it in their own video or remixes it or otherwise makes something new of it isn't that fair use?

Censorship is a very dangerous thing. it

should be extremely restricted as to what it applies to. Incitement to kill such as Jihadi promotion is an area where censorship could be legitimate. Not much else. Content warnings and age restrictions should however apply to relevant material

Infringing on people activities, when nothing illegal is being conducted, is unacceptable. There needs to be undeniable evidence of guilt before Internet platforms are allowed to monitor a visitor's actions. Unfortunately being stupid is not a crime, though it sometimes should be

There should be a process which is transparent and simple to understand such that possibly damaging content will be immediately and automatically identified and blocked for a very short time until there can be a fair and accessible process of evaluation which is kept available for examination by anyone who wants to know the reason. This should include a method for analysing and reversing the decision without greatly complicated or expensive red tape

Any legal claim should be proven before it is acted upon. To do otherwise is to promote a 'guilty until proven innocent' justice system and opens the door to people using or threatening infringement to censor opposing viewpoints by burying them for long periods under legal bureaucracy for personal, ideological or commercial gain.

I believe the latter. Big Brother is not the kind of world I want to live in. It's going to far these days. The state in these areas needs to be reined in. Freedom is a good thing. Freedom of expression is a good thing to. Freedom of speech is a good thing. Support these things.

This should only take place with oversight

from the courts. Internet platforms should not be required to monitor users' activity. If however it comes to their attention that paedophiles/terrorists/rapists are posting vile content, they should feel empowered to remove it themselves. The posters of such content should be able to appeal via the courts. Specialist training should be made available for decisionmakers

nobody should monitor anyone's internet activity without a court order. i really don't believe in censorship of any kind, if something offends then don't partake, after all god offends the devil. if we are talking infringement of copyright then yes a court should be involved if they really want to punish people

No-one should monitor the internet activity of private individuals!

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law

No. Should have to be proven.

As public accommodations, Soundcloud, Twitter and Youtube are obligated to serve the public without discrimination, however, as self-governing corporations, they have some responsibility to filter content in order to maintain a modicum of civility by curtailing the expressions of hate or threats and additionally protecting copyrighted material and users' personal information

Websites should be monitored for counter-terrorism purposes, and if its illegal to share something then sure, give them the right to remove the links.

I think alleged infringement should have to be proven in court first

This seems an unnecessary measure. Some things will always be shared (e.g. porn) that we'd rather were not but monitoring and people's time should be better directed

elsewhere. Hate material, child and violent porn and incitement to violence, religious or otherwise, unfortunately ought to be monitored if there is any capacity to do so effectively, as a price of free speech.

Absolutely NOT...if I produce and share, that is MY right if it's MY material. Unless it is inflammatory or downright illegal, no one else should have the censorship rights to my materials. Infringement MUST be proven before action is taken

Innocent until proved guilty. Would be violated by any automated system acting bluntly.

I think court is a step too far but there should be some form of independent arbitration.

Alleged infringements should be dealt with in a court of law. No one should be encouraged to become state snoops, that smacks of Nazism and is bringing George Orwells vision of 1984 near to reality.

I think the ideal we should strive for is a balance somewhere in between those two choices

I am outraged by the suggestion that a profit making private platform, who may have a vested interest should be censoring material that has been shared. In what way is it appropriate to ask companies like Google (who own Youtube) that are guilty of tax avoidance on a massive scale, to act as moral guardians and administer the law in place of legally qualified lawyers and judges? What checks and balances would be put in place? What room will there be for contention, argument and debate? The EU is supposedly democratic what price democracy and free speech when a machine makes autocratic decisions about the content of a video or Facebook post?

NO. No censorship without

proof of infringement.

Once you have uploaded then it should remain in the public domain.

I think these things should go before a court as this is the only fair way.

Unless the content contravenes the terms and conditions of the site, or breaks the law, no sites should not have to police content.

The internet is a web of electrons arranged in specific order to share information between individuals. It is not physical property for you to claim. Keep your greedy paws off!

I do not think sites should be required to monitor activity. That would add a lot of overhead to smaller sites without the money or manpower of larger sites, such as Google

No. That would be like requiring the telephone company to be responsible for monitoring everyone's phone calls.

It's a basic premise of freedom of speech that it should only be curtailed where harm can be proved. It is difficult to see how harm can be proved anywhere other than a court of law. I am disquieted about a system of monitoring that could lead to unregulated censorship.

NO - platforms should have NO SAY, in what is "Acceptable" !!!This is simply ANOTHER LAYER OF CENSORSHIP !!!

Prove in court that infringement has happened

No, providers such as YouTube have no business monitoring user's activity

Innocent before proven guilty is a hallmark of most modern, democratic justice systems. Why should (alleged) rightsholders

have authority that regular citizens do not?

I think it would be absolutely disastrous for freedom and a dark day for democracy if companies were even given license let alone duty to monitor our use of their products and services. Utterly unacceptable.

The regulation of platforms begs the question of who sets the regulations and how much could these be driven by narrow national or commercial interests. The monitoring of billions of posts each day would also require automated monitoring of posts just to cope with the volume of traffic experience tells us this would lead to false positive and negatives. Furthermore, where individuals monitor content they apply their own unique quirks and morality, often inconsistently.

Platforms such as SoundCloud, Twitter and YouTube should not face regulations requiring them to monitor Internet activity. Alleged infringements should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship can occur.

I don't think that they should have to monitor my internet activity and filter and remove content I produce and share. I do think that there should be some free body that people can appeal to in cases where content shouldn't be shared, without the need to go to court, but I do think that going to court should be an option.

All infringement cases and similar should be required to be carried out in a court of law with the standard laws applying in particular innocent until proven guilty.

There is a danger of censorship here. The facility to monitor content should not, as a rule, be applied across the board, however if there is reason to believe there is a wrong doing then it could be

permissible under a court ruling. Further to the above, some content could be removed for a variety of reasons, but there must be recourse to appeal against the removal initially to the provider and then to an independent arbitrator before finally challenging it in court if necessary.

absolutely it should be proven first. there are clear examples of takedown notices being used improperly where a company buys the rights to use a design then they issue a takedown notice against the original artist. the movie 'Pixels' is a prime example

If posting something violates the rules of the platforms they are right to take it down. They ought not to have to remove material when asked to do so by others the courts should have the final decision.

If infringement is alleged it should be proven before any action is taken to remove or filter content. Platforms should not be required to monitor anyones activity on the internet.

Innocent until found guilty

prove infringement first

No body should be allowed or required to monitor my internet activity, nor interfere in any way with content I share. Due process of law should be followed before any censorship is made for any alleged infringement any where not just on the internet.

No I do not belive service providers should have to check peoples content. If a copyright holder has evidence of an infringement of their copyright then they should directly request the removal of the material by the site owner and if the material is not removed they should then take out their own court case

Alleged infringement should be

proven before removal.

I think internet hosts are acting as a service for the content, not as originators. Should the post office be held responsible for the content of the letters it carries? The originators should be held to account, not the carrier or host. Their function should be to put the parties into contact rather than police the content, unless it is proven to actually contravene the law or their terms of service.

Platform sites should be allowed to get involved and arbitrate a dispute over an infringement notice, they should not be required to monitor uploads for infringement (that is the responsibility of the content producer). A court of law show only be a last resort.

The problems with the DMCA in the US shows that giving rights-holders complete control is bad for everyone.

In general yes, a court and not a company or individual should make decisions, for consistency, oversight and appropriateness. Of course, a certain amount of monitoring is always necessary, and some content first RECOMMENDED for removal (ideally by the original poster), and only removed by the platform operator in extremis. There should be clear and substantial penalties levied against the platform operator for inappropriate REMOVAL, so that this is not used as an arbitrary censorship mechanism, but is used with extreme discretion only where it is extremely likely that a court would back it. Automated mechanisms should do no more than warn the original poster and alert the platform operator to check manually, if action is not taken. These procedures should be published and transparent, as should any actions taken on the basis of them.

Self monitoring and reporting by users

should have agreed processes to follow. Alleged infringements should go through the legal process of the land where the alleged infringement occurred.

Platforms will never be able to properly do a job which belongs to a court of law.

Censorship should not be with individuals and groups rather their requires some legal standing with access to independent appeal/review

Always through a judicial process. Have we learnt nothing from history.

Hell no, there should not be excessive monitoring to anyone's web services. It just punishes the people who do it for fun and never catches people who do it maliciously.

Alleged infringement needs to be justified in some way - if not before a court then in some way which gives you a right to challenge. Any takedown found not to be justified should be compensated. There whole issue of unjustified threats needs to be addressed and put on an equitable basis

No I do not believe these platforms should be monitored and filtered. It should go to court first and be proven.

The whole idea of monitoring internet activity takes us into Orwellian realms. There needs to be clearer laws on what should be immediately censored and what needs proving in a court of law. The concept of corporations having 'human rights' is a serious problem.

This issue seems to be one of who holds the responsibility for publication - whether the individual or the platform. The key problem for this type of monitoring is that it is not specific in the same way that a specific legal action is. Consequently, at a practical level, it is more likely to be monitored by some form of software based

on generalised programmed rubrics. As a result, it is not likely to have the same rigour that a court case has. This has the potential for a number of false positives and diminished content which, on closer inspection might not infringe copyright.

Alleged infringement should be proven and certainly not automated.

No point censoring something before it becomes public. As for my own activity, of course I don't want it censored in advance just because somebody doesn't like me

I am opposed to monitoring of content by the respective platforms. A court order should be required before content is taken down. It should be the rights holders burden to prove infringement, not the users burden to prove fair use, or non- infringement.

Corporations like law court because it scares people allowing them to be steam-rolled by their legal teams and huge funding. Hence the Electronic Frontier Foundation and public funding of cases heard in court is absolutely necessary

I do not think that service operators should be burdened with making the decision regarding what is "legal content" or automatically remove any content. I do believe that there should be a legal procedure for removing content which balances rights of free speech with rights of content creators.

The law and court is our way of dealing with this, not arbitrary decisions with no oversight

No one should be monitoring my internet activity. There should be legal protection, innocent until proven guilty by an independent legal authority

It should have to be proven. The internet

should not be exempt from the doctrine of "innocent until proven guilty."

The whole idea about internet censorship is like going back in time. It has no place in this 'enlightened society.'

No. No. No. Nope nope.

I think that removing content without recourse is wrong.

It's usually unreasonable to require service providers to be responsible for policing copyright infringement of their users. On the other hand, requiring each individual case to go to the courts before a decision is made is even less practical. It's not clear what the right approach is here.

No they should not have to monitor me, or filter without some form of appeals procedure.

Alleged infringement should be demonstrated in court before censorship

No, they shouldn't monitor my activity

Platforms should not face regulations requiring them to monitor Internet activity. If there is an alleged infringement it should be judged by a court of law.

Sensorship is normally something you would expect from places like China and/or dictatorships. Please, don't go down that road. As in all other context, the only sane thing to do prior to deciding on censorship, is letting the case in question go through court. This is not something to be decided by private companies, as the possibilities of misuse are too many

No, firstly, because it is impossible and secondly and most worryingly it might lead to crude and discriminatory profiling. All infringements of the law should of course have to be proven in law.

Proven in a court of law.

You should have to prove ownership before a take down request. Large companies should post bond.

The one size fits all approach so favoured by lawmakers always ends up fitting none. Whatever issue is being addressed will not be solved by this, merely driven elsewhere. Maybe you should actually address the concerns of your citizens instead of making them think their thoughts need approval?

I am appalled at the idea that some faceless person can make a decision as to what is appropriate for me to see. If I object to content I am quite able to turn it off myself. I believe that they should need to prove infringement of law before removal.

No, we do not need thought-police. A legal process should be in place.

No action should be taken until infringement has been proved in a court of law. That's what the courts are for. Of course social media platforms should not be required to monitor what their users do - that would be the equivalent of requiring the postal services to inspect the content of all letters!

All censorship needs to be vetted by a court of law before the censorship activity occurs.

Some censorship may be deemed okay, but I would like to know who it is who thinks they have the authority to censor

No companies such as Twitter should not have any reason to monitor my internet activity. They will already remove improper content when alerted to the problem.

No to part A Yes to part B

No, this should not be the responsibility of the content provider. This is effectively

asking these companies to do the work that law enforcement should be doing all along. If genuine breach of copyright takes place and is validated in court - then standard legislation for digital copyright ownership should apply. Infringement of digital copyright however is still being treated as a jailable offence in a lot of western countries, Which is just ridiculous

No censorship! The courts are there for a reason, and if anyone suspects infringement let them take it up there. What next? Thought crimes?

Infringement should be PROVEN beyond a shadow of a doubt before any kind of consequence occurs

No, it is for a court of law to determine whether an infringement has occurred.

To preserve free exchange of information it should take a court order. I could imagine whiting out parts of photos with an explanation and a way given to access it if it is useful information, as opposed to child pornography for example

It is for a judge to decide on what is legal property, not the Internet providers or service industry otherwise the most powerful player can censor anything they want.

I believe not. This would kill the electronic "free speech"!

THEY SHOULD NOT ACT AS JUDGES FOR THE PUBLIC IT SHOULD GO TO COURT.

Censorship without legal oversight is just dirty censorship. I say no to self-appointed guards of morale

Additional requirements on websites to police and track content limits creativity and limits what new companies can achieve. Only large established companies

will be able to adhere to all the new rules.

Court of Law! Simple, this monitoring has already gone too far!

no-one should be monitoring my internet activity. Any perceived infringement by me must be proven in court.

Service providers should not monitor the activity of individuals. It is legitimate for them to monitor the actual content of their own platforms, but referencing Q1 where I remarked on automated tools, the pitfalls of necessary automation apply here as well. Certainly there should be no assumption of guilt, or pre-emptive right to enforce removal without some formal adjudication, but there again corporations would win by mere threat of court action against smaller actors who could not sustain the cost even if they were to win

ABSOLUTELY NOT!!!! My internet activity should be as private as the letters I receive through the post. In fact they should be far more private than this due to the scale of possible abuses of my data or large scale datasets which include my data. It should not be up to private websites to have to monitor their users, something that they will always do in a way that reflects their own individual quirks and morality. For example facebook permits hate speech but bans nudity

No, no, no and no. Alleged infringement needs to be investigated to prevent abuse of censorship. As far as I am concerned there is no need to monitor or censor a persons internet activity unless they are actively bullying or abusing other people online. It would be hugely impractical/impossible to enforce monitoring of all activity on a site and requiring sites to do so would result in the closing down of many great sites. Linking and sharing are foundations of what makes the internet

great and should not face regulation.

They should be required to remove illegal content

yesno

Must be proven

No. Should be proven in a court of law

Appeal mechanism but not courts - too expensive

NO and NO because as Buckminster Fuller so presciently suggested ... "You never change things by fighting the existing reality. To change something, build a new model that makes the existing model obsolete." Perhaps that's what the EU should be considering now about the EU itself, in the context of the fact that there are THREE EU PRESIDENTS in charge of THREE LAYERS of EU Commissioners, at the top of the tree, so to speak, dreaming up ideas, to justify their self-serving missions, to make profit and taxes out of that which Tim Berners Lee GAVE FREELY to Humanity including the PEOPLES of EUROPE, for the purposes of making the "RIGHT CONNECTIONS". The EU Commission has proposed an idea that would require platforms to censor the web by monitoring and removing content posted by Internet users. I do not support this so-called 'duty of care' provision in the Digital Single Market plan. Monitoring billions of posts per day results in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression. When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for, and are very prone to get the balance wrong. When individuals monitor content they apply their own unique quirks and morality, often inconsistently. For example Facebook permits hate speech, but bans nudity.

NO. No one has any right to monitor my internet activity or remove my content I produce or share. Infringement MUST be proven in a court of law before censorship - this should be a given!

Infringement MUST be proven in a court of law in the country of residence for the alleged violator

Free speech nowadays is applied rather selectively depending upon the agendas of the people in power. No one should be able to decide arbitrarily what to filter or censor without due process and a court order. That goes for snooping as well.

Alleged infringements should be proved in a court of Law before Censorship occurs

Alleged infringement should be proven in a court before censorship

I do believe that some limited monitoring is required for the purpose of safety. Monitoring for such terrorism activities, child pornography, hate speech, racism, abuse of any sort and other unethical, immoral practices that falls under such extreme categories. Yes infringement should be proven in the court of law before censorship occurs

Any alleged infringement of rights owners by internet users needs to be subject to the rule of law. The existing court structures must be used for this.

NO! the legal system is already in place to address bad people.. the only system missing is the system making bad politicians accountable and give them jail time where warranted! they create any scenario to make the average person a criminal.. THAT'S CRIMINAL!

No I do not believe they should face such regulations. And Yes I believe infringement should be proved in a

court of law before censorship occurs.

No to first, yes to second.

No. We should be allowed to go about our own business

Yes innocent till proven guilty

that's a hard one... yes someone should be monitoring. courts can be expensive and long winded. if there were regulations that were broad enough to allow opinions without threatening or bullying others, then the platform owners should be able to sufficiently monitor that, no?

Perhaps some monitoring could be good. BUT it seems that there are no fair or ethical guidelines in place, it's at the whim of those monitoring

Absolutely not!!! I don't want anyone monitoring my internet activity. Google is bad enough as it is.

We should not be subjected to monitoring by Youtube or any other platform and they shouldn't be subject to these regulations either. Alleged infringement has to be proven first

No
Yes proven in a court of law

Should be proven before courts first or arbitrary body to handle it

No. infringement should go to court but it should go to genuinely independent arbitration first and not the vested interest of say the ad standards authority which is anything but independent.

Yes I think an alleged infringement needs to be held in a court of law

Rule of law should always prevail especially the premise of innocence first and proven guilt as well the rights of freedom of expression

Yes have to be proven in a court of law.

What! That is a weird idea. It sounds like the things I would expect to find in communist China or other totalitarian states. As for the Court of Law, Her Majesty versus wee Jimmy.

No platforms should not be required to monitor our internet activity, or filter or remove content we produce or share. Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law first.

Proof first.

There's some really egregious people in the comment sections, and a lot of negative and uncalled for stuff....but I guess, if you're for free speech, then you're supposed to support the worst versions of it, or then we're all in trouble....but some of the "bad" speech is just downright counterproductive to all of humanity and its further knowledge....I guess you could eliminate really stupid speech and petty arguments where people aren't even referring to the video or issue being presented, I think that stuff is very wasteful and fills up pages better served with other productive and valid material and constructive comments....

Absolutely not! Legal infringement must be proved in a court of law. Innocent until proven guilty !

Should be proven in court of law or through due process of the law

alleged infringement should be approved in a court of law

We have courts for a reason. Let them do their job

The current invasions of privacy in the world do not need to be made worse. There needs to be a legal reason for censorship, rather than assuming

everyone is an infringer without proof

No, yes to in court.

No content should ever be regulated or otherwise mismanaged until said content has been proven to be in infringement in a court of law

No. Only if guilty. Our Law states people or considered innocent until proven guilty - why is this different?

I cannot see how such regulation could be applied fairly, it would needlessly impede legal speech and expression. A court of law to show when infringement has occurred sounds better

They should not face such regulations. Alleged infringement has to be proven in court of law before censorship occurs

Website operators should be self-managing and only take it to the extremes of court action where necessary

I think we need some third way - something in between. So that artists and creators have a recourse and ability to earn a living from their creations, but not so that it requires costly and lengthy court decisions.

Infringement should have to be proven before censorship occurs.

It should be proven in a court of law

it should be proven in court first

No, unless it is criminal or terrorist. Otherwise infringement should have to be proven in court.

prove it in court!

No they should not face these regulations

This is a futile process. The internet is the virtual version of everyday life. Do I have

someone telling me what I can and can't say or do on a daily basis - no. We have laws, which also apply to the internet, but I can choose to ignore the law at my own risk. Do I have someone editing or removing what pours out of my mouth in the real world - as much as I'd like it sometimes - no. That is the internet. It's not always a nice place. Illegal content (read, in context to the laws in place in country) should be removed, but having a filter over every post is the denial of freedom of speech

NO, I don't believe in that

No, I feel the internet should be an open place. Governments however don't like this as they can't control their public easily.

I believe that SoundCloud, Twitter and YouTube should not face regulations to monitor internet activity. This would be a form of censorship where the vast majority behave responsibly online. Websites should use their own internal monitoring and warn users in certain circumstances and potentially ban them if necessary. This should only be done in exceptional circumstances and where someone may be threatened and infringement should be proven in a court of law. To clarify, I do not support any form of internet censorship or mass monitoring. Individual websites should instead pursue their own policies.

They shouldn't have to monitor it. If the alleged infringement relates to copyright, it sounds like a legal matter and should be dealt with as such.

Yes, court review must happen BEFORE content is removed else it is the DESTRUCTION OF FREE SPEECH. The onus of copyright has ALWAYS been on the holder. Media conglomerates are trying to get away with murder. Copyright is a fundamentally flawed concept. If the concept was applied everywhere, no

one would have access to the Internet because Tum Burners Lee and his team would have copyrighted (or patented) the technology. Copyright is an immoral and nonsensical demarcation between the improvement of humanity as a whole and the benefit of the few. It is an earning model that is inefficient. There are better ways to receive earnings from creative work but humanity will not implement these methods as long as the idea that you can "copyright" a piece of work exists.

the last

Innocent until proven guilty

Perhaps the music industry should be responsible for making sure royalties are collected every time their artists benefit from using Twitter. Idiotic

Platforms should not be depended on to monitor and censor people. They should not have the power to decide between right and wrong and to infringe on privacy and freedom of expression.

Media-sharing platforms should not be required to actively protect the content of others, as the current system works reasonably well. Allegations of infringement should be proven in a court of law before censorship action is taken.

it is ridiculous and petty-minded to suggest that platforms such as Twitter or Youtube should monitor content. The illegitimacy of such content should be decided upon by external judicial means before any action to censor should be made

Courts are the right place to debate such things. Censorship sounds reasonable until you consider who decides on who the censors should be. What training/ qualifications should they have? Freedom of speech is a valuable right and self policing works well. Unpleasant, racist

posts are ignored and not reposted and positive messages sent in their place, this is far better as a way of educating users of the net than any censor

Maybe Facebook should rethink their rules. But I think site owners have the right to set their own rules. Anything that might provoke violence should be illegal. But these proposals are more about paranoid business interests

No to monitoring/filtering/content removal by platforms Infringements should be proven in a court of law

I don't believe platforms should need to monitor copyright

No! Not at all

No, courts should be made ground zero to impose any kind of censorship

No, they should be proved in a court of law

No: do we not have freedom of speech and Expression? Do we not have the right to express ourselves however we want as long as it is not slanderous to others? A court appearance should be mandatory and all costs paid by said person complaining about infringement

HELL NO!

NO & YES.

No, definitely not. Alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law.

No, it is not their responsibility at all and such regulations would be damaging to the free sharing of information, would be easy to misuse, and also economically damaging to the providers and users. Also, this is technically difficult or impossible to implement in such a way as not to filter or remove perfectly legal content.

All cases should be judged individually by a court of law, and the decision and its justification publicly available

No to restrictions, yes to actually needing proof

I think that this is a difficult terrain. I want Twitter and others to be responsible and remove hate content/sexual and violent abuse etc. It's important to act proactively around cyber bullying. But, I feel that people have a right to air views which I might find abhorrent. I don't want to censor free speech.

No and not necessarily. But the burden on the plaintiff should be much heavier than it is now to prevent copyfraud, harassing takedowns, and disagreement masquerading as copyright-based objections

no, social (and media) platforms should not face regulation requiring them to monitor internet activity, or filter and remove content. Infringements should be proven (but may not necessarily require court of law).

No they should not remove

No. When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for, and are very likely this delicate balance wrong.

No. No

Having individuals' online activity monitored in favour of large corporations would be ridiculous and an horrendous step backwards.

No, the costs are too high for the business involved such that they would never get off the ground. Infringement should be reasonably

proved by more than the accuser.

I don't believe that online platforms should be obliged to actively monitor or filter content uploaded to their servers, as this is impractical given the scale of the data involved and risks hampering genuine creative work. If they receive a complaint about infringement and follow a fair process which considers both sides of the dispute, they shouldn't be held responsible.

Infringement should absolutely have to be proven in a court of law before any censorship occurs. Furthermore, platforms such as the abovementioned should not be co-opted by rights-holders and forced to do performance rights policing. I do not support the "duty of care" provision in the Digital Single Market plan, nor do I support the imposition of automated rights-monitoring systems (which would more befit totalitarian states), or the requirement for website operators to act as informal and poorly-accountable members of the justice system.

Intentional infringement should be proven in a court of law

Infringement and the impact of that infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

No, they should not. That raises their costs which means people who use that service have to pay more due to lazy and incompetent legal bodies failing to bother to do their jobs.

There are two questions here, which cannot be answered together by just yes or no. first question: no second question: yes

I think there are times that the content should be removed

Definitely courts should decide and not the platforms

No to Question #1 Yes to Question #2

unsure

Court review process

There could be cases for doing so.

The volume of content transactions means that rational, consistent censorship is impossible. This means that overkill will be applied, and manipulated to suppress ideas that conflict with state/corporate agendas.

Yes/Yes

I think the onus should remain on the rightsholder. Hosting services should remain neutral. It isn't simply a question of users versus rightsholders, but also the ability of smaller rightsholders, and those creating new works, including using elements from other works to continue to have their works protected. It is also essential for democracy that rightsholders should have to prove infringement - that they have the rights, and that use is outside fair use. The system described allows for large rightsholders to continue to dominate and to be able to close down competitors without having to prove that they are indeed the rightsholders. Without fair use, the ability to talk, reference, quote, illustrate etc other's works the foundations of democracy are threatened, as individual protests and opinion is easily silenced.

Should be proven before censorship

Alleged infringement should be proven first. Monitoring the web follows the principle of guilty until proven innocent, which delivers a dangerous precedent

No Perhaps

They should have laws about what they do with the data they have and be limited in what they remove

Courts should determine

Proven in an open court

I want no one to monitor my internet activity

No one should be forced to censor or remove content without the oversight of a court of law,

they should face regulation. alleged infringement should be proved legally before any censorship

Platforms should not be monitoring my internet activity. Police can do that only with a warrant, so why would it be legal for the platform to do it without a warrant?

Alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs. We are not guilty until proven innocent.

All legal expression should be freely allowed without fear of interference or routine monitoring.

Just leave the Internet alone. It is a place for all communities to come together. Any restrictions can only be harmful.

Infringement needs to be proven before items can be censored. Automated systems are not up to the job of doing this and web sites should act as judges as they are not qualified.

No. Infringement must be proven in a court of law by impartial/unbiased official entities.

No, because you essentially letting a company model society.

No. Until it is proven in a court of law that a specific criminal offence has been or is being committed, there should be no requirement for Internet space-providers to police their users, any more than landlords or mortgage providers

should be responsible for criminally-policing their tenants or householders. That is what we have courts for

infringement should definitely be proven before action is taken that might affect individual rights

Innocent until proven guilty. Content should not be monitored unless there is real evidence of illegal activity and a court order should be necessary

Monitoring on such a big scale is bound to failure. Infringements need to be evaluated by people not computer scripts

First question: no Second question: yes

Alleged infringement should be proven before content is taken down

I believe they have no right to censor or remove free speech.

All copyright disputes should be settled in court, after the infringe has been sufficient time to remove the content themselves.

They absolutely should not be required to monitor anyone's activity. Innocent until proven guilty

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs. One person should not have the right to unilaterally decide they don't like my content and remove it

No, they should not be monitoring my activity anyways, required or not. Having a trial for censorship makes more sense, even if it is a lot more lengthy and costly. Ideally, we could find some solution inbetween the privacy-infringing mandatory monitoring, and the costly, over-worked court systems. Also, I really don't think that one can put blanket-solutions over a system as incomprehensibly diverse as the Internet

No, I don't think they should monitor users. I want infringements to be proven

I think I should be able to create and post freely, without platforms being forced to monitor activity. There are existing laws and sensible terms and conditions in place that oppose harmful content.

I do not believe in censorship and monitoring of the Internet.

Our internet activity should not be monitored by anyone, including our governments

Absolutely not. For a start, only massive corporations would be able to afford it, so it means innovation will cease, and secondly it's an obvious invasion of privacy, which I believe is a Human Right.

I object to being monitored and spied on as it is so unless I post or share illegal content, I don't expect it to be restricted or removed, too many videos have mysteriously become unavailable on YouTube for no apparent reason?

No censorship!

If content is highly offensive (racist, homophobic...) it should definitely be taken down and to court! Otherwise no, leave it. Stop policing what people say.

They should have to prove infringement

Accusations should always be placed before the courts, not left to corporate interests whose only concern is extorting profit.

Alleged infringement should be proven in a Court of law before censorship, as it can genuinely be done by mistake rather than out of malice. Regulations would only make users afraid of posting content and it would stifle creative outlets

like Facebook, Youtube and Twitter.

Platforms should NOT have the ability to monitor nor remove content. Alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law.

Regulations making online platforms (e.g. YouTube) responsible for content that users have posted would be an enormous drain on these platforms to the extent that they would no longer be able to function as effective low-cost sharing tools in the way that they have. It is critical that infringement be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

The platforms shouldn't be held accountable for what YOU decide to share, or publish. YOU have to be responsible for that

Part 1: No Part 2: No

This should need to be proven, it stifles the right to freedom of expression

Censorship must be controlled by law. The ISP or app provider should not have that burden

It should be up to a court to decide whose property it is and not some computer program that blocks things

Proof in a court of law should be required.

Infringement must be proved in a court of law.

No. With the necessary automatic monitoring of such a huge amount of content, overreach will inevitably occur.

I think a court of law is unnecessary if there is a clear breach of copyright, but I think these platforms should be less hasty in removing content for other reasons

q3 There should be no

censorship or monitoring.

Alleged infringements should be looked at individually, carefully, before censorship occurs. Websites should not make their own decisions about what is legal and what is not. That role belongs to the courts.

Platforms should not be above individuals

The courts are there for good reason and they should be used

Alleged infringements should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

I think they should have regulations applied, but also court of law should be used to prove infringements.

I don't use social media.

Maybe not necessarily proven in a court but the bar should be at higher than it seems to be now.

No, I don't

I agree that all abusive, dishonest, defamatory and stolen intellectual property should be removed

To the first question, no. To the second, not unless the accused denies that the content alleged to be an infringement violates terms of service

No, these platforms should respond to legitimate concerns about illegal posting when advised by the public

No. What enters the internet stays on the internet. Copyright in the 21st century means the right to copy whatever you feel like copying

Innocent until proven guilty should apply here as much as anywhere else

It is outrageous that such action can be initiated without due legal process.

Alleged infringement has to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

Any infringements need to overseen by a tribunal of some sort. What motivates corporations means they should not be judge jury and enforcer

Automated systems are an abject failure, proof before punishment

Infringement must be proven.

They should not be able to take anything down. alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

No should have to be proven in court unless of a sexual nature eg. Paedophilia

No Such alleged infringement should be treated through the legal system

No they shouldn't have to filter stuff, and yes, it should have to be proven first

Should be proven in the court before any action

No, if a crime has been committed then it should be addressed through due legal process whether it is on the web or in the street

Should be proven in court.

Whatever happened to "innocent until proven guilty"? Of course no censorship till allegations are proven.

This is against our rights . We just use internet . We do no harm

Should have to be proven

lawcourt

PROVED

I strongly object to requiring a platform to monitor my activity or filter and remove content that I produce and share. Alleged infringement should be subject to proof before an independent court. Remove the so-called duty of care provision from the digital single market plan.

Monitoring for hate and incitement to violence I agree with. I can even agree that copyright infringement for profit should be a no no. But we are supposed to live in a free, democratic country where we are supposed to have freedom of speech

no I don't think they should have those regulations. The internet is free for everybody. yes I think it should come before a court of Law before things get banned

No, I believe alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

No, absolutely not unless it is certainly pornography, filled with bad language, threats, etc

It must be proven in a court of law

Everything is lawful until proved otherwise

Infringement should be proved

No, platforms should not police copyright-infringement.

Prove it in a court of law. The majority of content that is used in an infringing way is not used for commercial purposes. Sharing is caring. Sharing is advertising. Sharing should not be illegal.

In some cases alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

All content produced and shared should have to be proven as infringement in a court of law before censorship occurs

Users should be free to share and use the platforms as they see fit, and it is the right holders who must be ultimately responsible for protecting their works by issuing take down requests. In cases where there is dispute whether right is infringed or not, things should go to court for resolution

No, internet is a functioning anarchy and should remain so.

Alleged infringement should be subject to the test of law

No. Actively policing members should not be the job of the service

No filtering!

No. If I break a copyright law, it should be thoroughly checked before being taken down. By that I mean, it does not necessarily have to be in a court of law, rather I want them to check if any copyright is infringed before the content is taken down.

Maybe somewhere in between - alleged infringement could first lead to a direct challenge to the uploader to explain both sides of the material in question - reasons for and against leaving it online, then only if it is clear that the intent was to unfairly benefit from use of another's intellectual property should it be taken to law. Instant removal without discussion or reason given smacks of unjustifiable censorship.

No. Not under law and certainly not willy-nilly at any big company's request. Firstly, the person making the request must prove that they hold copyright to the content and secondly that said copyright has been infringed. Unless this is done within a court of law, massive abuse will occur.

Absolutely not. Speech should be suppressed *only* after the removal has been justified before an *independent* judge or tribunal

No! They can do what they want with their own platforms, and they do. Regulating this is a waste of time. Yes, censorship should occur in a court of law - OR - if the platform itself decides to censor.

Alleged infringement should have to be proven before censorship occurs

It should have to be proven!

Absolutely no to monitoring my activity, absolutely not to filter and remove my own content. Alleged infringement is just that. Our judicial system is built on an innocent until proven guilty platform. Someone thinks I'm infringing on their copyright, prove it first!

alleged infringement have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs?

alleged infringement should be proved in a court of law

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs. When websites make decisions on what is legal content they are acting like courts and judges, a role they are not qualified for, and are very likely this delicate balance wrong.

Alleged infringement should have to be proven in a court of law. The internet is not a place for corporatised vigilante justice, although it seems it is moving in that direction.

Any censorship should be subject to due legal process.

Democracy is all about freedom of speech freedom of expression and peoples

human rights with which to do this. To needlessly regulate the internet for innocent people whilst the real criminals who are well known to the security services continue to get off scott free, is utterly wrong. The UN and all govts don't like us having our human rights . The answer to q3 is a resounding...'alleged infringements have to be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs

I believe freedom of speech should be preserved on the Internet, so long as it does not infringe on others rights to this freedom, nor does it incite religious/ racial hate against others any alleged infringement on this freedom needs to be protected in a court of law & requests made to scrutinise individual account should be submitted through the proper channels, for instance to prevent acts of terrorism.

I believe in net neutrality. and freedom of expression and creativity. and not censorship

I believe that existing censorship tools have become fraught with false positives that have frequently and regularly taken down content that does not infringe on copyright holders intellectual property. Expanding this to billions of posts/messages a day will have an unfair impact on free speech. Also this requires that companies who impose these tools are free to interpret the conditions of censorship without any legal qualification and are almost certainly going to get it very wrong as it will almost certainly contain cultural and personal bias

I believe the courts should decide before before any monitoring or filtering or removal of content is permitted. The worst people to make such decisions are politicians who sadly cannot foresee consequences but want to be seen as doing something, rather than do the right things.

I do not believe sites such as Twitter and Youtube should have to monitor shared content.

I do not believe that any Organisation should be required to monitor internet activity or filter or remove internet content unless a Court of Law requires that specific content be censored. Requiring organisations to monitor and make judgements about internet activity and content is potentially a very dangerous step, fraught with problems of interpretation, commercial bias etc. It would inevitably lead to a totally unjustifiable suppression of free speech and suppression of freedom of information, two cornerstones of any free or democratic society.

I fiercely believe that no organisation should regulate, monitor, filter or remove content I or anyone else produce or share! This would be a fatal blow to our Freedom of Speech!If there are reasons to do such things, the alleged infringement must be proven in a court of law before any censorship is considered.

If companies business models no longer work in a modern digital age it is them that need to change not the new inovitive organisations. There is a huge misconception that all file/link sharing sites online only provide access to illegal content. This is completely untrue and all though such content is available so is much legal content. By shutting such sites down you are directly negatively effecting content providers due solely because larger content providers are telling you to in order to protect their own interests. In addition it is ridiculous to suggest that all files downloaded illegally would have been purchased legally if the download was not available. I hope you side with the vast majority of people and the developing tech world and not with big business who has had its day.

If criminals like drug cartels, murderers, and gangsters have been caught and evidence can be found by retrieving conversation, or type, this should be made available by court order. If people like the corporate trash who owns facebook withholds information on these people, they are as guilty, and should be jailed. Any information should only be handed over if there is a bonifide court order. No one should be allowed access without it, and only properly vetted people should be allowed to handle information, not the nosy parker next door who cares nothing for privacy

Infringement must be proven in a court of law. If we allow the internet to be censored we, the people, will be wholly controlled by our governments, and that is unacceptable, pure and simple.

Infringement needs to be proven before censorship. This is a slippery slope to censorship. Who in these companies makes these decisions? People who are Un-elected and unaccountable - this is a terrible idea for freedom of speech.

Infringement should be proven

infringement should have to be proved before I am monitored

Infringements need to be proven in court first

Internet activity should not be monitored.

Monitoring & filtering should not be default activities and should only be undertaken as part of a criminal investigation.

naturally, I believe that infringement should have to be proved in court...

No – this will almost definitely result in automated systems that unfairly censor legal speech and expression. Websites

are not qualified to act as courts and judges – alleged infringement must be proven in a real court in a real court of law before any censorship can occur.

No and the alleged infringement should be proven in a court of law before censorship occurs.

no censorship please

No control. If the state, or the European super-state, thinks I've done something wrong, it is up to them to prove it in a court of law. And I will be asserting my indefeasible rights under Common Law - I reside in a Common Law jurisdiction.

No monitors, no censorship.
Keep the internet free.

No to all of the above. Our freedoms are getting smaller with all these regulations and restrictions. People should be able to make their own decisions as to what they want to access.

No to censorship

no to the first and yes to the second

No way should this happen

No way!

No, alleged infringement must first be proven in a court of law.

No, expecting social media platforms to monitor content is missing the point. We have a legal system for resolving such issues. Technology firms should not be expected to take on judicial roles on the cheap, because that would be the worst of all possible outcomes for all concerned. There is already a major social media platform that allows hate speech to go unchallenged, but bans nudity. These companies are just not capable

of judging what is socially acceptable, despite being called "social media".

No, they should not be allowed to monitor internet activity. Yes alleged infringement needs to be proved in a court of law before censorship happens.

No, they should not be monitoring at all.

No. Should be done in a court of law.

Nobody should monitor my online activity without a court order.

Only if someone places unacceptable statuses

Platforms should not be required to monitor their users' internet activity, any more than pubs and cafes should be required to record and monitor their customers' conversations.

Prove infringement before censorship. Defend our freedom and privacy!

The internet is the most accessible window on the world. It's both anarchistic and democratic at the same time. Any one who believes that anarchy can be governed doesn't know what anarchy means. Anyone who feels the internet Needs to be governed have their own agenda to promote, or skeletons to be kept in a cupboard. Last but not least, everyone who insists that they Can govern this world, be it by the internet or the sword,,, well, perhaps it would be kinder to commit them to the care of a home for the mentally hilarious. That would leave us democratic anarchists to get to get along together at our Own Sovereign discretion.

The internet must remain open and free from censorship by the organisations unless alleged infringements are proven in a law court.

There should be no censorship unless an infringement is proved in a court of law

they should not monitor our activity, giving authorities more power over us is not a good thing(it usually corrupts them if they are not corrupted already) It would be better if we had more power over authorities! Why is the statement "innocent until proven guilty" slowly being eroded?

Under no circumstances

Web service providers should have no responsibility for content provided by third party contributors.Web service providers should have a duty NOT to monitor or record the activity of those users who are simply accessing data. Web service providers have a duty to keep private any records made of users who are creating or modifying content on their services. No sale or transfer of any such records should be permitted except after full and open discussion in a court of law.Any infringement of intellectual copyright should be proved in a full and open discussion in a court of law held in the country of residence and subject to the laws of that country in which the alleged infringer resides. Alleged infringers should be protected from all personal and financial risks right up to the point of conviction.

Save the Link question 4:

Should websites and users be forced to pay a link tax? Put simply: should websites should have to pay money when using snippets of text to preview other content online?

European Commission consultation question:

Are you a holder of rights in digital content protected by copyright which is used in an online platform?

- As a holder of rights in digital content protected by copyright have you faced any of the following circumstances?**
- An online platform such as a video sharing website or an online content aggregator uses my protected works online without having asked for my authorization?**
- An online platform such as a video sharing website or an online content aggregator refuses to enter into or negotiate licensing agreement with me**
- An online platform such as a video sharing website or an online content aggregator is willing to enter into a licensing agreement on terms that I consider unfair**
- An online platform uses my protected works but claims it is a hosting provider under Article 14 of the E-Commerce directive in order to refuse to negotiate a license or to do so under their own terms**

If yes, explain.

Total number of responses: 1333

Unique responses: 868

"We now live in a global community, linked by an open Internet, and imposing laws like this that stem the flow of data across only one region of the Internet would have an effect on communication over it everywhere, not just the EU. Established publishers online may be able to live with such taxes being put in place, but what happens to those starting out building new services online? Link taxation is a near sighted and ill-thought through concept, leading to a weakening of the open Internet and stifling the free movement of knowledge and information."

No

No link tax. If people put information online, it is in the public domain for fair use.

No, this should be considered fair use and no taxes should be applied at all.

No!

A 'link tax' would be entirely wrong. Another way of looking at it is that the linked content is getting free advertising so maybe the linked websites should pay the tax. A link tax is clearly absurd and will only stifle innovation

A "link tax" would destroy the internet

A definite don't know!

A link tax is simply nonsense. A link is like a suggestion or recommendation. Why would someone have to pay in order to recommend something?

Absolutely no

Absolutely no taxes

Absolutely not

Absolutely not, if it's in accordance with copyright regulations, meaning the text is used for a non-commercial and/or educational purposes or for preview, and the full text is not displayed.

absolutely not!

Absolutely NOT! The internet must remain free, and not taken over by CORRUPT interests bribing member of the EU.

Absolutely not! The very thought scares me!

Absolutely not! This is a way to ensure that innovation and inspiration be smothered, that exchanges and knowledge be hampered, that cultural, social and economic development be hamstrung and that we slip back into the Dark Ages.

Absolutely not. It's an insane idea, that would abolish the WWW completely, making search engines, blogs, and social networks impossible

Absolutely not. That's like a poll tax. Open communication is not only desirable, it's essential. That must not be impeded.

Absolutely not. The Internet is built on freedom of information. A link tax is the equivalent of literary critics being charged for every time they quote part of a book

Absolutely not. The Internet's brilliance is in the way it allows the free flow of information and sharing of ideas. People already pay for their Internet services, either from landlines or mobile. And they have the choice to pay for premium services online. If you put a tariff on linking, you effectively shut down a highly competitive market and isolate small businesses and charities

Absolutely not. The only thing a tax like that would accomplish is to make it harder for small businesses and startups to function, make it harder for people to communicate casually, and make it harder for knowledge and information to be shared and distributed. The internet is to human knowledge what air travel has been to human transportation. Restrict it, and the only conclusion I can draw is that it's a malicious attempt to sabotage the greatest knowledge-sharing network in the history of the human race.

Absolutely not. There are ways that online text can be made private or unlinkable without charging. Again, charging sites money for their content based on royalties is an incredibly sticky slope for the free internet. The whole idea is that it is a public forum and that any and all content is available to all, unless parameters are set within a website's own administration (not forced onto another's!)

Absolutely not. This is shared commons and any other interpretation is simple thought policing, and an excuse used to thwart the dissemination of social/political movements

Absolutely not. This would be disastrous

for many sites, and lead to a severe hampering of the internet's ability to be a creative outlet, which is one of its most important purposes today. It's also entirely unfair - websites are already paying to maintain and run their sites, and I honestly can't see what purpose a "link tax" would serve, or who should receive the money

Again, this should be fair use. Apart from the cost, it might make publishing on the web a lot more cumbersome for private persons and small organizations.

Again: of course not.

Are you serious? Of course not, this is an absolutely terrible idea

Change the way we create money and think Basic Income instead of pay to click. That «level of misunderstanding» makes me angry and sad because Internet is the most beautiful thing humans ever created to boost up their knowledge and needs of freedom. It should encourage that way... sharing, knowledge and freedom.

Definitely no. The Internet as a free medium of communication should stay a common source of sharing knowledge without having to pay anything.

Fuck no. That'd kill the internet and literally be racing free speech.

haha, this should prevent ads too, *RIGHT* ?put simply, no.

Hell no. Taxes are for the physical, not virtual world

I am not in favour of the link tax

I should not be taxed for previewing content

I'm against this kind of taxes. It's usually only beneficial to large content

producers and it might be dangerous on who will produce and control any kind of content. It is too temptative not to be used in their favor

If someone is forced to pay a link tax, it means that every webpage must be scanned for "infringing links", and this means a need for almost total control over non-public parts of the web, a control for which some jerks in politics are longing for. It will also change the cashflow of the web, allowing government news outlets to make money by simply producing bullshit, and Merkel and Hillary and Putin will make money every time when online tabloids show their ugly faces - because they will declare themselves to be a source of income for "news" agencies.

In no case websites and users should be forced to pay for this kind of usage.

Indeed, the EU lacks a fair use exception doctrine.

Laws that create link taxes for online platforms harm our ability to innovate online and actually give entrenched publishers more power over online content. Regardless of where you live, many of our favourite websites will be impacted by bad regulations. The Web is global and it will affect Internet users everywhere. Many websites cannot afford to pay money to link to excerpts of content available elsewhere online. New fees on linking limit what they link to, or could force them to shut down entirely. Taxing links stifles innovation for new online services. The next reddit or Twitter would be unable to start up under these rules. The web is an incredible information space, and every successful scheme to prevent linking weakens the foundation of the open Internet.

Link tax indicates that every piece of content or information is worth

paying for, information should be free and not held by the highest bidder.

Link taxes stifle speech. A link is simply a reference to the original material in its unadulterated form. On clicking such a link, the end user sees the content referred in the environment of the original contents owner. All profitability and content 'paywalling' can be done on the side of the content owner, on the content owners' own site. Linking does not prevent or block such efforts, and therefore also does not interfere with the profitability of content itself. If a content owner is too lazy to take measures to protect paid-for content, then that is at the caution of the content owner, not of the party placing a link. The nature of opinion, news, academia and discourse in general, is to refer to other, previous discourse. Much of this is already placed in the public domain, or placed publicly accompanied by advertising to generate revenue on the internet. The link tax, directed at search and indexing groups, content aggregators like Google and Facebook, on behalf of the content publishers (mainly Elsevier and Springer groups, as those payrolling this entire debate) is disproportionately harmful to independent sites and resources voicing opinions or facts. Take wikipedia. It now only needs to maintain its own server costs, would now have to pay to cite / and link to academic papers, or newspaper articles (mind you, not include content, simply placing a reference). It would bankrupt the wikipedia project instantly. Opinion? A blog? It cannot explicitly link or refer to any content worth mentioning, as this would incur the tax. Having an opinion is free. Hosting it on the internet is cheap. Referring to potentially any other human work: unaffordable. This won't work. The current body of scholarly works, (as also, might I add, is for the most part funded by public money, yet locked in proprietary, paid-for-access storage by

above mentioned Elsevier and Springer, incurring huge costs along the order of tens of millions yearly, for these educational institutions, also publicly funded, to access the fruits of their own publicly funded labour) would not be able to exist without the ability to freely place references. The implicit cost of these references (archive subscriptions) is covered by the universities and invisibly publicly funded, but it is not reflecting any added special benefit or value added by above mentioned media companies. Imagine a 'news tax', in which newspapers would have to pay a fixed percentage to the subjects of a news story (dead, alive, or cat). How does one think this would affect the reporting of news? What is the harm in linking, e.g. placing a reference to the original work in its natural context (hosted by the publisher of said work), other than the original work receiving more views? For the person linking, it forms a reference to whatever they are discussing. For the person linked to, it provides a new, free stream of incoming viewers / content consumers. It very much seems that Springer and Co. very much realize that archiving is now a low-cost, technologically 'solved' problem, and therefore in profit margins is a race to the bottom. Instead of focusing on their value added benefit, the editing and curation of content, they choose to lobby for the same broken public works-ransoming cartel mechanics they have applied to academia, and thus far have gotten away with keeping in place due to the opaque financing records of public education.

Links are the beauty of the internet. Taxing links is a silly idea that will cost millions. Smaller website and businesses will not be able to afford this and will have to limit their linking or just give up completely. This will make it harder for new online services to start up, as well. This plan is the start of the crumbling of the open information source that is the current internet

Most definitely not..

Negative. This is ridiculous. I pay enough for everything. I refuse to accept such nonsense They're capitalizing my beautiful internet and i will no longer stand for it.

never

No

No

No and no

No as this gives power to the rich to control the flow of information. This must never be allowed.

No because there is no infringement other than the two parties involved. In other words why should a third party be involved if I am posting a link to a second party for material that is tagged as free access and distribution

No I do not agree with this!!

No link tax should be paid.

NO LINK TAX!

No link tax. Info should be free up to the point of needing access to a research journal, eg. How long until the pass it on to the consumer?

No link taxes.

NO No

NO ONE should be charged a link tax

no taxes

No taxes on snippets etc on the internet. Everything else is outrageously ridiculous and will only lead to tax evasion and pirating

no the content creators should pay any such tax, as the links provided by sites such as Yahoo, Bing or Google actually drive business and eyeballs to them

No the Internet is build of of links and implementing a tax like this threatens the Internet as we know it today

No they should not if they are merely using snippets to direct viewers to the whole article

No way this is a preposterous idea.

No way! Never ever! A snippet is always a free form of advertising for the person/company set up the text. A link tax is an absolute no go. This would minimize the ability of regular internet users to get a wide spread set of information to build their own opinion on topics. Censoring the internet is the wrong way!

No web pages should be able to show text or related things free of charge. Particularly if these web pages are created by individuals or non profit organizations advocating for a specific cause. This is especially true for web pages that are engaging in E commerce. Copyright enforcement should be solly in the hands of government in these cases, not for private interests to dictate.

No websites should not be forced to pay a link tax.

No, absolutely not. That's just a ploy to squeeze more money out of internet users and content makers

No, as those snippets are short and have a descriptive role - analogous to including a short excerpt from a book in its review - something which surely must be allowed

No, but perhaps some limits should be established to the amount of text that

they can attach (without payment) to the link. Reality is that with the current situation in Internet, rather soon we will have no problem because the amount of new independent interesting material available will be rather limited (but we of course will have a lot of advertisements disguised as original material, no problem)

No, how much more red tape is going to get used around this planet? This is just another way to deter people from using copyrighted material. I am also doubtful that the original content creator will get the full amount to be paid. There's always some government "official" begging for tax money, a fee here, a fee there. You administration, postage, processing, the collectors. It's a never ending list meant to make it too difficult to even bother, likely also too expensive to even want to share content

No, I don't think so

No, id rather stop using the internet, big corporations dont deserve rights and tax on everyone and everything..

No, it will cause more economically driven usage and shut out more community based website creation

No, it's only a money making tool. Would be similar to tax the air we breathe. As much as we can find arguments to do something like this, ultimately it is only about control and money.

No, No, and NO!

No, sharing ideas and works of others through citing and linking is something that has been done the beginning of the written word.

no, that again tramples on fair use rights

No, that attacks the very core of what

the web is, taxing it would kill it.

No, that makes the internet useless

No, that's a ridiculous idea. It undermines the entire working of the world wide web

No, that's capitalist bullshit we all pay enough taxes already

No, the INTERnet is based on INTERconnectivity. A html page without links to other pages would be utterly useless, especially since the vast majority of links on any given page link to content on the same domain. It would be like taxing encyclopedias on the number of entries.

No, they should not.

No, this is absurd, inhumane, and again, a crime against humanity. This would first of all require every website to identify itself, would secondly severely limit non-corporate websites and probably destroy a lot of them. It would put a tax on using the effectively infinite ability to use links and would destroy free speech on the internet too. Paying for speech is wrong.

No, to my opinion, offering a sample does not constitute a violation

NO, users should NOT be forced to pay a link tax!

No!

No! Paying a link tax would have serious repercussions, limiting online services and innovation due to costs

No! The whole point of the Internet is to share information as freely and as cheaply as possible

No!!!

No!!!!!!

No.

No. A link tax would be detrimental to everyone. It would make the Internet virtually unusable. If someone wants to charge for content, they must do it within their own web domain only

No. Absolutely not.

No. But they should reference the source.

No. creative commons

No. Fair use is a right and does not have to be paid for

No. If websites wish to charge for content, they should use a "paywall" or other mechanism -- linking to that content, and other fair-use, should not be restricted

No. Imposing such a tax is neither necessary nor to the good for the state of the Internet as a whole.

No. Information should be free to use and to share. Most worthwhile content is spread by "word of mouth" (i.e. linking), and charging to link content will ultimately leave only "approved" content (that will be filtered and controlled by the state or by media giants).

No. It would be of great detrimental value to both end-users and content creators if quotes, citations, snippets or other previews to or on links would no longer be possible. By linking to another website you are both providing a service to the end-user (by guiding them to more relevant content) and the other website (by leading traffic to their site, which may be monetized). Websites that wish to remain inaccessible to the majority of users already have a great array of tools at their disposal to do so.

No. Link tax is the dumbest thing I have heard. It does not cost anyone anything

if the snippets of content are displayed - at least if implemented right. If this was enforced, what would small sites do? Just use less links, use no links? That would disconnect the content. This more sounds like a different kind of censorship

No. No no no. This is wrong in SO MANY ways. The whole web is based on hyperlinks. Linking sources and give a citation of it is the most important thing if the internet should survive as a useful source of free knowledge. And even now european internet-business and startups have so many to overcome, that they probably never will compete with the US. Taking away web neutrality (and: yes, it is taken away - look what telekom did) was a hard strike for IT-economy. So don't do the next one.

No. That would destroy the free distribution of information

No. Thats a cash grab. If i see a link that interests me, I follow it and the source may generate income from my viewing it on their site. It's essentially free publicity for them. Why should they get the benefits of exposure and cash

No. The link is the very base of the Internet. Paying for linking affects small business.

No. This could force many low-budget sites that serve millions of people (such as Daily Kos) to shut down. It would limit internet freedom.

No. This should be allowed as "fair use". It should also be acknowledged that such sharing likely has diffuse but real economic benefits to society at large, as well as rights holders

No. This undermines the concept of free speech

No. This would break the internet

No. This would completely destroy the free-sharing of information that the Internet is based on, and which has created all its innovation and revolutionised the world so far. This would commodify the sharing of information and completely distort the equality of information sharing that the Internet should have. Without this quality, the Internet will be turned into a glorified shopping mall for anything. This would create a huge barrier against the ability for people to freely search out new and unknown information online. Furthermore it would clog up internet transactions and greatly increase the cost of ISP services as well as online products/services/shopping etc

No. where did this come from?
should I pay rights if I tell my friend
what my neighbour said?

NO. Would be stupid and absurd

Not at all

Of course not

Of course not. Freedom of link should stay that way - if publishers don't like it, they can use a paywall

Of course not. It would be like paying to use a public library when in a city in another country. Provided the amount viewed is small [as with % used for review purposes in printed text], there should be no reason

Only commercial websites that are making a profit off content they did not produce should pay tax

Only if you really want to
destroy the internet.

Q4 No

Short answer: No of course not. Long answer: implementing such a tax is pretty much impossible and amounts to illegal censorship, since many private bloggers have fairly low income and could not afford to pay that kind of tax. Also by the logic of that idea traditional paper media should also pay that tax every single time they mention other media, people or even when they cite anything anyone has said

So long as only a portion is used and the original source is linked to, it should be counted as fair use. It is no different than quotation. Reusage of an entire text should be counted as copyright infringement that law already exists.

Telling people about interesting content should never be taxed! If I give my friends book recommendations, reciting a few lines from memory I do not need to pay the publisher. I should not have to do so because I do the same on the internet. A link tax will kill the internet as a free means of communication.

that is 'micro-transaction' nonsense

The "link tax" is the virtual equivalent of the "oxygen tax": should we pay for breathing? Should we pay for sharing information? That said, be certain that link replacements will appear as soon as a tax is voted: circumventing that tax is just a technical matter.

The idea of a link tax is abhorrent. It goes against the basic principles of the internet - that of making information available. The only people to benefit from this practice will be the people who do not want to majority of the public to educate themselves

The internet isn't really "free", since there are networks, software and storage to maintain, but it should

be accessible to everybody

The web is an incredible information space, and every successful scheme to prevent linking weakens the foundation of the open Internet

There should absolutely not be a tax associated with linking to content. This is a very important process for sharing information and knowledge.

There should be no link tax at all, that's a completely unreasonable idea.

There should be no taxes to use the internet, nor to link to other content

This is not acceptable! I see no right for that!

This is outright stupidity. Who even thought this up? Have they ever used the internet? Have they ever read news in a newspaper that references reports from other news outlets? The internet is the medium of the future and links are what holds it together. If you put a tax on links you will severely restrict the internet and slow down business and innovation, as well as culture

Websites who use links only advertise for the website they link. People get sent to the site behind the link, so why should they pay for making content known?

What an historically stupid idea - like the window tax (people just bricked up their windows) or the water-wheel tax (it shut down mills all over Britain but didn't add up to revenue for the government.) People will find other ways around it, because communication is a natural human activity and cannot be stifled for long, but governments will a) not get the money they imagine they will, and b) they will lose a means of spying on us and what we are interested in, and in their

tiny-minded world, that's supposed to be important, isn't it? But maybe pumping up the already obscene "take" of the biggest corporations is all they're really interested in, even though even they must know it can't go on forever. What is this - grab every last penny and "sauve qui peut"? C'mon - stretch for a little sanity here.

What is my country or any other country have done for me in order to have a better internet connection (for example)? No, I don't think that I should pay any taxes when I access a link.

Yes

"Hey, have you seen today's 'Daily Bugle' — there's a story 'Are the PC brigade stealing the identity of the memory of Diana?' If I say to a colleague in the office, or on the phone to my mum, I am simply telling them about the article, alerting them to it, by using its name (its headline). I'm not infringing any copyright. Even if I read out the standfirst, or a particularly relevant paragraph, to give them a taste of it, I'm simply signalling what the article contains — drawing their attention to it, publicizing it. The same is true online. If I share a link to an article electronically to people I know, I'm suggesting they may wish to read it. Obviously I have to include enough context to let them know what it's about, and to entice them into reading it. This is no more a copyright infringement than chatting by the office water cooler or on the blower to my mum. Indeed, many news websites specifically include metadata in their article pages so that when sharing a link on Twitter or Facebook, the headline and standfirst are automatically included. It'd be absurdly hypocritically of an organization to complain about, treat as an infringement of copyright, or demand payment for, an article excerpt which has only been included because of code they specifically put into their sites for doing

that very thing! And the same continues to apply even if links are being shared in a professional way by an organization. If I choose to pay somebody to phone me up and let me know every time an article of interest to me is in one of the papers, that's a useful service, but it isn't an infringement of the papers' articles. If they email me, or Tweet me, or display them on a webpage, that doesn't fundamentally change what's happening or add a breach of copyrighted material into the situation. The link-sharer is telling me about articles they think I'd like to read (on the original websites, with me encountering advertising, subscription charges, or whatever the publisher wishes); they aren't re-publishing the article themselves, or leeching traffic from the original source. (Quite the opposite! If they're any good, they are increasing traffic.) Links are links. They are signposts of the internet. They are how the worldwide web works. Please don't let publishing organizations bully you into destroying this (and most probably themselves in the process);

A link tax could very easily break the web as it is. Its existence would force many platforms to restrict what is linked to (especially smaller platform providers) and potentially cause useful services such as Google News to shut down entirely as they did in Spain. If Twitter were to have to pay a link tax, it would either have to be a flat rate for all links, which would charge for users linking to their own content on other services, or require complex analysis to decide which links need to be taxed.

A link tax favors the large and powerful media but stifles the small, new and creative sites. This is a destructive idea

A link tax is a terrible idea as it would damage the net as a whole as people will simply stop using sites that implement such a policy.

A link tax is just another money grab by big business

A link tax will make the web much less useful, simply because it will discourage people from linking to useful or interesting content. Just as in old world media you have the right to quote something or mention the name of a book or news article, the web heavily depends on making links freely.

A link tax would be massively detrimental to what is currently the greatest platform for freedom of speech and democracy ever created

A link-tax is absurd. However, the concept could be tested with a provisional fee on joke-sourcing.

A very very strong NO.

Absolutely and unequivocally not. A link tax will destroy the intrinsic value of the internet. The corporations that advocate for such taxes will not survive such a move. Users will simply stop using them as has already happened multiple times in a variety of industries. That list is already pretty long. But how about this: if a link tax is imposed, an equivalent data usage fee should be also charged to corporations/governments and distributed to users to compensate users for the use of their data. To privilege one segment of the industry over another is inherently unfair and discriminatory.

Absolutely no!

Absolutely not

Absolutely not, that's just ridiculous.

Absolutely not, this sounds more like a lame reason for countries to get more money.

Absolutely not, this would be tantamount to censorship.

Absolutely not!

Absolutely not! Don't the big companies make enough money already?

Absolutely not! Such a scheme would choke the Internet and bring information exchange to a halt. Imagine what would happen if we had to pay a myriad of tolls and charges every time we drove a highway, city road or side street!!

Absolutely not!!!! Links are THE backbone of the Internet and this will completely ruin it for EVERYONE!!! As an web hoster, we will never agree to or comply with such nonsense!!

Absolutely NOT!!!!!!!!!!!!

Absolutely NOT.

Absolutely not. A "link tax" will stifle information sharing, creativity, and innovation.

Absolutely not. If the content owner does not want the material to be freely available online, then do not put it on the internet in the first place

Absolutely not. Links are vital to both the originator and user of content. I can think of little that could do more universal harm to the free movement of information.

Absolutely not. The internet should be free

Absolutely not. This creates artificial value, a kind of interest on internet usage, which will lead to the same kind of crisis as the artificial value of mortgages and any other interest-based structure.

Absolutely not. This makes no sense and goes against the founding principles of the internet. The link tax would

kill innovation which has made the net into such a fantastic media

All of these ideas are absurd. The internet isn't a government. It can not be governed. It can not be monitored. To pay tax on links is a baffling concept, both for freedom of speech, small businesses and internet users

and no. no.

Another clear "NO!!".

Certainly not: it is against the workings of the internet

Certainly Not!

clearly not. this is beyond mean-spirited selfishness and greed. this can only really be seen as a deliberate attempt to stifle the worldwide web by a fearful and or guilty establishment

Definitely not

Definitely no! This would ruin the Internet as we know it.

don't know

Everything online works with links, a tax like this would basically destroy internet as we know it and render it useless

Frankly, the internet SHOULD be free. ALL OF IT

FUCK NO LINK TAX, THATS TOTALLY FUCKED!!!!!!!!!

Fuck no. Why should websites and users have to pay a link tax on top of free, word-of-mouth advertising? If I like a companies' service or products, I'll recommend it to others. If I hate it, I'll also inform others. If ANYTHING, these companies should be paying ME for spreading the word

god no

Heck no!

Hell no

Hell no! That's like removing the web from World Wide Web.

Hell no. That is the dumbest thing you could possibly do. The internet is built around links. Think about google and every other search engine ever. Think of informative websites such as one used by students. It is vital that the internet remains an intricate web of information connected to everything. It would be really rubbish to destroy that.

I can live without snippets but links should always be free and authors should always be named even if they allow free distribution.

i disagree, is stifles the freedom of expression

I do not believe that industry should have any more say regarding content than authors or artists or ordinary citizens No

I do NOT think commercial interests are the right authority to decide what should be removed! Of course not!

I do not think websites have to pay money when using snippets of text to preview other content onlineWebsites should not have to pay to use links. This is completely ridiculous.

I don't think so

I don't think so. Websites should be able to use other content

I don't understand no

I think that the link tax is backstairs way for big companies profit from the web.

If personal photos are such content, then,

yes. Taxing links may undermine the very foundation of open internet. This question should be approached with GREAT care.

In books, we are allowed to cite other books without having to pay a monetary amount. On the internet, the same stance should be taken.

Internet should be free otherwise it will degrade and cease existense

It is a basic right like language. Will they want to copyright this next.

la red es una increíble forma de intercambiar conocimientos ¿pagar para compartir tu trabajo? no estoy de acuerdo the network is an incredible way to share knowledge ¿I must pay for sharing my own work? I disagree I always give credit for the work of other's

Laws that create link taxes for online platforms harm our ability to innovate online and actually give entrenched publishers more power over online content.Taxing links stifles innovation for new online services. The next reddit or Twitter would be unable to start up under these rules.The web is an incredible information space, and every successful scheme to prevent linking weakens the foundation of the open Internet.

Link tax is stupid

Link tax sounds like a preposterous idea. It would probably destroy the internet as we know it today and would wreck the careers of uncountable online professionals.

Link tax? That is absurd. I have a small web site which contains primarily scientific ideas in a neglected area of study. Please see: www.jimworhey.com. New taxes or any new bureaucracy would stifle valuable ideas

Link taxes should not be allowed, because linking and using snippets of copyrighted text should definitely fall under the fair use provisions of copyright law.

Links to an original content or snippets with a link to the original work should not be restricted in any way.If the work is publicly available, advertising it and showing where it can be found should always be fine.In case the artist made the work publicly available by inadvertance, the blame is his.

My link is my content. If you start taxing link, you start taxing content. Taxing link is the death of the open internet. Besides, a link is FREE ADVERTISING for content that has been put on the PUBLIC INTERNET! If people don't want their data to be linked to, they simply should keep it private.

NEVER! if I had to pay money, I wouldn't use the service

No

No - it contradicts fair use principles.

No - this is in no way enforceable and any attempt to do so would ruin smaller sites and inconvenience larger ones

No •Evidence already shows the harm that existing link tax has done. A study in Spain found that the law "will cost publishers €10 million...which would fall disproportionately on smaller publishers." •Regardless of where you live, many favourite websites will be impacted by this plan

No a link tax is a bad idea. Links should be unregulated

No and no. Although I wish that links are only used to redirect to the original source and not to someone copy/pasting an article.

No certainly not.

NO DEFINITELY NOT

no fast lines to make providers richer

No I don't! Sincerely, Eric

No link tax

No link tax or similar.

NO LINK TAX! SNIPPETS ARE
LEGAL! LINK RESTRICTIONS AND
TAXES WOULD BE INSANE!

No link tax. Authors cite sources.
Websites link back to original content.
There should not be a fee for linking
back to freely available content simply
because it exists on another site.

No link tax. That is almost the antitheses
if what a world wide web should be.

No link tax. The internet allows for
cross-sourcing, cross-citing, etc. Why
would one possibly remove that?

No link tax. The net is open. Period.

No link tax. The power to tax
is the power to destroy

No NNo

no No

No No NO NO NO

no of course not. what an absurd idea!!!

No one should have to pay a "Link tax"
The internet is a vast and incredible
storehouse of information, which has
been freely available since its inception.
To even consider a link tax (or any
of these proposals for that matter) is
unthinkable to me. It's nothing more than
corporate greed. The idea should be
scrapped and never mentioned again

No rediculous.. U already pay to
have a website... Its just a way to
make extra money on the backs
of others... Just plain wrong...

No tax

No taxes!

No they should not if they are
merely using snippets to direct
viewers to the whole article

no to both

NO way

No way! Internet should actually
be free of any tax or cost. And
so should water, by the way

No way. There are too many reasons not
to do this. Blogs post 1000s of links, they
will have to monitor all their links all the
time and see if conditions have changed.
Linking to public content is like repeating
the newspapers headlines I have seen on
the street. I don't have to pay for that either.
If the original site doesn't want its content
to be linked to they should put it behind
a paywall. In other words: if they want to
protect their content it is their duty. If I
want to protect the contents of my house,
I close the door as well. I cannot make
others responsible if I put my belongings
on the street and people take it. The reason
websites do not go behind paywalls is
because they love to be linked to. Making
us pay for the links is just a sneaky way
for them to improve their business.

NO we already pay a fee for our internet

No we should not pay any tax, we
pay enough for the internet

No websites and users should not be
forced to pay a link tax. That would be
unfair to smaller publishers and small

websites. Small websites would be unable to afford the payments and be forced to limit what they link or shut down all together. The internet is an open source of information and it is essential that it stays an open source.

No, a link tax will contribute to a lack of deep domain knowledge, something that we, humanity will need in order to help the environment and find some form of peace amongst ourselves

No, absolutely not! Why? What is the real reason behind this? We are talking about links, not the content itself. Of course, the snippet should be reasonably short, but otherwise, it is just the pointer to the real content

No, absolutely not. This is as absurd as taxing people for writing down a (physical) address

No, an attribution should suffice

No, as it would hinder people's ability to "stumble upon" content through less wealthy sites who might not afford to pay link tax.

no, as long as the text snippets do not exceed a certain length.

No, cross referencing is important

No, definitely not

No, easily accessible exchange of information would become limited to upper classes

No, I do not.

No, I don't think so.

No, in most cases it even draws more attention to the original data.

No, information should be free

No, it will break the internet

No, links and otherwise have to be free.

no, no

No, no, no. The boost to the economy resulting from free access to it facilitates is far more valuable than any fine users are likely willing to accept --- and will be more equally distributed, as well. A parallel to hardcopy Free Use policy should suffice

No, nobody should be charged for citing other content - especially when it is linked to the original source.

No, not forcing. World wide web is a free zone to go and to surf and place a link.

No, obviously not. There is still a right to use other content in a new context. Furthermore, enforcing this tax would be close to impossible on the internet and would greatly damage the internet. However, the creator should be credited for the work used.

No, of course not

No, of course not.

No, otherwise we might also start charging for air use in planes and public transport also

No, sharing links benefits everyone. for instance, if a friend posts a link to a film I may not have heard of that they believe I would like, I may go and see it, generating income for the film makers and studio. The same for products, travel almost everything I can think of. There is so much information available it is impossible to keep on top of everything but links posted by friends, a 'heads up' are always welcome!

No, such payments are a crazy idea, spawning censorship and

subverting democratic consensus
and informed consent

No, that is absurd, one is helping the other when doing that. The only sense in doing that is reinforce monopoly and to shut down all the others.

No, that should be free

No, that's absurd. And even ignores that those same links are what carries traffic over to the target sites! which makes it double dumb. Of course links can be misused, just like butterknives can be used to torture. But it is the misuses that need to be persecuted, not the butterknives!

No, that's the base of the world wide web. If you forbid html links to other pages, the rest of the world will point and laugh and just keep hyperlinking. It's like forbidding birds to fly into your country, pointless.

NO, the hole idea is stupid and the stupid people that think that any tax on anything part of the internet is right should be fired and jailed.

No, the internet should remain free

No, there should be no link tax

No, this is a money grabbing scheme by companies to make even more money. It is wrong to charge a small business or content producer extra money, when they already have to pay for webhosting, video hosting and advertising to get their names out there in the first place. Not to mention with the current economic problems the world is facing, makes it even more difficult for these people to survive. It only serves to benefit large corporations that want more and more money, despite already getting more than enough of a profit share from the original sales of their products

NO, this law does nothing but cencors

legit information and makes it easier for corrupt politicians and other officials to manipulate public opinion.

No, this would stifle freedom of information on the internet. The internet as we know it would cease to exist

No, we already pay to use internet

No, websites and users should not be forced to pay a link tax.

No, websites should not have to pay when using snippets of text to preview other content online.

No, why should taxpayers support a dying business.

No, you would be damning traffic to sites which would then languish in cyberspace

No, not at all, this would undermine the free communication via the web

NO!

No! Absolutely not! A link tax would kill the web, kill free expression, prevent millions of bloggers and vloggers from doing what they do. That would absolutely kill citizen journalism which is the best thing we've got going now!!!!

No! Certainly not!

NO! Every small business and independent user will be destroyed by a link tax while the massive corporations will just be able to dodge the link tax like they do every other tax

NO! Link tax is a greedmeister's scheme. Profit ueber alles, you money sick slobs

NO! Nerver

NO! NO! NO! I will NOT pay a link tax. Information should be FREE.

NO! Sharing knowledge is important.

No! That would be the end of wikipedia, a website used by many to learn. Knowledge should be freely available to everybody, so anybody can educate themselves and grow stronger in an increasingly competitive world.

NO! The basis of the world wide web was free sharing of interlinked information. Why on earth would anyone consider it a good idea to tax this? The internet is one of the greatest achievements of our time, and now legislation proposes to break it under the guise of protecting us, but really just giving in to corporate greed. Taxing links will make way for a two-lane internet, where content that has a (huge) company behind it will get a preferential treatment, while blocking out access to individually generated personal content. Simply put, yet again, the big commercial companies will rake in the cash and even more importantly, it will be a way to effectively disable access to information. I cannot and will not agree with that. Serve the people, don't steal from them.

NO! Who is that money supposed to go to?

NO! Who is that money supposed to go to? There will be no more open internet

No!!! A link tax??? what are you kidding... why not just pull the cord on the internet entirely??? who are these people making these decisions??? Who will be getting all the money? This is all so awful I want to scream!!!

No.

No. Absolutely not

No. Any link tax is unacceptable in the open and democratic media of the Internet. A link tax will be rejected in the United States and Canada. Payments of link taxes

will be blocked by these governments

No. Apart from taking away a big chunk of the internet's appeal, I think it will have huge adverse effects. There will be less linking in the first place. Second, it will affect all content that would have been linked to in the first place as people no longer get to see that content. F.e. if I read an interesting headline on Google News, I will typically go to the full article and by that action, I generate income for the owner of the content. I may even spend money for it if it's behind a paywall (and have done so in the past).

NO. As long as it is attributed appropriately and this means to the standard required by the content owner.

No. controlfreaks always want to suck money out of their abuse of power. It is sick but control-freakiness is curable, I am sure. Taxing links stifles innovation for new online services (think: the next reddit or Twitter) – and ensures the dominance of entrenched players. The web is an incredible information space, and every successful scheme to prevent linking weakens the foundation of the open Internet.

No. If someone wants to charge others to use their snippets, fine. I suspect they will not get many takers. But there's no need to make a mechanism of enforcement - let the market decide

no. information is only controlled by fascists like North Korea.

No. It's free advertisement for the sites linked to

No. Just like traditional media is allowed to quote from other works web sites also should have the right to quote. As for links, the current standard is that if you reference some document then you should

provide a link to it and hyperlinks that walk around rightsholders and scientific publishers are far superior since they goes to the actual content of the articles instead of some stupid paywall so a link tax is in direct conflict with the goals of education of the people of Europe

No. Not only is this ludicrous it is an administrative nightmare and subject to errors and false accusations due to hacking and malicious attacks.

No. Simply no.

No. That is ridiculous and there is no place for that on the internet

No. That will be the death of the current internet, and will only give rise to a parallel illegal internet. Don't try controlling a world-wide medium with local, inapt legislation. Especially not with taxing links, because it is just as with corporate tax-evasion the servers will find a permissive country without tax, while destroying high-tech jobs in the old country. That's a bad message to your voters for any politician.

NO. That would go directly against the right to share information

No. That's absurd

NO. The Internet is exploding and transforming our lives for the better. It has proved its worth. The companies who are complaining have many times proved their worthlessness. We can always replace a few sharks in suits. We cannot replace the free open Internet

No. The internet should be free. It is the greatest protection for freedom and information exchange ever imagined.

No. The internet, when originally devised by CERN, was a tool and resource designed to share information freely. Before then, as

a military concept, it was supposed to be a system, designed to resist stranglehold, isolation, disconnection. The internet was originally a resource used by researchers to share and develop ideas in unity, for free. As a model of free information, it fundamentally relies on hyperlinking to work. Free hyperlinks, that work universally, on any machine, on any browser. Having paid-for links would break the system: notably all browsers would have to implement it, it's not consistent with the rest of the world, it's not demanded by the people who use it (only by corporate lobbyists out of touch with reality). Indeed, paid-for links are pointless: websites can already censor and block information behind what is called a "pay wall". Some newspaper websites already have this set up. If paid-for content needs to be blocked, it is already possible for them to do that on their own website (no need to block links or charge for them!). But by sharing the information publicly, in a system designed for open sharing of information and resources, designed to resist disconnection and isolation and strangulation, they are implicitly consenting to share that information openly. If I publish a photograph of myself online, and it gets used, and I get angry it got taken, who is to blame? The one who took it, unknowingly? Or myself, for publishing it publicly in full view? Most people would say myself. If I want my information private... I shouldn't publish it. The link tax would cost many of the poorest in the world who already have difficulties getting online, and would negatively affect small start-ups. It's essentially an additional payment for what doesn't contribute for much. Harsh copyright laws and the ability to paywall websites already exist. Links - a fundamental backbone of how the internet works - do not need to be changed. As the saying goes... if it isn't broke, don't fix it

No. The major media giants control too

much of what can be said and what is said. There is much hidden from the public majority that pay would make certain who can afford to follow the threads to where any truth might be found

No. The other websites should consider this as free advertising

No. The right to reference and quote is part of free expression

No. They are creating links that will create interest in the full contact and then the owner of the material will get his/her views when they access the full context

No. They should most definitely not. An idea like this would in my eyes easily be abused, in the manner that regular sayings or statements could be used to force people to pay. Paying for words, text and similar that is regular-day use, or simply just snippets, is part of making the "free web" not free. Not to mention how this would impact free speech!

No. This idea is completely absurd. The internet depends on links to function.

No. This is a grotesque proposal that runs counter to the entire development of the world-wide-web. The web would not have become the world-changing part of our lives that it is today, had this idea been in existence in its early days, and implementing such an idea now would threaten to stifle and shut down the innovative, creative and unpredictable ways in which it will develop and change our world in the future.

NO. THis is just a way to tax the internet to death. The EU gets Tax money,big business lobbyists are happy, critisism of the EU is made more difficult and the internet dies. A win-win-win-win situation for the EU-elite and a big loss for humanity

No. This is simply "fair use"

No. This should be considered as "fair use". Without such links, fewer people would find the source material. It is well known that open access to "teaser" material increases sales of the actual product. This kind of unwarranted taxation amounts to an insidious form of censorship

No. This will priveledge only certain sections of society who because of wealth will have free access to all available information. This puts many people back into the dark ages of communication due to cost.

No. This would be very detrimental to sites hosted in Europe. Many will shut down. It will also be very costly to enforce. In addition, this would cause speech and the dissemination of information to be available only to corporations and the rich as the poor would not have the funds to pay link taxes

No. Ultimately the owners of linked content are already benefitting from increased traffic which sould be sufficient 'payment-in-kind'

No. Websites should be able to freely link and display short parts of content that is available for free

No. What the fuck is this? You can't charge people money to use links, you don't OWN links. what right have you to charge for them? Besides, if this passes, people will just copy/paste URL's without turning them into links. It'll be slightly more inconvenient, but nobody is going to pay money for that shit. Don't be stupid.

No...This is the whole point of the internet is to share knowledge so I may be writing about something specific, say women in WWII and want to link from many countries sites to give a overall picture

with links to the source material. A link tax means only commercial knowledge will be shared, and the internet has already been dumbed down enough by Google commercial interest putting advertisements before real information

No.Content publisher may decide to show particular content only to visitors who paid (or to visitors to whom the content is delivered via paying proxy partner), but nobody should be "forced" to pay anything. As universally applied "tax" it does not make much sense.

no.keep links free

No.No advertising company pays me money but they all shove ad's in my face that I never asked for. If that is legal, then taking some content without asking should also be legal, as long as you state the source / give credit if needed.

No.No tax if snippets of text /preview is only citation, i.e. legally permissible reproduction of proprietary content without approval from the owner.No tax if snippets of text /preview goes beyond citation, but consent of the owner must be sought.

Noooo

Nope.

Nope. Should I have to pay a tax when I suggest in person that my friend check out a new musician? Should I have to pay a tax when I play a song I bought in iTunes for a friend who is visiting my house?

Nope. This is self defeating and amounts to a tax to benefit publishing houses. If they don't want their "previews" shared then don't put them out there. It's like saying that movie studios should charge to watch preview trailers.

Nope. We don't need one. Information is

free. Must be scary for those politicians

Not at all, when you link a content or share a preview, you add value to this content

Of course not

Of course not , you cant give people chance to have an information and after that take it away from them . Just a better control . And musicians and movie makers , well we all know they make A HUGE amount of money so I think they should stop fighting for their "right " just to take a Dollar or two or Five from every single person . Art should be paid , but allowed free in some moments

Of course not! This is a naked power and money grab. The author of this obscenity should have his or her name and address published everywhere on the net. With photos. And Anonymous should begin digging into their lives..

Of course not! This is ridiculous.
How about charging politicians
money for creating absurd laws?

of course not. that's stupid.do you have to pay money to scientists if you quote out of a article they've written? NO!

Of course not. The area concerned is best explored and exposed to a broader audience in this manner. I'm not saying it should be the other way around, but it would make a lot more sense to pay for publicity then to charge for it.

Of course not. The whole idea of the web is the free transfer and sharing of knowledge, creativity and the exposure of corruption. See what Tim Berners-Lee has to say

Paying a link tax would shut down many small websites, creating a monetary barrier for people on low incomes or running small businesses. It would reduce

the growth of the internet and hamper sites which might start organically and not be backed by wealthy people

Requiring websites to pay a link tax is an outrageous idea

Snippets should be considered a form of fair use. Moreover they represent an incentive to follow the link so there is an advantage also from the destination site.

Snippets should be ok provided the source is stated. Such short abstracts should not be fee based when a complete rewrite is being done

Society is currently following a natural evolution to shared information and access. Penalties (fees/taxes) while attractive to the wealthy and those in power, the effects will be negative in ways which none of us can imagine

Stop control us with your greed for money and power

Taxes should not be applied

Taxing links goes against the concept of the internet. We should embrace free information for all.

That is an absolutely terrible idea. No they shouldn't. It's completely disgraceful that anyone would even consider this.

That is as ridiculous as saying people should pay tax for sharing ideas in conversations. It is ABSURD!

That is bullshit!

That is ridiculous. Of course not.

That makes no sense at all. The hyperlinks are here since the internet has born, maybe even before. It also drives traffic to the linked site, so why charge for that? It makes no sense at all to me.

That would put us right in the shoes of North Koreans. The best contributors don't have the proper funds to publish in a paid way.

The idea of a link tax is abhorrent. It goes against the basic principles of the internet - that of making information available. The only people to benefit from this practice will be the people who do not want to majority of the public to educate themselves

The idea of having websites pay a link tax is wrong. The cost will fall disproportionately on smaller publishers, as shown in the study from Spain. Even though these regulations are for Europe, the Internet is world-wide in name and nature. Internet use everywhere will be impacted by this plan. Many websites cannot afford to pay the fees that will be required to show bits of text to preview content on a link. They will have to limit what they link to or shut down entirely. That will limit the web. It's a bad plan. Don't let that happen. Taxing links stifles innovation for new online services (think: the next reddit or Twitter) – and ensures the dominance of entrenched players. The web is an incredible information space, and every successful scheme to prevent linking weakens the foundation of the open Internet.

The internet must remain free for use by individuals. The property rights of individual intellectual property holders are overruled by the human rights of 'freedom of speech' and 'information transparency'

The IT in Canada already costs enough, and with all the offensive ads popping up so often, we should not have to pay money for this

There are fairer ways to monetise websites - so, no users should not have

to pay linktax. Links should remain free, or the internet loses it's point.

There is no reason for link tax other than simple corporate greed. It's one-sided and harmful to everyone. This prohibits basic functionality. It falls under Fair Use. Will reviewers have to pay to exhibit opinions? Will aggregate sites suddenly collapse? Link tax is a plan thought out for the immediate present with absolutely no regard to the impact it will have

There should be a system in place whereby profitable businesses absorb the costs of such services in a direct relation to the benefits provided to each business. Users and websites that receive no measurable financial benefit should not pay anything for any of this. The ISP's and others who gain direct financial benefits from their users should absorb the costs. Their users are paying them already.

There should never be a "link tax". This is just one more way corrupt politicians are extorting money for nothing of value. Websites should be free to provide content and links without being concerned about so

They absolutely should NOT! It's just an absurd concept that would destroy the Internet as we know it and leave it another wasteland inhabited only by the already rich and powerful.

They shouldn't have to pay.

This is abomination. Internet should remain a free place for everybody. One cannot tax ideas freely circulating among people

This is an attempted cash grab and does not serve the people who use the internet the most and therefore it's a terrible idea

This is both a rip off and a way to limit free speech

This is just plain stupid, paying for publicly available information? Every website in the world would shut down other than the big websites. I'd stop using the internet and use alternative networks.

Utterly not. That's not how the web works.

Websites and users should NOT be forced to pay a link tax. This would block the free flow of information on the internet. It's how I gain much of my knowledge and I frequently use links to direct other people to my sources and to give due credit to the sources. It is a powerful way of sharing knowledge and people often use a few lines to show the potential reader what the content is, as a quote. To the best of my knowledge, this is standard practice in copyright in the UK and is common sense

Websites shouldn't be liable for their users actions or for linking. It's not their job to police the internet and such a tax will unfairly treat businesses;

What on earth? Yeesh, no. That would be ridiculous. If the problem is that it costs the content host to host the content, the content is used by someone else, and the someone else gets all the revenue generated, then tell the ad companies to sort it out. Don't penalise people for promoting content online

What?! No. This would be a grave abuse of the open internet.

What?? And who would profit from that stupid idea?

Why? No I don't. We already pay enough taxes.

yes

You will break the web with this. Please stop trying to squeeze more and more money out of the systems/people

and focus on the common good

. If anything, it should be the other way around ... By linking we are driving traffic to those websites, and the way the Internet works today that's helping them !!!

. No!

....!!!..NO..!!!.. what weedy rubbish...!!

A link is just a reference. Why should you tax it? Should I pay taxes if I say: "You can read more about this interesting topic in book xyz."? No, because I am just recommending a book! A lot of links are recommendations, sources for further reading or just showing pictures around. Nobody would tax me if I'd show some imprinted pictures to my friends

A link tax goes against the entire spirit of the Internet. Most linking promotes trade and knowledge

A link tax is ABSOLUTELY RIDICULOUS. The internet is not called the web for nothing. The best part of the internet are links. Any tax like that will ruin the whole idea of the internet. Who gets the money from this tax? Big business again?

A link tax is utterly undemocratic and heavy-handed. The idea naturally stifles the ability of net users to disseminate information. It necessarily supports dominant and entrenched players and thus also stifles innovation. Who is doing the forcing of the tax and for what purpose? It's yet another case of the rich and powerful protecting what they've got

A link tax should not be forced on users

A link tax will restrict and ultimately kill the internet as we know it, it's one of the worst things that could happen. They can't take down whole sites in overseas countries so this is the way they'll target them instead.

A link tax would change the Internet beyond recognition. I cannot see how private, non commercial users could be made to pay a link tax.

A no brainer. Making people pay excludes people who can't pay, and that is a huge percentage of the world's population.

A tax is not appropriate. However, if copyrighted material is used permission should be obtained within the law or compensation made appropriately

A tax would tax everyone who posts a link. Will I be forced to add my credit card or banking information to every website I comment on because I could post a link? I can understand that essential copies of texts may oppose the writers intentions. But citation should be allowed in the web. This kind of censorship attacks scientific speech

A vexed question. Who would benefit from the Tax? How would it be enforced? How would the level of tax be arrived at? Would it be a fixed fee or a sliding scale? The question is rather broad and vague and throws up so many more questions.

absolutely no

absolutely no user tax! we pay our sips enough already. if businesses want to charge for using their content, that's another story. just like ip law, the person or entity creating the text should have the right to charge or share for free

ABSOLUTELY NO!

Absolutely not

Absolutely NOT - the idea undermines a main principle of the internet. Links should not be restricted at all - the publisher can choose whether he allows people to link to his content on the publishing web server. He can restrict this now! The internet

shouldn't be taxed in this way - if we must have an internet tax to raise revenue, it should perhaps be on connectivity, and should NOT be related to what information is being accessed! But it should be possible for a publisher to charge specifically for access to specific information and give the user the choice whether to accept that charge or do without the information. Need better technology to make that possible.

Absolutely not, it's difficult enough to make money with a website. When websites are forced to pay money for using snippets of text to preview other content online, many cannot afford to pay these kind of fees and have to limit what they link to, or shut down entirely

Absolutely not, or we should be paid for mentioning their products, films etc to our friends, in return. Why should we advertise their promotions for free?

Absolutely not, the internet is used by many, for one because people can afford you, anywhere. And it should stay that way, this is as bad as window tax from the medieval times. They paid to look out, we'd be paying to look in. If the websites have to pay that still doesn't work because sometimes you need to quote something on your blog, and it doesn't make sense to go through a rigmarole nobody is going to bother with

Absolutely not, this would make the internet a very unfriendly place to get real information. For instance, a person could write that something was said by another, without providing links for proper attribution. People reading articles, or comments would have to do all of the research over again if they wanted to be able to trust what they were reading. Just think of all the scientific and medical articles that would become far less trustworthy

absolutely not!

Absolutely not! Besides being contrary to the use of the Internet as it exists today and incompatible with the right of quotation in some places, it is also silly in and of itself. Would people be prevented from reviewing books and exemplifying their arguments with short quotes? How about reporting on a web-page in the news? Going down this road would not lead to a good place.

Absolutely not! I don't understand how the very essence of the Internet has been deemed something that governments believe tent have the right to control. It is a public forum. It is no one person or group's property. This whole endeavour by the EU is ludicrous! It is clearly a scheme set in motion by the wealthiest with the most political clout for their own benefit!

Absolutely not! It will severely limit the ability of people to be able to browse across the web and say, look up on the news for instance - and this will especially hurt those with little to no income at all.

Absolutely not! Links, quotations, thumbnails and previews should remain entirely free, for the sake of total equality on the net.

Absolutely not! Who told any govt anywhere that they own the internet?

Absolutely not!!!!

Absolutely not.

Absolutely not. All that does is restrict freedom of information to those that can afford it. Snippets of content should be viewed as fair use -- not to mention free publicity.

Absolutely not. And more than that, it is a ridiculous concept that only the most depraved, greed obsessed and small

minded people could have come up with.

Absolutely not. Internet is fastest way to spread knowledge and no kind of barriers should be added to it

Absolutely not. Is this a joke?

Absolutely not. Links should remain open and free for everyone, in the spirit of a free and competitive internet.

Absolutely not. No to taxing the Internet.

Absolutely not. One of the values of the internet is the ability for cross referencing content. I am not aware that, for example, a review of a book in a journal or newspaper is obliged to pay for permission to review published material. Similarly link tax has the potential to stifle the value of the internet. In any event, this should be between the publisher of the material and the website. It should not be taxed.

Absolutely not. Speaking as both an Economist and an Information Scientist, who has also studied some systems theory in relation to both disciplines, this is an absurd and retrograde suggestion. It threatens the entire basis of the web. The phrase "killing the goose that lays the golden eggs" springs to mind.

Absolutely not. The reality is that if such a tax is implemented businesses will simply not offer content in that region. The example of Spain and its attempt at this should serve as a warning to legislators of the unintended, but obvious consequences of these actions.

Absolutely not. The vast majority of websites make no money and are in fact not commercial operations. The vast majority will therefore stop operating, leaving in place only the giant, monocultural corporate types, thus diminishing our culture and

intelligence as a species even further

Absolutely not. The very essence of the web and its usefulness relies on linking and sharing with extracts and titles. Much of the value of the web requires fair use for comment and review.

Absolutely not. They used to tax the amount of windows a house contained and this is equally absurd. If they cannot manage public funds adequately and efficiently, which is proved regularly, it is not acceptable to continue to find ways to extort even more money from the public to fund their incompetence and corruption. The internet is created for the people by the people and remains free for everyone's benefit. It is a "... human right to connect."

Absolutely not. THis is utter madness.

Absolutely not. This proposal is profoundly damaging to innovation, freedom of expression and the information potential of the internet. I could not afford to maintain my web or social media sites if this went forward.

Absolutely not. This would be seriously impede the freedom of sharing and accessing information and put power to the wrong hands

Absolutely not. This would restrict freedom of expression to what users can afford to pay for, which would appear to contravene the European Convention on Human Rights.

Absolutely not. We all use comments and images that we've seen or heard before. A link tax will remove a significant number of lower income users, limiting valuable communications and biasing information and discussions toward a financial class

Absolutely not. We're already paying the price in overpriced internet services and user fees as it is. If we keep getting

nailed for these services, it'll be too cost prohibitive to keep. We'll just be sick of it and not waste anymore time on the internet. We can still access information from traditional sources like the library.

Absolutely not. With how massive websites can be now, especially ones that allow members to post content, that would bankrupt probably millions of sites. It never posed a problem before, so it shouldn't now. Besides, the stuff you're linking to is free. Why should linking to it have to be paid for by the owner of the site? ESPECIALLY for the sites where they weren't the one who put the link there? And as an online artist myself, this would be dangerous. Oftentimes I use free references on the internet to help my artwork. When I'm done with the picture and I post it, what do I do to show people what references I used just to be courteous to the people who made those references? I link them, of course! When I am posting sometimes 3 or 4 links per picture I make, that adds up. And it'd be especially disastrous for artists that do photomanipulation. Many times I see their reference list exceed 20 links! This is not a good idea, especially for sites that allow content creation

Absolutely outrageous suggestion! We already have so much important information hidden behind ridiculously expensive paywalls. Putting a general tax on links would seriously interfere with the dissemination of knowledge which is the crowning glory of the internet. I think it would actually hold up human development and growth! Completely crazy idea!

Against

ALL INFORMATION SHOULD BE FREE

All links need to be accessible.
It is too important

ALL websites and links to them should be free.

And no No.

and nono

Any kind of URL link tax is absurd. Linking is the fundamental idea which made the entire world-wide-web possible. Using snippets of text as a preview (without charge) should remain permitted under the "fair usage" doctrine or equivalent present in most jurisdictions

Any scheme to prevent linking weakens the foundation of the open interest. Any campaigning body, especially a minor one or new one, will be inhibited and limited as to what they can link to. A study in Spain found that an existing law will cost publishers 10 million euros, falling disproportionately on smaller publishers.

as mentioned earlier, a link does in no way touch the rights a rights-holder has and needs for protecting their content from, say, piracy. links are the equivalent of a sourced footnote in a scientific paper, of calling something by an identifiable name, or pointing a finger to indicate identity. it is essential to all discourse on content, from scientific work to everyday talk, and therefore must be protected and not limited in any way. such a link tax would be absurd in the extreme.

As with all copyright issues. If a link is being used commercially to further the business interests of the person posting it, they should certainly ask permission of the link holder whom may also benefit from the arrangement, though should have the right to refuse if the use of the link is deemed inappropriate for whatever reason. Barring the use of links to expose crime or corruption. However refused permissions from the criminals could result

in litigation.... but that's going to happen anyway if serious crime has happened

Bullshit

But I think this is wrong This very idea strikes me as 100% INSANE

but no for the second question No

but not all NO Link Tax...That is a blatant money grab and will restrict the free movement of ideas

BUT Tim Berners Lee's free gift of http, www and mosaic, to the entirety of humanity, was provided for the social as well as economic benefit of ALL the PEOPLE, not just those in business and particularly NOT just for those that make profit from hyperspace. I have, of my own profit-free will and at no cost to anyone, been BLOGGING since the advent of BLOGGER, and posted hundreds, nay thousands of properly accredited links, which have spread the word about the good things in life, as a result of which I have FREELY promoted pictures, video, gifs etc., as I continue to do today and that was long before the rights holders and companies WOKE-UP to using the internet themselves, particularly Facebook, to promote their wares. The fact that most Profit Making entities on earth now have a Facebook presence, stands as testimony to that. If copyrighting, charging for and taxing thereof is implemented by the EU how am I and every other one of the other billion or so people like me going to be recompensed for our own material that is FREELY ADVERTISING those who would seek PROFIT and the PROFIT MAKERS. I was a founding member of *zaadz, have my own letschangetheworld.ning presence in cyberspace and have been active at Facebook since the advent of their Timeline upgrade and during the whole of that time, mine and the views of others, on how WE

FEEL about LIFE, should have been openly welcomed by every, business and rights holder, as FREE PROMOTION, as it should most definitely continue to be so. I do not think websites have to pay money when using snippets of text to preview other content onlineABSOLUTELY NOT - please see responses to Q1 Q2 Q3Laws that create link taxes for online platforms harm our ability to innovate online and actually give entrenched publishers more power over online content. Regardless of where you live, many of our favourite websites will be impacted by bad regulations the Web is global and it will affect Internet users everywhere. Many websites cannot afford to pay money to link to excerpts of content available elsewhere online. New fees on linking limit what they link to, or could force them to shut down entirely.Taxing links stifles innovation for new online services. The next reddit or Twitter would be unable to start up under these rules. The web is an incredible information space, and every successful scheme to prevent linking weakens the foundation of the open Internet.

Certainly not

Certainly not if this goes without the courts' involvement

Certainly not!

Certainly not! The Web is the greatest political tool the world has known and it is evolving its own culture. It also is the greatest of libraries and a potent educational tool which requires the freedom to evolve without limitation. Many organisations are being threatened by its power in rapid communication but those that are need to devise ways from which they too can benefit rather than legislate against natural development.

Certainly not.

Certainly not. Are we taxed to breath?

Charging for the Internet will centralise control in the hands of the largest companies and lead to monopolies. It will be the end of the free press.

Companies should not have to pay a link tax, and previewing other content online should be a basic part of the web's function.

Content creators still need to make a living, and until a worldwide basic income exists (if it ever does) people need to get paid for what they do. However, too much is suppressed and content can't reach its full market potential the way content is removed by rightholder's legal teams currently.

definately not. keep the money grabbers out

Definitely no link tax or any other such payment

Definitely NO, they should not be required to pay anything!

Definitely not

Definitely not - once you introduce money barriers it limits freedom of access and thus expression - again once that ugly materialist factor arises it sets a precedent for further increases in costs until the poorer are denied access altogether.

Definitely not, one of the powerful features of the Internet has always been the "hyperlink", the alternative would be to rerun the search engine with slightly modified search string which would make the whole "research on the Internet" process clumsy and unwieldy !

Definitely not, provided the source of snippets of text is acknowledged. Links should remain totally free. Any attempt to

tax links would be impractical anyway.

Definitely not, the information exchange power of the Internet is built around hyperlinks.

Definitely not, the success of the worldwide web is precisely because it doesn't add a barrier to entry

definitely not!

Definitely not! This is completely insane. This will end blogs and small businesses.

Definitely NOT!!!!

Definitely not.

Definitely Not. Fair use must be protected. And linking and referencing are essential parts of any body of information. It is essential that websites continue to freely (in all senses) link to other websites - this is the very foundations of the World Wide Web. Without this our ability to remain informed is severely compromised. It is vital that websites and blogs continue to be able to function. Both so that individuals and companies can make a living, and so that as end users we can all make informed decisions in all aspects of our lives. Referencing works is vital. It is vital to support opinions, forms the bedrock for scientific reporting and evaluation, is essential for fair consumer rights, for companies to market their products. It is essential for a healthy free market and democracy.

Definitely not. It amounts to free advertising of others content and suppression sounds like cutting off your nose to spite your face, it's counter intuitive

Definitely not. It hasn't worked in the past and will not work now. We need a free flow of information. This smacks of big brother.

Definitely not. It's our internet, not yours, so leave it alone.

Depends on the website and whether they have the permission/good will of the other content creator.

Don't know.

Don't know

Evidence already shows the harm that existing link tax has done. A study in Spain found that the law "will cost publishers €10 million...which would fall disproportionately on smaller publishers." When websites are forced to pay money for using snippets of text to preview other content online, many cannot afford to pay these kind of fees and have to limit what they link to, or shut down entirely

Fair use is a right and does not have to be paid for.

Fair use No. Click bait yes.

forcing pay walls onto the internet will destroy the very thing they find valuable. if it's no longer free then half their clientele will no longer stay around. halving the people that see their ads and content.

HAHAHA, no way!

Heck no. This would completely obliterate so much of the internet including small businesses, creativity and even for people like me who educated themselves online. I'm not coughing up money just to do research.

Hell no

Hell no, there are already systems in place to do this. This tax would only stifle development and restrict the average person. Bad idea.

HELL NO!

Hell No! This is just another way to censor content. Is governments want to raise taxes why don't they target all that corporate tax that is stored in tax havens off shore?! This will effect the global use of the web and many websites who cannot afford this tax will close down. Taxing links stifles innovation for new online service, for example, Twitter, and ensures dominance of entrenched players. Or is that the point? It's anti competition and should face legal challenge just for that. The web is an incredible information space and every successful scheme to prevent linking weakens the foundation of the open internet. The EU is supposed to be about openness and freedom and not censorship and authoritarian rule

Historically the use of reasonable quotations in other media has never been taxed, and there is no reason to treat digital media differently. If this tax ever became mandatory, it would be impossible to enforce, as there are not enough courts and judges on the planet to hear all the cases.

Holy hell this is such an awful idea that I don't even know where to start. The use of snippets of text or images pulled from the site that is being linked to is designed to draw people into clicking that link - giving them a preview of what the story is actually about and allowing them to better find the sites, articles and blogs that they are actually interested in. It is beneficial for the site being linked to as they get the viewers, and it's beneficial for the users as they get the content they want. The idea that a charge like this should be used to prop up dying print industries at the expense of up-and-coming web industries is daft

I am deeply horrified by this suggestion. The internet is BUILT UPON hyperlinks! Previews are beneficial to the recipient of the link. Any restriction on the right to link can only be intended to stifle the free

exchange of information and content that is the whole purpose of the internet! I believe this idea would be entirely unenforceable and that whoever is suggesting it has not thought it through and does not really understand how the internet works!

I absolutely oppose a link tax. It is counter to the founding spirit of the web and to the open sharing of knowledge that has so helped global education and engagement

I am 100% against all forms of censorship and any limiting of web freedom.

I am not normally a holder of rights in digital content, however I do not believe an across-the-board tax on hyperlinks is justifiable, on any level. Quoting is common practise in publishing, and there is no tax placed on that. Why should the internet be subject to such a draconian law?

I believe sites should be scored as to how much this makes up their total content, but otherwise no.

I believe the Internet should be a place where intellectual property holders should not have excessive rights. The virtue of the Internet is its freedom and freeness. Making information into property just makes profits for a few while denying access to the many. That should be an obsolete model in the Information Age.

I cannot imagine how such an asinine proposal could be policed.
"Link tax" - what nonsense!

I do No, they absolutely shouldn't

I do not agree with a link tax. If there is no financial benefit to a website that is providing a link, why should it be expected to pay for doing so. The whole idea of the internet is free information.

I do not agree with it being removed. No.

Such a concept is incredibly destructive

I do not agree with the proposed link tax. It is designed to hobble the internet and make it a far less useful tool than it is at present. The internet has done so much good in getting news that otherwise wouldn't have reached the eyes and ears of so many people. This idea seems to be to do just that. To stop the internet from doing what it does best. Giving information to the people. You're our representatives. Do some good.

I do not think so: It is better to allow hyperlinking to the greatest extent possible

I do not think websites have to pay money when using snippets of text to preview other content online.no

I do not think websites have to pay money when using snippets of text to preview other content onlineAren't we paying enough in taxes. This is just another way of achieving censorship through the means of taxation. It is devious and probably unenforceable.

I do not think websites have to pay money when using snippets of text to preview other content onlineNo

I do not think websites have to pay money when using snippets of text to preview other content onlineNO!
Absolutely NOT! Ridiculous!

I do not understand No they should not

I do not understand why some contents are taken from the web, legal contents. Also, rightsholders should only hold rights for two years max, then the rights should be universal/free No they should not, NO they must not pay link tax. This is a kind of measure natural to dictatorships

I do understand why it has to be taken

down there should be no link tax

i don't Absolutely NO!!!

I don't know much about this issue, but it sounds like a bad idea to me.

I don't think so. Websites should be able to use other content

I don't think there should be a charge for information sharing.

I dont understand I do not think websites have to pay money when using snippets of text to preview other content online
No

I must be missing something. Computer programs depend upon internal links connecting up various parts of the software, not only links to data but more importantly to the various executables needed to sustain a dot on your screen. Likewise the web was built to do the same thing. It is an extension of your computer, ask Bill Gates.

I support Free Linking.

I think if people are already paying for the internet, they shouldn't have to pay in addition to it

I think it would be disastrous to have a link tax. The internet is a universal tool that binds the people of the world. There are some who would have no issues with a link tax, but for others it would put access to information too far out of reach. Taxes should be constructive, not destructive. This would be a tax with an unsound political goal. It cannot be justified.

I think not, but again, I'm not sure. Haven't spent a lot of time thinking about this or looking into it.

I think that a link tax would severely limit the fair spread of information

on the internet, and would unfairly bias the spread of information in the favour of large businesses.

I understand why some things are removed, but reasons should be given

I would accept that if in scientific papers that are published in conferences all over the world we pay taxes for each reference we make to other papers to support the case. Links are references. It is like saying that you have to pay taxes when you reference anything that is not your content. If, e.g., I say "Albert Einstein said E=mc²" should I pay tax? If not, then why should I pay tax when I say "Albert's Einstein formula (link)"? It is insane

IDK

if information is in the public domain right of access should remain open and free. Any link tax is again another ploy by large media corporations to increase their profitability and help them cling to an outdated business model. This should not supersede the public's right to an open internet

If the content they are linking to is freely available then it should be freely available to link to along with an excerpt if wanted to provide context. If the content is not free then it should still be possible to link to it just without the excerpt.

If this becomes the case, that "tax" will only go towards giving the already wealthy power-brokers even more financial power. Why would I want to give them this added power?

Im not even gonna answer this one.. The whole idea is just too dumb

In no cases should there be a tax on links. This would be a great blockade for the distribution and availability of information

Is this a possibility???

It is ridiculous to even think of charging websites for linking to other websites, since the goal of every website is to get traffic and links are the way traffic finds you

Laws that create link taxes for online platforms harm our ability to innovate online and actually give entrenched publishers more power over online content.

Levy a tax on linking would break a fundamental part of the way the Internet works. We now live in a global community, linked by an open Internet, and imposing laws like this that stem the flow of data across only one region of the Internet would have an effect on communication over it everywhere, not just the EU. Established publishers online may be able to live with such taxes being put in place, but what happens to those starting out building new services online? Link taxation is a near sighted and ill-thought through concept, leading to a weakening of the open Internet and stifling the free movement of knowledge and information.

Link tax is a horrible idea that is against the fundamental concept of the Internet. Politicians shouldn't try to reshape what the Internet has become to make a small lobby group happy.

Link tax is an abomination - it would just promote the current wealthy/ powerful

Link tax is an outrageous idea and totally undermines the versatility of the internet.

Link tax will perpetuate the digital divide.

Link taxes are likely to simply increase the power of the 'big players', reduce the ability of smaller websites to compete, and slow down the use of the internet as a knowledge sharing and extending device

Link taxes would empower publishers, impose unmanageable costs and stifle innovation, ruining the open sharing of ideas and information throughout the web.

Link taxes would prevent the majority of the world's population from having equal access to information. Link taxes should not exist.

Links are an inherent element of the World Wide Web, they facilitate information sharing and the accessibility of data. Attempting to tax link(s) is an abhorrent process. As a fundamental method of accessing the web, making it chargable cannot be justified in the global basis that is the Internet. If what you are looking to do, is to totally shut down the internet and its massive benefits for society today across Europe, then you are going the right way. Never mind the benefits that the internet brings and the monies that governments already make from internet based activities Charging for Links feels to be much more of a 'Money-Grab' by governments, rather than a reasoned expectation by internet users and bodies. The inherent structure of the WWW was to make data more accessible, charging for links stops this

Links are the mechanism of sharing our knowledge there should not be a tax on the sharing of information. This is a step towards ignorance for the sake of corporate profit

Links provide payment by way of increased traffic to the linked content, a monetary tax will simply presume profit from the use of the link which may well not occur - thus diminishing the variety of content which is a resource for all internet users. It is simply more censorship of those who do not have corporate financial resources.

Links should not be taxed - if the EU

parliament is short of money, why can't it make cut backs like the rest of us, starting with MEPs salaries? Publishers should not have control of internet usage - this is a matter for the courts and legal system.Taxing links will put a financial burden on smaller business and anybody else using the internet. This is grossly unfair as some may not be able to afford to pay these taxes and may prevent other businesses from entering the market.The web is an incredible information space, and every successful scheme to prevent linking weakens the foundation of the open Internet.

Make the legacy industries adapt or die

May I ask, do you know how computers and/or the internet works from a technical stand point? Because this is not in any way something that is acceptable by anyone.

Never

NEVER.

NHo

No

No - absolutely not, as long as it's clear who the content creator is and that it's a genuine short preview rather than the majority of the content. If platforms such as Google and Facebook are discouraged from allowing links because of the risk of having to pay out, this would have a negative effect on those who wish to permit and even encourage free linking to their creative work, in order to enable people to find it via these popular websites.

No - and how would it be monitored. If I post something, I know it is open unless I put some sort of control on it.

NO - it would stifle the internet! And who would benefit from the link

tax? People? NO - government and large corporations only. It would CRUSH creativity and innovation.

NO - STOP DESTROYING THE WEB - THIS FREEDOM OF EXPRESSION IS WHAT THE NET IS ABOUT NOT BLAND CORPORATES TELLING THE PUBLIC WHAT TO DO AND WHEN TO DO IT.

No - the idea with internet was to give anyone a voice at the same conditions. Nothing one the web should cost different from any user. It should be free.

No - this is an example of holders' automatic commercial policy of maximising income.

NO - unenforceable piece of supidity

No -- the idea is an iniquitous step away from freedom.

No absolutely not

No and No

No certainly not

No certainly not, any kind of 'link tax' would be a devastating blow and jeopardises the foundations that the Internet is built on.

no definitely not

No fees because that will slow and reduce information sharing if not kill it almost completely.

No I do not agree. Internet is a network not a shop. If you want to cash on every glimpse of what you sell put your content behind a login procedure. A link tax is like charging fans for making their idol more popular

No I don't

No I don't believe that websites

should pay a link tax for snips of text to preview other content online.

No I don't believe they should.

No I don't think they should be forced to pay a link tax

No it should be free

No it will kill the Internet! Then perhaps that is exactly what (some) Governments want!

no keep it free

No link tax

No link tax, or fee of any kind that would impact the free movement across the web

NO LINK TAX!

No link tax.

No link tax. It's their problem to resolve with publicity or whatever

No link tax. The internet is like a public library and no one has the right to charge for reviewing public information

no link taxes!

No more than non-internet media. As long as the links and authorship are acknowledged.

No No

No No.

No No. No

No No. This is a money grab!

No not at all! Writing and posting in the internet is like speaking with others. Asking this question is the same as asking: Should people pay money for quoting someone else? Would anyone

like to be restricted in what he thinks or what he says? I don't think so.

No of course not

No of course not.

NO ONE should be FORCED to pay to link to content that is posted on the Internet !!!!If you post to the Internet, it should be widely understood, that the post you make, holds NO COPYRIGHT, AND SHOULD NOT BE USED TO GENERATE PROFITS. The INTERNET, was DESIGNED to be FREE, and SHOULD REMAIN SO !!!!!!!!

No one should be taxed yet again

No one should have to pay a link tax

no opinion

No sure not

No tax

NO TAX ON LINKS. It would not be fair. Using snippets of text from books, films and documents has always been allowed under copyright law. In fact I believe that a specific number of words are permitted - why should digital communication be any different. It would stifle innovation. It would severely impact on information sharing.

No tax on links. Many communications between friends contain links for information which is part of any search or research and by its very nature demands some relevant description to enable choice. Without it much that is new and/or innovative will simply die

NO TAX.

NO TAXES!

No Taxing period!!!

No they should not, this is a form of

financial censorship which would undermine the little people

No they should not.

No they shouldn't - this isn't rights infringement at all!

No they shouldn't, the web is based upon links to references to back up their claims, the internet is a digital encyclopaedia of all things human. We should be free to link to anything we choose for free.

No This ide is also rediculus. It limits alot of possilitys to use internet and limits entrepreneurship.

No to a link tax ... I pay my provider plenty for an internet /phone every month

No to a link tax. Taxing linking will reduce linking, isolating web-users into their own little silos and further polarization. The modern world needs more interconnectedness not less

No to the tax/link fee. The snippets are good for the media companies, as it drive people to their payer websites.

No way

No way ! Never ! Thoughts are free. Besides , I don't trust coroporations and governments. Taxes aren't paid by corporations . Only enforced on individuals.

No way we already pay for internet and this just takes the piss charging more

No way, people suggesting such a law should be immediately imprisoned and publicly shamed. Maybe the stocks could be brought back for this purpose!!!!!!

No way!!! Link tax is daylight robbery!!

NO WAY!!!!

No way. Ridiculous. Another example of rampant greed

NO we pay enough taxes. WTF?

No we should not pay any tax, we pay enough for the internet

No--this is definitely an infringement on the right to share knowledge. One is allowed to quote small sections (when credit is given to the owner) when one is writing a book.

No-one should have to pay a "link tax". It is clearly just another way of making money out of ripping off joe public. In fact companies should pay the poster of the link for providing free advertising

No, a link tax! preposterous

No, absolutely not! How complicated do you want to make life? Its unworkable and will stifle the free market!

No, absolutely not. Paying a link tax would severely impact accessibility of websites and public access to information in general.

No, and the very idea is as unjust as it it ridiculous.

No, are you nuts?

NO, because it would cost a large amount of money that only laerge earners could afford, smaller busineeses would be stifled or go bankrupt as they are forced to pay for vital links.

No, because the increase in cost would rebound to the website owner as links become too expensive to include on 2nd & 3rd party websites

No, because there are no fees to associate the taxes with

No, breaks the digital economy as it's growing, and is totally regressive

no, but permission probably should be sought first.

No, but previews should not remain active if the site's they link to request that they be taken down

NO, definitely not.

no, fair usage of copyright already protects this. there is no need for more red tape and would result in fewer and fewer providers of content. which is what big media wants.sorry but if i make something for the web its up to me how i distribute it. i own the copyright no matter what a eula says...there not binding in the eu.(yet)

No, fair use

No, frankly this is crazy idea, the internet is about linking and sharing of information, this is fundamental to the internet and making a charge for this would be the end of the internet as we know it

No, how ridiculous.

No, I disagree that link taxes should be paid. It is an infringement on the freedom of the internet.

No, information cannot be owned

No, information should be free to view.

No, it is a fundamental principle of the internet. Anyone can link to anything. You can't charge someone for "pointing" to where information is

No, it is absurd.When the publishers have the word my name, God or Europe in their pieces who will they pay link tax to.

NO, it's called Fair Use!

No, linking and posting snippets is fair-use.

No, linking benefits the target site already.

No, linking information is the essence of the world wide web. As a scientist I believe that being able to trace where information comes from, is what makes the network of sites useful. Putting a tax on these links would destroy this feature

No, linking is a fundamental tenet of the Internet as are clips and should be considered fair usage

No, links should be clear, but free. i.e. you should be free to link, but not pass off others content as your own.

No, not at all, never.

No, not if its publically available on the internet. What's next? All written notes must be turned so that they can be checked for copyrighted references and the author of the note charged?

No, obviously not. This just favours big websites over small ones.

No, of course not! Link tax is an absurd idea. It would harm the development of the web.

No, simple. Unless huge tracts of dialogue, verse or lyrics are used then there should be no tax.

No, that doesn't even make any sense. To start, to which government it'll be paid? The one where the host is located, the one where the person creating a link is living, the one that has more users accessing to the content? Unless the global Internet is wiped away, any possible solution would be unfair for both users and to many governments. There's also the important detail that many websites aren't making much money, if they're making any money at all. And the exceptions, the ones that are making money, already pay taxes as corporations, and their stockholders pay income taxes. Adding an additional tax that isn't related directly

to their revenues is illogical and would close down many sites, as well as giving no way for new ones to be created

No, that is a terrible idea. The web works the way we think and taxing links would be like trying to tax us for associating memories and ideas

No, that is completely against fair use and (summary) links are not even the real content. It would be highly destructive to free speech.

No, that kind of makes communication and sharing information more difficult.

No, that puts the entire control of how the Internet is put together into the hands of the companies with the most money, the most vested interests. How can that not be a terrible plan?

No, that would destroy much of the interrelationship that makes the internet such a egalitarian platform

No, that's an utterly terrible idea!

No, the internet is open and needs to stay that way in order for it remain accessible to all and for online innovation to continue, which is its strength.

No, the web is the greatest educational tool and free access to explore links to further new educational avenues is essential

No, the whole point of the internet is that it is a forum of ideas - one of the few in which we can all participate.

No, there should be no link tax. The net should be free to facilitate sharing of information and ideas and connections. The link tax is unaffordable to many people and families. Why must we pay a tax for previewing a piece of text or work? We should certainly pay

for the full work to ensure that the rightsholder is fairly compensated.

No, there should be no link tax. Small snippets of text used as previews of content should fall within fair use, in the same way that citing or quoting authors is allowed in larger articles

No, there should not be any link tax

No, they should not

No, they shouldn't

No, this is an outrageous suggestion. It runs counter to the very idea of the 'world wide web'. The internet is too important to everyone to be restricted in this way, and it is a basic right for all humans to have access to this tool, without such restriction. Such rules will stifle competition and innovation, and we'll get a situation like we currently have in US media markets, where a few huge corporations control media access.

No, this is nonsense. At least until car drivers and industry pay sufficient taxes on externalities such as kids breathing their toxic waste

No, this is stupid and whoever came up with this should be ashamed.

No, this removes the right of free speech which I'm supposed to have. The European countries seem to be wanting to remove this. What happened to this being a trade agreement? Why is mainland Europe trying to run my country? They don't live here!

No, this seems like an April Fools joke

No, this should come under fair-use. If there was going to be a 'link tax' in play, it should be in the other direction so that you'd pay services to link to your content as a business directory or

similar concept. This already happens in practice and is called 'advertising'.

No, this would be a tax on the free-flow of ideas and information.

No, this would fundamentally alter the ability to share information & inform others of material that might be of interest to them.

No, this would not be sustainable, and would be a fatal shot to the heart of creativity and information sharing through one of mankind's greatest inventions

No, user can pay for the text on these websites, if they want to. But not for a preview.

no, web taxes are a terrible idea, in concept and potential application

No, websites and users should not be forced to pay a link tax! When websites are forced to pay money for using snippets of text to preview other content online, many cannot afford to pay these kind of fees and have to limit what they link to, or shut down entirely

No, websites should not have to pay a link tax - it will harm the free, open internet and favour only big corporations.

No, websites shouldn't have to pay to show "snippets" that preview other content. These "snippets" help promote these other sites, books, magazines and expose their content to others. The internet needs these links or what is the point if the internet. It is to share information

No, yes

No, absolutely not!

No: here in Canada we already pay an exorbitant amount to access the

internet. Don't make the internet a place only for the wealthy

No!

NO! Definitely not.

NO! NO NO NO NO NO. How do you think the internet works?! The internet is most peoples main source of information. To tax knowledge... that's disgusting.

No! That's just silly! Google would go bankrupt from all the tax. Facebook too. And Wikipedia. Not just the Internet, but the entire world would break down! We would lose the ability to have all the world's information at our fingertips, leading to a global brain drain. It would bring us back to the middle ages

No! The 'fair use' policy is there for a reason and absolutely applicable in this situation.

No! The internet should be a free platform. Stop trying to monetise the world!

NO! The web is an incredible information space, and every successful scheme to prevent linking weakens the foundation of the open Internet

NO! This goes against everything the internet stands for.

No! This is ridiculous! So when I write an essay or write in my journal and quote an author AND give them credit for the quote I should pay for that now too? Get serious. If you want to monetize your links simply setup a subscription model for the content! That's an individual's right to do. But their responsibility to enforce and maintain. Governments need to stay out of free speech

NO! This is the age of information, shared freely it will advance society for the better

NO! Too likely to make websites and users give up on having comment sections

NO! WTH did this come from? What wretched individual or agency came up with this insidious little idea?

NO! You may as well be forcing people to pay tax on the air they breathe.

NO!!!! and NO

No! Do MP's pay for dinner expenses? Seems it's all about taxing something

No.

No. A link tax goes against everything the Internet is supposed to stand for

No. Absolutely not

NO. Absolutely not. This is absurd and ridiculous. The internet MUST remain free

No. Charging a fee for linking would force smaller and less wealthy websites to limit what they linked to or else shut down entirely. This would be a backwards step, away from the truly open Internet with its vast opportunities for researching and exchanging information - and so promoting education and discussion. Taxing links stifles innovation for new online services and concentrates web power in the hands of a limited number of large, established websites.

No. Create content specifically for the purpose of sharing, as many already do today. Sharing is used as a principal means of marketing and distribution. It is a flawed idea to look at taxing this.

No. Defeats the whole ethos of the internet - the free exchange of information

No. Fair usage should apply. However, deep links are problematical.

No. Further monetization is destructive.

No. Hosting costs money enough

No. I acknowledge that money is a necessary part for long-term, sustainable solutions. However, a link tax policy seems like an incredibly clumsy tool that will likely do more harm than good

No. I am a college teacher and web links are very important for my students' education

No. I think the author/source of the content previewed should be cited, adding the link to the original source, but without paying anything.

NO. If "unfairness" is being done then those cases should be decided by a well constituted arbitration process.

No. if the link goes dead, that's fine. but simply saying "hey, you can find stuff here" is not criminal. The sale of such is. not giving directions

No. In jurisdictions with fair use, fair dealing, or similar, link text should typically exempt from copyright. In jurisdictions that lack such exceptions to copyright, a similar measure should be added to allow reasonable use of copyrighted text as link text. The arbiter of reasonableness should be a court, and not a rightsholder.

No. In most cases this linking is to the benefit of the site linked to, and there is no reason to charge any fee. The internet search engines work through links. A tax would result in very few links, and the internet would become unworkable, but perhaps that is the idea behind this whole thing.

No. Information should be free, unless specifically copy written by the owner and then a singular charge should be applied

No. It is a tax on information.
Tax adverts instead

No. It is an unworkable and ill-conceived idea that cannot be applied fairly, nor is it ever intended to be applied fairly.

No. It's free advertisement for the sites linked to

No. Just a money grab from the government

No. Just put the source, that's it.

No. Keep globalism and governments out of our private stuff.

No. Linking is fundamental to the web, and it's unreasonable to impose costs on people linking to other content.

No. Links are how the internet works. It is foolish to pay to link to third party content when that content could easily be replaced without the original linker's knowledge.

No. Never. It is money grabbing idea with no sensible basis in the realities of the Internet.

no. no

No. No in any shape or form.

No. No. No. Ridiculous idea.

No. Quite how this would work is beyond comprehension

No. Quoting small snippets to indicate what content is linked to should be considered fair use. A link tax would be likely to entrench large players (Google, Facebook) while making it difficult for newcomers to innovate. Freedom to link is fundamental to the phenomenal success of the internet, and should not be restricted or taxed.

No. Strangling the information highway,

the greatest "book of knowledge" ever produced would be similar to the Taliban refusing scientific education to people so they can keep their power.

No. That is patently ridiculous

No. That what is posted on the Internet is public, and the case cannot be made that the vast majority of authors on the internet do NOT want their content to be mentioned (e.g., blogs)

No. That will destroy small businesses and prevent poor people from using the internet or setting up websites as they won't be able to afford it. It's a discriminatory policy, which will also damage the ability of less well off countries to get their people building websites, worsening the gap between rich and poor.

No. That would undermine entire communities that rely on said links as focal points for discussion. It would also be an unfair advantage in favor of larger entities over startups

NO. That's counterproductive in both political and economic terms. Shrinking the web makes no sense.

No. The entire idea of a link tax is ridiculous, and will limit the sharing of ideas and information.

No. The harm of link tax as already been documented in Spain, where a study found that the law will cost publishers €10 million, affecting the smaller publishers disproportionately. In the end there would be a very small selection of content available and a halt to the growth of small/new businesses and innovations. Taxing links stifles innovation and ensures the dominance of already established powerhouses. Due to the global nature of the web internet users everywhere will be affected by these changes, regardless

of country. The web is an incredible information space. Every successful scheme to prevent linking weakens the very foundation of the open internet

No. The Internet was supposed to be non commercial at the first place!!!

No. The mere thought is repulsive and flawed

No. The whole point of the internet is its interconnectedness, it's in the name. This would stifle and destroy the internet and its benefits very quickly.

No. They are, in fact, giving free publicity to those sites to which they are providing links.

No. This idea is simply mad and ends up - a in Germany or Spain - strengthening the market position of the market leader. In Germany it has led to Google being able to extract zero price licenses from publishers and news sites which are not offered to others. This entrenches monopoly - exactly the opposite of what consumers need.

No. This is a money grab that threatens the impartiality of the Internet and monetizes an international human right to access information and communicate

No. This is a ridiculous idea that would stifle the openness of the web

No. This is a vital part of the web infrastructure that would be detrimented

No. This is nothing more than greedy scumbags descending to a new low

No. This will just increase the cost and freedom of the internet as a whole. When using small snippets of text to preview this should come under the 'Fair Use' heading. Fair enough if someone is copying the whole text but snippets

should be allowed. Also, policing it would be nigh impossible and would backfire on those who want these rules.

No. This would greatly impact information sharing.

No. This would limit the freedom of internet. Internet belongs to everyone and it should absolutely not be limited. We (people, humans) should be able and allowed to express ourselves freely on internet (as long as no illegal content is shared of course).

No. This would limit the spread of information.

No. This would make it harder for startups and other small companies to get recognition on the internet. This also would not help to regulate unauthorized sharing of content, because users still could reupload something as their own content.

No. This would massively compromise the neutrality and freedom of the internet. The internet is free and neutral, giving equal voice to all. This cannot be allowed to be taken from us.

No. This would simply prevent people from finding information on the internet. Maybe the allowable size (in number of words\ letters or percentage of the original text) of the snippet could we defined by law

NO. To tax what? The fact that they are PROMOTING knowledge and potentially monetizable content?

No. To whom and why? No one has any rights to any money when someone links to their content. And no one should create rights for such a thing. The internet is meant to be the place to publish things (if you want to provide restricted access only there is technology for that).

No. Valuable content may be put behind a paywall. If the content is something anyone can view, it shouldn't matter where the viewing happens as long as the original source is appropriately credited. Posting entire articles is another matter and falls under copyright infringement.

No. We don't have to be paying now for these services now. Why will we have to pay for them in the future? How much more money do they want to extract from us?

No. Websites and users should not be forced to pay a 'link tax'. The very idea is untenable and unconscionable. Any law that creates 'link taxes' for online platforms will be grossly detrimental to freedom of speech, thought and expression will harm our ability to innovate and build new online businesses (like Twitter and Reddit) and will give established publishers even more power over online content. Many websites simply cannot afford to pay money to link to excerpts of content available elsewhere online. New fees on linking will limit what they link to, or could even force them to shut down entirely. The web is an incredible information space, and every scheme to prevent linking will weaken the very foundations of the open internet.

No. Yet again big companies will be able to steam roller over individuals without recourse to justice or fair play.

No... this is ridiculous and entirely contrary to the spirit and ambition of the internet.

No.no.no. Definitely not. That's what made the Internet what it is. It would kill it.

No.The whole point of the Web is to create and to share contents from everywhere. Adding a "Tax" for linking will limit the creativity, innovation and free speech.

Nobody, be it a private person or a non private entity should pay for setting or for

using any kind of link. PERIOD. The only thing that a company should be allowed to take money for is the used webspace from entities who provide websites and for offering space for commercials. Youtube for example should only be allowed to make money with offering the space for commercials. NOTHING ELSE! NOTHING else should be allowed to create money. Every other way of making money for internet companies should be regarded as bribery and prosecuted for both parties - officials from gov. entities should be accounted personal AND the gov. entity should be taken responsible for bribery. And the punishment should be SEVERE!

Non !

Non absolument pas. Les extraits et les liens doivent être gratuits.

Nope

Nope!

Nope.

Not at all!

Not at all. Link tax is a stupid idea.

Not at all. This is an integral part of internet use and engagement. Requiring fees for such marginal elements will squeeze the life out of online activity by a very wide range of individuals and communities.

Not for just "snippets".

Not for snippets, possibly for commercial use of large amounts of material but even that is questionable

not more tax especially link taxes.
links should be free and open

Obviously not. The linking and indexing function clearly operates, on balance, to the benefit of those being indexed. That

these beneficiaries also want to be paid for being helped would be laughable, were it not so offensive. Taxing links would cripple the usefulness of the worldwide web.

of course not, it's about time we abandon the idea that everything should be quantified in dollar signs

Of course not! Don't be so silly!

Of course not.

Of course not. If you want your content to be exclusive to your site, put it behind a paywall and riddle it with DRM tech so that no one gets it. Otherwise, the Internet should be free to link to and to quote content from other sources. Not copy the whole thing of course.

Of course not. So fascism is on the rise in Europe?

Of course not

Oh hell no, the idea is preposterous

Only commercial activity should be paid

Pay per view would kill the very nature of the internet. This would only serve to kill off new start ups, make research and information gathering harder and generally make the open internet a more closed system that stifles development and growth.

People will stop sharing if it adds to their costs. If it is commercial companies who want us to see/hear their products they will almost certainly find such a tax counterproductive, as people will stop directing friends towards whatever is being sold if it incurs a charge.

Previews are a valuable clue as to content. Crazy to pay.

Put Simply NO . In more detail ABSOLUTELY

NO PAYING . FURTHER THOUGHTS if some bodies want there to be payment then they may pay , especially if they do not pay other dues that the rest of society does.

Ridiculous to tax links

Ridiculous. NO

Same problem as the previous case - like asking you to pay when you give someone directions, advice, etc... What should one say - there is new movie, it is very good, go check the site of you know who and find it....?

Setting links and using snippets are 2 totally different things. Setting links using the target's self-defined head or title or headline or some description the link-setter comes up with MUST be legal and free by definition (exceptions only for link targets that are 100% obviously illegal). Anything put online publicly is public, period. A site that does not want to be linked by search engines has to use established standards like HTML meta data and robots.txt. The usage of snippets and their length could easily be solved within the content using a to-be-defined HTML meta tag. Unfortunately, content providers seem to be stupid.

Shared information should remain free in all aspects

Should I pay to share my own content, no. Paying a tax for sharing a link, is like paying a tax for talking. It's stupid.

Simple answer: No

Simply no.

Simply put: no.The internet flourishes, when people link to each others content, either by single words or using content. Without linking, or with link tax, I believe that what makes the internet what it is,

would be much harder to achieve for the individual or small company that it would make everything worse for everyone.

Snippets of text are not “publications”, and should not fall under copyright protection. This is the very epitome of “fair use”, and should be free to do. No taxes, no money to the publisher, no charge at all. The publisher stands to benefit from traffic generated by hyperlinks - what is the problem?

So long as a link is used as a form of citation and an article or page does not attempt to plagiarise information, and said information has been posted freely to the internet in a publicly accessible area, there is no reason that any form of recompense or taxation should be required for using that link. Anything otherwise would be coming close to an attempt to suppress the freeflow of publicly available information and could more easily be used for dishonest or unlawful practices than legitimate ones.

So the question's unclear.
Absolutely not. Fair use!

Such a link tax would impede the natural flow of information - to mankind's detriment. We should be looking more towards advancing civilisations, NOT holding them back

Taxing links does not seem practicable and would stifle the model of the web which leads to so much evolution and creativity. Content should not be copied, but linking to content preserves the rights and ownership of the content creator so should be done freely.

Taxing links is absolutely CRAZY. The Internet (what most people think of as The Internet) is successful almost ONLY because it is a global implementation of a concept called Hypertext. Hypertext, in essence,

is nothing more than text with these very links. In other words, taxing links on the internet will undermine the internet ITSELF. Every shred of progress that the web has wrought -- every child learning about NASA online, every citizen buying a parking ticket faster from a website, every email such as this one found due to an issue linked on websites -- MUST, by definition, be limited and controlled by such taxes. Worse, many small startups and public good services, such as the news aggregators known as “Planets” will become unworkable, since they are not yet profitable, or not designed to create profit, but also are too small, prototypical, or transient to apply for non-profit status. Taxing internet links would essentially destroy the internet as we know it, restoring big corporate control over media. The concept itself is a cynical ploy by those with vested interests, and MUST be prevented from EVER becoming law

Taxing links stifles innovation for new online services. The next reddit or Twitter would be unable to start up under these rules.

That is completely ridiculous

That is outrageous, of course not.

That is ridiculous. The internet survives on linked text. If the text was not in the public domain, it could not be linked. Simple as that

That it absolutely ridiculous and would destroy the internet and ecommerce, as well as making it easier for terrorist and so on to hide from the authorities by sending hidden URLs by text or mail. A newspaper doesn't pay an address tax for listing the addresses of its advertisers

That's as stupid as when a few years ago, the U.S. postal service tried to charge postage on sending email. And

just as petty, I'd like to point out.

the ability to search for information using links should not be limited in any way, particularly by charging a linking fee. If having found the source of the information being searched for there is a charge to actually access it, that is then up to the user/searcher to decide. TO DECIDE

The fundamental purpose of a hyperlink, the key defining concept of "hypertext" which is what the Web is built from, is to refer to external material. If that incurred a cost, or was disallowed, the Web would become a boring place of small isolated islands instead of a thriving, global, living source of information with cross-links wherever they are motivated. Any useful hyperlink should not be blind, but include some short description of what it leads to. Long quotes of text would border on information aggregation, and that is a separate issue entirely, one where I think some sort of fee would be reasonable if the links were provided as part of a for-profit business operation. However, if ordinary, everyday linking to certain content would cost money, I would go as far as saying that the Web as we know it would cease to exist.

The idea of a link tax is absurd and unworkable. Linking is fundamental to the internet and is merely free speech!

The idea of a link tax is totally absurd and unworkable. It would completely ruin the internet, whose main tool is the link. All links must be totally free, just as people quoting others in the street are free to speak. Free speech is a fundamental human right.

The idea of a link tax is utterly absurd, given the disproportionate damage that would result

The Internet must be free to all people.

The internet should be free from any taxes. I should be able to show or point my friend to anything on the internet via a link quite freely and without any charge whatever

The internet was founded to enable the free exchange of information any restriction, control or taxation would infringe upon this basic function creating an unequal bias away from the individual user for whom the internet was founded.

The link tax is for revenue raising and hindering the sharing of information. This is exactly what corporations and modern governments want as they fight the loss from traditional media and strive for censoring the spread of information to only their message and agendas

The whole idea of the World Wide Web is that it is a WEB. Information should be passed freely as if spoken on the street. The whole part of links is to join information, in pieces, to make a coherent whole. The web "surfer" can then come to their own conclusion. Perhaps, this is what frightens governments, people who have a free will.

Their too powerful. When filming my family in a bar where there is music in the background, the copyright of that music should not be enough to remove all content. When linking only to a page which is infringing copyright, the page should be removed, not the link. It would be the same as too forbid saying 'hé, look over there' when seeing something which could be illegal. No, no, no, no

There is already too much regulation on the Internet. If this kind of control was applied to the real world we would call it fascism.

There is no justification whatsoever for the proposed "link tax." There is a long established principle - at least in England - that material from other sources may

be freely quoted for the purposes of review or criticism, provided that such extracts are reasonably short. It seems to me that the use of links is similar to this, and is in no way problematic.

There should be no 'link tax'

There should be no fee for previewing content or for links.

There should be no link tax

There should be no link tax. It makes no sense for anyone. It would be like taxing a bus driver because he gave you directions to the library

There should be no link tax. Snippets of 15 words or up to 0.25% of text (ie a quarter page from a 100 page book) should be allowed free of copyright and tax.

There should never be a reason for a link tax. It would be like saying that library's would have to pay a tax for index cards

There should not be any link tax, that's the most ridiculous idea I've ever heard.

There's nearly no point to the web if hyperlinks are restricted. A tax on hyperlinks will make the web nearly useless.

These charges 'act' like exploitation.....a scam like technique for hidden costs. NO!

This flies in the face of the document model on which the entire web is built. If this tax were to come into existence it would break the internet on a technical and social level, the cultural loss would be huge and the financial loss would be crippling to high technology economies

This goes too far. It is not a very good idea

This is a completely ill thought-out idea: hyperlinks are massively important

conduits of communication and information dissemination. To try to put up paywalls and turnpikes would have a disastrous effect on any number of forms of traffic caught in this system- for example what happens to links in educational papers, materials and resources? Workplace reports? Press releases? Hyperlinks shared in campaigning literature and materials? Charity documents and material? Petitions? Personal websites, CVs and blogs? Social media pages? Petitions? Local government or municipal services information sites? It's like trying to put taxes on footnotes and indexes in books. Utterly wrong and impossible to enforce meaningfully.

This is an awful idea. Costs incurred are likely to be passed on in the form of 'pay to use' charges which will deter free expression and the sharing of information across the internet. The alternative scenario could see countless websites shutting down - unable, or unwilling to pay these charges and impossible for them to cover such a huge potential cost

This is both a rip off and a way to limit free speech

This is crazy - any country implementing this is committing economic suicide. Entrepreneurship will go to wherever the internet is most free.

This is probably the worst idea in the history of the union. And that says a lot...

This seems to me to be a cynical attempt to destroy the tenet of the sharing knowledge economy that has flourished in my adult lifetime. Deeply worrying, deeply suspect and very dangerous for any democratic country.

This tax is ridiculous.

This type of law attacks the core idea of an open Internet, by setting an arbitrary

tax on something as fundamental as hyperlinking, it sets a bar which the rich and powerful pass with ease, whereas the poorer in society are then limited to use the Internet to a lesser degree. The Internet should be an open platform for everyone, not only those with the privilege of wealth.

This would be a really bad idea, and shut down many voices. It would solidly entrench the current big internet players and stifle innovation. It becomes a human-rights issue, because (for example) it would shut out worthwhile web use and access by people on tiny wages in 3rd-world countries. It's an unacceptable move.

Under no circumstances at all. If content is made freely available at a particular link anyone must be able to publish that link. This must apply equally whether there is any curation or not of the links, whether or not there is any commercial gain and whether or not there is any commercial agreement between the link owner and the link publisher. If the content owner does not want to allow third parties to publish links then they should not make the content available at a fixed link. There are plenty of tools available to require either login or non-permanent links to avoid linking if they wish.

Under no circumstances should a tax be levied on any Internet link

Users should not have to pay a tax or anything else to see something is redistributed widely online

We are taxed enough. There should be no link tax. The internet was designed by the people and with money provided by the people. The link technology is paid for through fees and royalties. Governments get taxes from sale of the net service. That should be sufficient.

Websites and users should NEVER be required to pay any money for links or previews of content. This imposes an excessive burden on sharing information

Websites and users SHOULD NOT be forced to pay a link tax when using snippets of text to preview other content online

Websites and users should not be forced to pay a link tax. Put simply: websites should not have to pay money when using snippets of text to preview other content online.

Websites should not be forced to pay a 'link tax'. The web should remain as free as possible, which means not to be exploited as a source of profit regardless.

Websites should not have to pay a fee or "link tax" as these costs are likely to be passed on to the user, which may discourage Internet usage altogether

Websites should not have to pay money to use snippets of text for previewing. I'm very much in favour of knowledge being widely and freely available to all - not exclusive to those who can afford a link tax.

Websites should not have to pay money when using snippets of text/links to preview other content online

Websites should not pay money to link or excerpt other sources.

Well no, of course not, peer file sharing is what the internet code is based upon. If you wanted a revenue stream then flag complete content and offer it in competition to the bit torrent price of "free", make content 5c, easy to purchase, across all platforms, and resaleable to others. ensure the money goes to the creators, not the lawyers. But 'taxing' hyperlinks? Are you cray cray?

What all in the world can we tax? As already layed out in my answer to question number 2: The web in a way is a copy of our real world & is an incredible information space, and every successful scheme to prevent linking weakens the foundation of the open Internet

What av ridiculous suggestion!
Absolutely no way should

What is the point or purpose of a link tax? Just because you can? Linking spreads information, opens markets, helps spread knowledge and information. Why would anyone in their right mind consider taxing this? Will you next be taxing people recommending books to their friends, or giving directions in the street? These are the functions of links. If you think they should be taxed you're not fit for purpose. You need to learn a lot more about how the internet actually works, rather than how you think it works.

What? That is a ridiculous idea and makes no sense. Do you pay money to read the blurb on the back of a book? No you do not. Get this idea in the bin where it belongs. (no)

While I see the argument for this, the problem is whether it penalises people who don't deserve it, more than those who shouldn't be allowed the freedom to flout copyright law. So, probably not unless a sort of handicapping system can be introduced.

Who the hell to? Not practical to organise. Think of how quickly you can insert a link into a blog post or facebook.

why should someone who can't manage the money that we are FORCED to pay get any more of our money? they aren't improving society with it, they are actually using it against all of us and then we

have to write BS petitions like this...
those people need to go permanently!

Without links, the internet stops functioning. not being able to link to sources for content on the web will ultimately hurt produces of original content, and will benefit sites who create content by rewriting other peoples articles. The google has faced such "taxes" in relation to its news search in various E.U. countries, it has (rightly) decided to stop offering its free discovery service. When this free advertising (involving no effort on the part pf the content creator) was removed, the news websites saw a dramatic drop in visitors to their websitesIt is worth noting that Google and other major search engines already offer a simple way for content creators to "Opt-out" on a site by site or page by page basis.,

Yes

Yes

Yes a small/fair tax might be acceptable..?

Yes And yes Snippets are only an "introduction" to the article in question. If that would happen then everything and share on Facebook would become illegal when it's clearly not!

yes No. How about a handshake tax? Makes about as much sense. You are attempting to profit form people right to connect with other human beings simply because the internet was used to do so. This is even more absurd than taxing clean and and sunshine.

Yes they do if they want to

Yes This tax is a stupid idea that will stifle creativity and information sharing

Yes, and yes

Yes, I understand Of course
not! The idea is absurd

Yes! Change your business model, the
world has changed. I do not think websites
have to pay money when using snippets
of text to preview other content online

Save the Link question 5:

Do you agree that sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. Why or why not?

European Commission consultation question:

Do you consider that different categories of illegal content require different policy approaches as regards notice-and-action procedures, and in particular different requirements as regards the content of the notice?

Should the content providers be given the opportunity to give their views to the hosting service provider on the alleged illegality of the content?

1635 people responded 'yes'

Total number of extended responses: 1544

Unique responses: 1409

"There is no comparison between the harm done to society by copyright infringement to the harm done by extremism, hate speech and abuse, on the web or anywhere. These cannot be governed by the same rules."

Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. • When copyrighted material is illegally shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. •These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

All forms of speech should be free. Creating exceptions to the first amendment, or subverting it through copy write, is infringement of that right

I agree! Only content that violates the individual or public good should be removed

I do not agree to apply the same rules, it would undermine the free circulation of ideas.

If sharing is not for profit, then it should not be punished in an extreme manner

Not sure. It depends on the situation

Sharing content is no crime and therefore should not be punished like a crime.

Sharing something is different from actually holding and expressing that opinion yourself

When copyrighted material is shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

Why use different rules - and does not condone free speech, expression of idea? Abuse and Hate speech is wrong, but freedom of expression is a right!

Yes, sharing has nothing in common with abuse and other harmful actions. Therefore it is not fair to punish it like such things.

Yes, This is like showing people your newspaper or book or using citations. Why should this be any different?

Yes. People have the right to share personal creative actions. In the United

States, it is called Freedom of Speech

YesThe motive is to be identified as being the trigger for action.

"Do you consider that different categories of illegal content require different policy approaches as regards notice-and-action procedures, and in particular different requirements as regards the content of the notice?"**ABSOLUTELY.**Sharing copyrighted material may cause economic damage, while extremism, hate speeches cause very different type of harm. THESE ISSUES SHOULD BE TREATED SEPARATELY.

Depends. Links to others' information is used to spread information, so unless there is a copyright on the information, it should be allowed to be used by others. But, using information that has a copyright, like books, should hold some form of punishment if the entire book is used to reprint/copy. However, if only a portion is being used to make others aware of its contents and availability while providing links to the rightful owner, then I see that as being okay. But anything else is the same as stealing

Extremism, hate speech, and abuse online should be held accountable. Same rules those that pass it along in same context. Governed by parameters of law.

I agree

I agree, because live is more important than things

I agree. There is a fundamental flaw in believing something immaterial, such as pictures, videos, blogs is actual property and be considered as such. Immortal "Content" is at the end of the day just a set of bytes, that one can replicate without removing the "ownership" of the original issuer.The argument that copying actually harms the content industry is

largely overestimated, in most cases content providers giving alternate ways of obtaining digital copies actually benefit from the so-called "piracy". Hate speech, extremism, and abuse have direct and most of the time vital consequence (look at the amount of people committing suicide because of internet abuse). Therefore there is a legitimate reason to be able to control and police that. Given that on one side you have vital consequences on REAL people (hate speech, abuse), and on the other side you have alleged financial loss, there is objectively no reason to treat both issues the same way.

I believe the less government intervenes the better.I also believe that punishment is NOT the best way to create a better world and that awareness of impact and inclusion are more adequate ways to create a better world for all.Extremism, hate and abuse are expressions of a confused mind and the more we fight this, the more it gets bigger.Extremism, hate and abuse can be limited by creating healthy boundaries with a heart at peace for the sake of the well being of mankind and by creating better ways of communicating with each other.

I do not agree. Much "ownership" is simply a financial arrangement and not connected to the actual creators of media.

In most cases, there is no harm in sharing the content, so it should be handled different from malicious actions

It's a difficult question.

Legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment.Our laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than

creating a new system. When copyrighted material is shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework. So no I do not think they should be governed the same way. They are not the same.

no

no to the same rules

No, it should stay in the hands of the law makers.

no. there is a significant difference between commercial entities losing out on SOME of their profits, and far more serious psychological or even physical harm being done to human beings

Off course!

Sharing content aids to understanding. Extremism (if I understand the definition correctly), hate speech or abuse does not aid understanding

Sharing content owned by others should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. The later harm people. The former harm economic benefits.
Have we come to the point where money has the same value as persons?

should be governed by different rules: copyright is a commercial affair subject to civil law, whereas extremism and hate speech should be dealt with by criminal law.

The harm of copyright infringement is not comparable to the harm of extremism and abuse. We might as well start cutting off the hands of petty thieves.

The Internet should be used freely and without government or corporate interference

The overarching use of criminalization of non-commercial copyright infringement leads to a diminishment of justice: Punishment becomes arbitrary, almost everyone is a criminal according to such laws. Who is punished depends on who happens to be focussed on by rights holders, or even by anyone else that would like to damage said people. It also makes people more likely to follow extremists paths, because if anyone is a criminal, what difference does it make?

This is a loaded question. Without a doubt a sane answer is yes. But before I can say yes the question of who is going to determine extremism, hate speech & abuse. A good example would be the song of F#&k Paris came out the day after the November shootings. The song was supposedly supported by Black Lives Matter yet these same people sanctioned not allowing whites in their circles of healing which were conducted on public property. Even though segregation is against the law this is viewed as civil disobedience and applauded as how things need to be. Regulation cannot be imposed on internet use because Extremism, hate speech, abuse & what is sane and insane will be governed by the golden rule. The powers that be fought the Gutenberg press because a free mind is a true danger to control

This one is complex!

When copyrighted material is illegally shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

Yes - media sharing is not the same as violent speech or incitement to violence.

Yes I agree

yes, apples and oranges

Yes, I do agree that the two should be distinct and governed by differing rules/laws. It is not necessary to react with nuclear force against minor infractions except for under the view of those seeking a Zero Tolerance Policy, and time and time again such instances have proven how detrimental they are to everyone involved

yes;

Yes. The Internet can have a lot of positive consequences, like learning from and getting to know other people.

Agree

agree. different problems cannot be addressed by the same rules

I do agree that linking to news and information content by websites should NOT be governed/regulated in the same way that illegal, threatening online behavior is governed. News stories in print cite sources, use quotes, include pictures all the time. Each of these is "in addition to" the main news being reported. And each often naturally causes the reader to want to read or see more about the incident, the players or the outcome/effects of the incident. Print media CANNOT physically link the reader to additional information relating to the story, it is limited naturally in that way. The internet and internet websites however CAN conveniently link the reader to more information. That is a valuable to everyone. Many people only get their information online today. Many more don't have access to print media at any given time. Linking to additional information online is no

different than someone recommending a restaurant to someone else. That second person may choose to investigate the recommendation further, or not. And if they really want to know something, they'll find the content and view it anyway.

It should not, because something is convenient to the powers that be does not make it right if the end result is the same

No, because it opens the possibility of those in power being able to control content they simply don't like, rather than content that is objectionable in a more objective, societal manner.

We have to rethink the punishments used in the legal systems, sharing a movie should not be punished harder than raping another human being

We should be able to pass info without it being governed, and who is the one to say you can't share that, well it's plain give the gov too much and they will go tyrannical, and that's why we should all stand up and say no more.

Yes.

Content sharing should absolutely not be governed by the same rules that punish extremism, hate speech and abuse. Content sharing is an exchange of knowledge with goal of enrichment and not the goal of inciting hatred or crimes against humanity.

I agree, and if the content is a problem, it's the content itself that should be dealt with

No as this will lead to censorship

No but I also don't think hate speech should be punished as that is yet again an infringement on rights of free speech

Sharing content generated and/or owned by others must not be governed by the

same rules that deal with hate speech, calls on violence and other kinds of abuse online. While these kinds of extremism pose a direct threat to rights of other people, online sharing may or may not infringe rights of owners, producers, or publishers. The latter can be properly established only at a court of law.

Yes, I agree. Everything on the Internet should be free to use.;

YES!

I agree. There is a vast difference!

In master fravia's own words:"The web was made for SHARING, not for hoarding and not for selling."

No, two very separate issues.

Yes , I agree that my sharing should not be governed by the same rules as criminals or radical extremist using the internet to further their cause , my use of the internet is purely to exchange information that is pertinent to political , social matters that would have an affect me personally , and to voice an opinion with a collective force to make a difference, on subjects that would be very difficult to do without the internet

Yes. Sharing content does not as a general rule put life and safety at risk.

a link just like the bullet is never the one that is responsibel for the shooting, its where people point it at.

Absolutely. If any person or organization put content on the Internet they should be aware of the Internet is public place and anyone can share the content.

Extremism and hate speech are cover-up labels for free speech. Any law that uses these terms is usually

totalitarian. But the sharing of photos is most certainly a completely different thing, one that I also support.

Humans are social animals. To be social means we share. Sharing leads to happiness. Happiness leads to peace

I agree. Sharing content owned by others is not always illegal, and most importantly, even if illegal, extremism, hate speech etc is always worse. These things should not be measured by the same standard or fought with the same means.

I'm not sure I understand the question. Sharing content (owned by anybody) as such should not be governed by same rules. However, it's necessary to understand that in some contexts, extremism, hate speech and abuse may be achieved via sharing content.

No i do not agree. These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

Yes!!!

Yes. Sharing is an important part of the Internet ecosystem and a small economic harm is completely different from extremism.

Copyright laws already exist. People's opinions, even "hate speech" is their right and censoring that could lead to censoring less and less extreme cases. Also, "abuse online" is already being "abused" (look at extremist "feminists" aka feminazi's)

Criminalizing sharing and linking doesn't solve any problems. Instead it creates crime where none existed before, and gives corporations and copyright holders the right to censor free speech and abuse the rights of well-meaning Internet users. It is unacceptable for the often baseless claims of monetary losses caused by sharing to outweigh the right to free

speech, free expression and justice. Internet users are the more vulnerable party and they should be given more protections from copyright holders, not less

Definitely not - that would be absurd

I agree because it would kill the freedom of expression which the internet is guaranteeing today.

I believe everyone has a right to their privacy, but if they choose to publish it on their own forum then it is out there for the rest of us to share.

I never understood why stealing was punished harder than, say, rape or murder. It's ridiculous the way money makers have convinced the world that money is more important than the well-being and life of others. So no, it should definitely not be punished in the same fashion as extremism, hate speech and abuse.

I totally agree, There is no reason to deal sharing others content the same way as you deal with hatespeech.

Information wants to be shared

It is ridiculous to even ask this. Of course it should not be treated the same.

No wee need free speech for democracy to work

No, as long as we're not sharing hate speech and abuse

No. It is not that bad as extremism, hate speech and abuse online. The first: It is only money in question, the 2. It could end up hurting people physically. And as mentioned before. The net should be non commercial.

Obviously not as they are two different things. Unfortunately it seems most people agree free speech must be

impinged upon in the case of hate speech, presumably to protect the stupid and gullible from their own inability to think critically. Abuse should be dealt with as the assault it actually is, with criminal charges and penalties. I don't know what people consider extremism, but I probably would argue it should fall under free speech protections.

Of course, seems to compare flowers and weapon

Of course. Hatred and abuse (when proven) are clearly different categories of offense than sharing (potentially innocently) copyrighted material. These latter offenses (when proved) should be subject to reasonable recovery of economic losses.

Sharing content is the essens of the internet and a free society. If a big brother-society looks upon and punishes this like terrorism - it will surely produce billions of terrorists. And we will be happy to destroy a society like that

Sharing content not intended to denigrate or do harm to others clearly should not fall under laws designed to protect by punishing extremism bullying hate speech and abuse

Sharing content should not be governed by the same rules as hate speech and abuse, simply because it is not. Most of the time, people aren't thinking about stealing, when using content online. Most of the time, they are using it for fan-made things like streams, photos, blogs and more. This way of sharing is most of the time encouraging others to look more into that particular content, potentially resulting in free marketing for content creators.

Sharing content via pictures, videos or similar formats should not be governed unless it is clearly being used for

monetary gain in violation of copyright. Simply sharing content which contains copywritten material does not harm the holder and should not be restricted

Sharing hate speech and radical views helps give people insight into the reasons for such bigotry or extremism, and allows us to challenge it. Banning the proliferation of this information is a form of censorship, which I am against

The impact of sharing copyrighted material is a financial one only - it is completely different than the emotional and mental impact of extremism, hate speech and abuse. Online should be kept as SAFE as possible - a place where people can be free from bullying and harassment. There are already laws to protect free speech while protecting individuals from abuse. These laws should be extended to online behavior rather than creating a new set of rules.

There is plenty of verifiable science that allows decisions to be made about what is harmful. The problem is that many times it's an algorithm that does the sorting with little or not enough human input. When there is human input, the person reviewing is not deeply competent in the psychology needed to make that decision.

These two issues do not fit under the same framework. Legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment. Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. When copyrighted material is illegally shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society.

They should be subject to copyright laws only

Well ... It should not be a loop hole that allows spreading abuse, hate and extremism..As long as you make it clear the content does not reflect your own views.

While sharing content owned by others can be wrong, it is not in the same category as hate speech and online abuse.

yes I agree.

Yes, because abuse and hate speech are much worse, more grave and serious

Yes, I agree. Amiable sharing is probably one of our better traits - to be encouraged.

Yes, I agree. The harm caused by sharing content owned by others is generally negligible compared with extremism, hate speech and online abuse, therefore it is not fair to judge these two practices using the same rules

Yes. Different topic. These two issues do not fit under the same framework

Yes...these are two completely unrelated circumstances and should not lumped into one category

Bottom line, using content that isn't yours is wrong and infringes on someone else's rights, possibly impacts their livelihood or privacy. There are shades here, and I don't want to go too far to the extreme but I also feel that unless the original owner of the content has made it freely available, it should not be shared

Casual use ie for a blog or comment is not an attempt to rip off a copyright holder and should not be judged as such when no harm is intended. In other words don't bring an AK-47 to a fist fight. As a writer I don't object to someone quoting a paragraph of

my story but sure do object if he/she copies the whole story and calls it his/her work

Culture is first and foremost for all people to enjoy, not a money machine for multinational giants, and should be treated as such. There's not an artist in the world who would not agree with having a large audience for their creations, and enforcement of strict ownership and publication rules hurts this goal

Depends on the content...if the content is hateful or abusive, then yeah it should face barriers to being easily spread. Otherwise...no

Hate speech and copyright infringement are not related at all and they need to a separate mechanism to deal with both.

I agree. Economic damage from copyright infringement, if actually demonstrable, can always be repaid. Emotional abuse and threats of physical violence are far less easily negated and deserve stricter control.

I agree. The harm (real or imagined) done by content sharing is not comparable to the harm caused by real crimes such as abuse online.

I do NOT agree. Online hate and abuse sends the message that it's acceptable behavior 'offline'

Immaterial rights should not be forced as severely as "real crimes". In many cases financial loss is abstract because people would not be ready to buy content in any case

In general sharing content only serves to raise peoples awareness and could be looked upon as a form of advertising. In particular civil law and not criminal law should apply in cases where it is believed the sharing is harmful. Criminal laws governing extremism,

hate speech and abuse apply regardless of the medium and I see no need to treat the online world differently

It is essential that different types of infringement are treated proportionally. It would be ridiculous to argue that sharing content should be controlled in the same way that extremism or abuse should be controlled.

No, it is not the same stuff so should be handled differently. If people are too lazy or stupid to differentiate between social harm and financial loss they should not be allowed to control the lives of others either.

No. Sharing content owned by others should be treated like a minor criminal offense - the online rules should closely mimic the real world rules

No. I think there are more grades of shade in sharing content owned by others. One key point should be whether sharing results income to the sharer. Furthermore the owner should be indicated.

Of course there's a difference between inciting violence and being abusive than if I were to forget to ask the content creator for permission to share the content. It makes no sense to treat someone who smokes marijuana the same as someone who murdered someone. Why would you apply the same rules to online content? Abusive and violent content should be dealt with by the appropriate figures. I believe there is such a thing as cyber forensics. Why not use them to convict anyone of instigating emotional and mental abuse? As for those who just didn't request permission before sharing content, why not establish a REASONABLE fee? Not every one is a criminal on the internet, you would want to take into account the person's prior history, such as previous convictions. Third strike scenario, for example

On Daily motion, my video was given an age gate. Even though to most, it doesn't seem sexual or hateful. In it, a guy blows to his thumb to make music. I re-uploaded it. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=jppyNd7_clo

Sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. These are categorically very different infractions, especially where the motive for distributing copyright content is educational or humanitarian, not profit-motivated

Sharing content should not be governed by the same laws used to punish abuse, hate speech and extremism online. Doing so will not only cripple the innovation necessary for a knowledge economy, but it will also detract from the work necessary to address legitimate cases of abuse, hate speech and extremism. In fact, the sharing of content should not be subject to this type of legislation at all, except in the most extreme cases. If the ability of an individual user to share content with others is prohibited or made economically impossible, not only will that damage the public good of the internet, but, in the long run, will only hasten the demise of the corporations/institutions that advocate for this. Free and legitimate use and attribution of content is fundamental to the internet. Without it, the internet will lose a significant portion of its ability to foster innovation, increase economic benefit and promote the public good.

The same laws should not be used. Sharing content is simply expressing yourself, and limiting what you can share is limiting free speech (within reason of course, you cannot share content in a way that would damage the original content creator).

They should be governed by somewhat different rules, since the crimes are as different as property crime is from violent crime.

This is a complicated question asked too simply. Content owned by others can be an infringement on their personal rights, portrayed in manners unbecoming, and thus as serious an offence as any other type of 'abusive' liberty.

yes Copyright infringement is a much less serious crime than extremism, hate speech, and on-line abuse

Yes, because sharing media is a way of expressing yourself and the anonymity of the internet already protects the individuals posting/ being offended by said media

Yes, it should not be governed in the same way. Some basic rules are required so that people won't take content freely from others and then claim it as their own (you have to make sure people know who originally made the piece you are sharing). But I do not believe it requires such drastic measures as hate speech.

Yes, of course I agree that sharing content should not be under the authority of rules used to govern extremism, hate speech, and online abuse. The intent is discussion and social reflection and not harm

Yes. Sharing content is NOT extremism, hate speech or abuse. They are different and should be treated differently with different rules/laws

Yes. The punishment should fit the crime

A fundamental principle of law is proportionality, that the level of punishment should be related to the degree of damage an infraction has significant potential to cause. Beyond that, there is considerable precedent that

copyright infringement is a civil rather than criminal matter unless the infringement resulted in direct financial gain

Absolutely not - The web should be a free oinformation source

ABSOLUTELY NOT THE SAME! The internet is 'by the people for the people'. Current hate & abuse laws exist and are applied to safeguard us from extremism

Abuse, extremism and hate speech has emotional impacts that do not exist when sharing content owned by others, which has an economical impact. Both should be punished, but the scale is different. Just like street criminals get punished differently if they steal a loaf of bread vs kill somebody.

agree.

Because that is completely rediculous

copyright infringement should not be counted as the same kind of illegality as hate-speech or abuse.those two just do not have the same impact on individuals.

Copyrighted content should be governed by the laws governing intellectual property. Extremism and hate speech should be governed by the laws of the state/regional organization in which they occur.

Correct

Do you consider that different categories of illegal content require different policy approaches as regards notice-and-action procedures, and in particular different requirements as regards the content of the notice?YES!!! It's so obvious. If I stole an apple in a store, I won't be punished the same way as the guy who assaulted a police officer with a firearm. Should the content providers be given the opportunity to give their views to the hosting service provider on the alleged illegality of the

content?YES!!! If John reported to the police I stole a car, hopefully, I will be given the opportunity to prove I didn't steal any car.

Extremism, hate speech and abuse affect individuals and groups of human beings negatively and baselessly, and should be removed from web sites, after careful review. Content that belongs to others should be available under "fair use"

I actually wish we would punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online far more than sharing content owned by others. Currently it seems as if sharing content owned by others is punished far more. I believe sharing owned content is at worst a nuisance and at best a promotion for the concerned content. It in no way can be compared to the horrendous potential results of extremism, hate speech, and abuse online!

I agree that sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be goverened by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech and abuse online because the governance of extremism, hate speech &/or abuse determination &/or speed of determination would be rendered inordinately slow, if not ineffective.

I agree. Most of the links on the internet are completely harmless and there is no single solution to govern them

I agree. One is more a civil crime while the other is a criminal act

I agree. There is any number of reasons someone might link to something someone said, wrote, etc. It might be for news, for fun, to point out how they disagree with them, or even by accident. Even if they are linking because they are agreeing with something you don't like, we're crossing into violation of free speech when we

say that we have a right to punish people for liking things we don't like or are even disgusted by. People should be punished for bad actions, not bad thoughts

I have reported hate speech and been told by Facebook that there was nothing wrong with the post in question. Several people I know were in complete agreement with me, but the post was not taken down. Something needs to be done to stop certain statements and images from being shown. The main problem, as I see it, is the censors' objectivity. It seems to be very biased.

Il est parfois très compliqué de définir l'un et l'autre. Une clarification européenne s'impose sur ces définitions avant que je puisse me prononcer.

Internet must remain free. Otherwise it will be pushed to the underground

It should not be governed by the same rules, sharing culture is not a crime

It should not be governed by the same rules. For culture to exist it must be free as much as possible. This is the idea behind fair user laws, which allow people to "riff" off each other's creative work. Sharing another's content, as long as it is not hate speech etc, must be examined in context and judged as an infringement of rights (or not). To equate this behaviour with extremism or abuse demonstrates how desperate the old guard is to defend their dying business models. Should corporate tax evasion be equated with terrorism? There is a better argument for this (tax evasion harms the entire country) than for suggesting sharing content online is hate speech

No because extremism, hate speech and abuse online are wrong. Sharing content owned by others isn't bad as long as the original holder is okay with sharing it,

but that is up to the individual themselves

No I do not agree. We should not be constructing a charter for internet trolls.

no, absurd concept.

No, the internet was developed originally for the free unfettered sharing of ideas - it is a worldwide resource, not to be governed or infringed by a minority

No. This is a different situation. Are we talking about linking to another person's site or copying material. The former should be of benefit to the site owner. The latter should be illegal with certain qualifications

No. This is an entirely different category, and should be treated differently. This doesn't necessarily mean that owned content should be shared with no restrictions. Freely allowing any and all sharing of owned content would effectively strip intellectual property owners of all their rights, and give them no means to stop actual abuse of their content, and while the "all information should be free" utopia may sound nice, the "it'll promote and encourage content creation and enrich our culture" argument that's so frequently used does not hold water, as time has shown goodwill alone will not feed content creators. With the advent of services like patreon and kickstarter we've seen new options for content creators to make a living, but as the situation is now, intellectual property laws are still necessary to protect the rights and livelihood of content creators. However, the acts and consequences of illegal content sharing and abusive behaviour are completely different beasts, and should be treated differently

Of course I think that. Sharing is a good thing.

Of course not. The reason is theory

aren't the same kinds of content and shouldn't be treated the same

Sharing a content that belong to other right-holders is a fault, which in the worst case would make the right-holder loose money. On the other hand, hate speeches are offending people, destroying their lives, and can lead them to suicide. The psychological impact is much more consequent, and should not be treated lightly. These two topics are completely different : the first one can be relativized in most cases or be caused by ignorance, the second one is a direct assault which falls in the responsibility of tribunals.

There should be no 'rules' at all. not even against 'hate speech'. It is better that suck people reveal themselves. if a person has made a lot of money from stolen content, then they should have it confiscated. That rule already exists. it

These are two different issues completely. Extremist hate speech has nothing to do with sharing cartoons about Mickey Mouse.;

They should be separate issues

When copyrighted material is illegally shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society

Yes

Yes I agree that sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. These rules should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system

Yes i do, The governments control enough of our private lives already, The ability to

be creative and show it to a large audience is one of the driving forces of the internet.

yes, because this is not the same risk for people

Yes, but in some circumstances that amounts to stealing/robbery, depriving someone or body from financial gain that is legitimately theirs.

Yes, I agree that sharing content owned by others should NOT be governed by the same rules used to punish hate speech or online abuse.

Yes, should not be governed by same rules. Sharing content owned by others is governed by copyright rules. Laws governing freedom of expression are a separate matter.

Yes, there is a whole world between copyright infringement and hate speech or terrorism.

Yes, we don't endorse a link when we share

Yes. A regulatory system already exists to govern this behavior

Yes. Hate crimes hurt people. Content owners claim they're losing money but there's no evidence they would be paid more if the content they ask to be removed was gone.

Yes. If they are not covered by extremism one ust assume they are not extreme.

"Illegal content" is too broad of a label to effectively manage with legislation. Hate speech is not equivocal to violation of intellectual property and should not be treated as such by the law. The high possibility of misinterpretation and subjectivity must be taken into account. Moreover, it is beneficial to the society for its members to be exposed to new content,

even if the legality of this exposure is dubious, rather than stay unaware of it

"Sharing content" is "communication", usually not a serious crime.

Absolutely not! Hate speech, extremism and abuse are used to cause real emotional pain towards a person or group. You cannot compare threats to life to the loss of a few dollars!

Absolutly sharing a song or a movie should not be governed by the same rules that are used to punish extremism or abuse, simply because they are completly different. If content owners whould provide a legal an fair way of distributing their content "piracy" wouldnt even matter anymore

Agreed. The vast majority of images are shared for goodwill and bring people closer together thus weakening extremism

Any move interpreting dissent as extremism should be avoided at all costs.

As expressed in the other answers, I believe that every community should decide what to ban and what to allow. Not every community should be put under the same rules. There are rude communities and gentle communities. And the user decides which community suites her or him. If laws are broken, the user is responsible for his deeds. And the community is the entity to decide what is ok and what is not ok besides legality. Members and content who/which are too rude or offensive will be exterminated by the community. If a certain community is too rude, stay out of it. There could be a set of rules put up for each community right at the beginning - like no nudity or forbitten words or stuff like that - the community should be the rule maker and be responsible for itself, not anybody else except if laws are broken. A broken law should be solely the

responsibility of the law breaking user.

As long as the person sharing the content references the original owner of the material it should not be a problem. It certainly should NOT be governed the same way extremism, hate speech and abuse is. That's like saying someone making a music video of their favourite anime is as bad as someone actively promoting terrorism

Complex issue. Who decides what is hate speech? Who enforces it? It very much depends on the content of the image & the context in which it is used

Content is not the same as my body
- I have stalking problems, and wish police would protect me - the German legal system stems from the witchburning times. (abortionforbidding and the new suicideforbidding law is enforcing RELIGION) The very idea that corporations can prevent me from getting knowledge like the church did in the bad old days scares me

Extremism, hate speech and abuse are all acts that the person commits very consciously. In contrast, posting something infringing on the internet can happen without the person knowing that they infringed something. This should be as much a differentiation as murder and involuntary homicide is

Frequently, such infringments can be innocent and should not be treated as acts of aggression. The affected parties in most cases are not hurt physically or mentally and in most cases the financial loss is minuscule, if at all. I myself was recently asked to remove an online design I had created which was part of the "1984 George Orwell" estate. I did so without question, but it had not occurred to me that I was infringing copyright. If I had been punished in the same way

as an extremist or someone producing hate speech, it would have not only been a travesty but a senseless waste of everyone's time & money in legal fees etc

Hate speech and abuse should be treated like in real life, sharing content which is owned by others is protected under publishing laws, similar to hard copy content, like books and all.

huh??! is that a serious question?? What do those have to do with each other?

I absolutely agree. I find it vital to be able to share a piece of information I find interesting with people I know, to educate people on topics they don't know much about at the moment or to illustrate a point. I can't even fathom in what way is sharing a news article on an interesting topic the same as hate speech.

I agree because it is not the same sort of crime. It is not about violence and hate but about money

I agree, because there is not a uniform standard governing speech.

I agree, because they are cultural goods and nobody is hurt. If you use pictures, videos, music of others for making money you should pay for it but not if used personally

I agree, the content that reflects our culture has to be accessible to anyone. Hate speech, extremism and abuse online are still activities that are illegal and should be treated as such. There are of course issues about who and how the definitions are created by

I agree.

I agree. And everyone who doesn't is clearly against Human Progress and Freedom of Speech. Let me say it this way:

If you are for censoring the internet, then you are clearly bought by someone with an agenda you hack frauds. We dare you to censor the internet you old farts. You don't even know what the Internet means for humanity so piss off please. Thanks.;

I agree. Because those regulations are stupid even when aimed at extremism, hate speech and abuse.

I am a publisher myself and I greatly benefit from this exposure. And that is true for every publisher out there, even the media outlets who claim that services like news.google.de and the like "steal" from them. The truth is quite the opposite. A large amount of people is referred to pages like spiegel.de via aggregators. And these companies earn by showing ads. The only thing is: the landscape has changed and the old idea of financing these publications only by selling advertising isn't enough any more. The big misunderstanding is, that a link or a shared headline is not a way to copy somebody else. Quite the opposite. It's a very gentle gesture, as it brings even more people to your site.;

I depend on the content. If the content itself is hate speech or extremism, yes. I agree with the notion that there should be more rules to prevent abuse online, but the current take on a new law is wrong and one-sided.

I don't believe sharing content owned by others should be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech and abuse online, since these are very different. Sharing interesting or entertaining content should be encouraged, not punished

I don't believe sharing content owned by others should be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech and abuse online, since these

are very different. Sharing interesting or entertaining content should be encouraged, not punished. It also gives the owner a free spread of its content without having to invest any amount of money for it, as quoted before.

I think sharing content owned by others should be with the owners permission. But if the owner posts it on-line, it is reasonable to suppose that he or she wants it read, so I should be able to post a link to it.

I think that sharing personal content online should be governed by the same rules that we use to punish hate speech and abuse. Anything done online is by its nature public and such we should conduct ourselves as we would in public.

I think there are enough rules and laws to protect content owners. the existing laws should be used instead of adding more and more rules to the system. Apart from this owned content and hate speech or abuse are two completely different matters which can't be put under the same rules! Economic loss and the emotional or personal impact to a person can't be governed by one rule but have to be treated by different sets of regulations!!

I'm not sure, it really depends on the kind of content you are referring to. Rules for those who do take an extremist stance shouldn't be imposed on the rest of internet users.

If it is against the law then it is against the law. The regulations need to be the same, it is the sentence which relies on how badly the law is broken.

If it truly is Hate speech, then we already have laws for that

If the content includes extremism, hate speech, and abuse then those laws should be applied. If it does not fall into those categories, then no. Existing laws have

been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system

If the material posted is publicly allowed to be shared, no problem. Material with copyrights must be respected. Extremism and abuse must be curbed

Indeed

It is important for law abiding citizens of countries in this world to be able to freely share content created by others on social media platforms. This way people can work to raise awareness about topics that are of importance to them without having to spend lots of time to create personal content

It limits our freedom, offers the path for manipulation on all different levels

It should definitely not be punished in the same way. Online abuse and hate speech are already poorly dealt with, with very few police officers/departments trained in how to deal with credible threats. Why put more stress on these departments and possibly risking lives of individuals being threatened online in order to police linking to blogs videos, etc.?

It should not be governed by the same rules. Free expression is necessary for democracy

It should not be. They are clearly different cases of illegality, particularly in the new 'sharing' world of the web. If we are to protect intellectual property rights we should build mechanisms into the content - eg, DRM

It shouldn't be governed

It's not the same and never will be

i formation cant be owned it can only kept secret but never will anyone own information vor data

Legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment.

Legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment. Our laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. When copyrighted material is shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

No I don't. A new system of laws A new system of laws is not desirable or needed

No if the purpose is merely to inform and not to make money then it should be allowed.

No it is different it is about sharing ideas that Benefit people whereas hate speech etc hurts people and weakness sociatial bonds.

no It should be governed by the same rules. For the same reason the rules are there in the first place. What is good for the goose is also god for the gander

No it should not. The entertainment industry has to much say in these matters.

No these unwanted contents can be dealt with

No they should not

No, I do not agree. Sharing content is what human beings do to pass along to others how good or bad something maybe. Punishing people for using word of mouth online entrenches on their fundamental rights as a human being. They don't even equate to extremism, hate speech or abuse. Having the same punishments for sharing content like a picture, video or blog, is how the world knows what's really going on. As even the media can be controlled by a corporation into sharing its own company rhetoric. It creates an unbalanced, dystopian society when you control free speech that way.

No, it should be handled differently

NO! - I feel that there are limits to what is acceptable...

No. Because we cannot know who and what is out there without seeing what they have to say and do. If we censor anyone who has an opinion we find unacceptable, these people will still exist and will simply find more secretive and subversive ways to communicate which noone can then monitor. If someone posts something illegal at present, the police and security forces, as well as individuals, can observe and track them. By censoring such material, criminals become much harder to track

No. It's one thing to fight extremism or hate speech (and here the law can't be hard enough in some cases). It's another thing to sue someone just because he posts the video of a song, esp. when they recommend to buy the album instead of illegally downloading it.

Not governed by the same rules - but sharing "bad" things probably should get a warning of some kind

Of course I agree. The former is the sharing of information the latter hurts people.

Of course not. Linking to blogs or pictures is the every day lifeblood of the internet and social media. Extremism, hate speech and abuse need to be curtailed and excised from decent online discourse. The two are not equatable

Of course not. We must not think in terms of lowest common denominators.

Of course there is a big difference. We have to punish extremism but these rules should not be used for normal people.

Openly sharing content should be considered fair-use

Private users forward links for unknown reasons. To remit a link does not automatically imply any accordance with the content of any Internet page. I often use links as a wrong or bad example for friends. I won't get punished for using links to Internet pages because I'm not responsible for the primal content.

sharing content is a completely different thing to engaging in hateful or abusive activity. these two things should not be treated the same way.

Sharing content is definitely not on the same level as extremism, hate speech or abuse. Sharing content is said to lose others money - which I still doubt - and extremism, hate speech and abuse probably do not cost anyone money, at least not directly. Extremism, hate speech and abuse are just a whole other level, a different quality of law infringement. They cut into other people's rights and content sharing may cost some people money, which is not even clear. Punishing them all by the same rules is just ridiculous

Sharing content is not extremism, hate speech, or online abuse, so punishment shouldn't be as if it is

Sharing content is not incitement to murder! Of course it should not be governed by rules designed for extremists.

Sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that used to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online as this is (on an individual level) a civil offence and not a criminal one.

Sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. Because sharing a file is not much different than borrowing a DVD from a friend. It's not a serious offence

Sharing Content owned by others doesn't have to be completely free, but it can't be censored like hate speech and abuse online. There have to be different procedures.

Sharing content owned by others should only be prosecuted when it damages the artists earnings

Sharing content should be healthy way for a good culture development and in no way should be compared to the latter in terms of punishment because it is stating that the former is as bad as the latter when it's clear the latter is usually way more harmful and undesirable than the former

Sharing freely accessible contents is not a crime - extremism, hate speech and abuse online are definitely crimes.

Sharing innocuous books or pictures with your friends is hardly the same thing as calling on all 'followers of the faith to kill Jews and Western infidels'. In what world would you use anti-terror legislation against an 8 year old sharing Peter Pan with a classmate? Apparently the world called 'EU'

Sharing is part of freedom

should not. Harmful messages should be free. Hate messages should always be removed to stop the hate.;

That is a sticky situation, however, it should be covered the same as the fifth amendment of the constitution for the U.S

That's a difficult question, but short answer is: I think it must be distinguished between abuse and financial damage.

The Internet age is only a few years old. It is too soon to start making laws about controlling it and should remain free and open. I am a very experienced IT professional, I worked for an ISP over 15 years ago and have some views on how best to regulate the Internet

The responsibility of sharing content owned by others must be that of the people that share. They have to ask for permission.

The thing with copying content is that no physical objects are being stolen. The extra cost of a copy is close to zero. No people get directly harmed (sure there is loss of income in some or even most cases, but souls and bodies remain intact). With extremism, hate speech and abuse the case is completely different. These exist to harm people directly. It is clear that extremism, hate speech and abuse should not come with the same rules attached as sharing content. Especially not if sharing that content might actually draw people to the site of the content owner, in which case the shared content should be regarded as free advertisement and nothing else

There is no point to this question, as pretty much every social media, forum and any other type of site that allows users to talk to each other has rules in its Terms of Service that disallow extremism, hate speech and other forms of abuse. But

in any case: referencing content is not creating or endorsing it. A journalist or a lawyer for example has to reference media created by extremists occasionally to prove said extremists views or even criminal behaviour. As such context is important. Condemning something just for mentioning it leads to irrational fear, mystification and only helps to strengthen extremists. To illustrate this with an example from popular literature: in the Harry Potter novels a lot of Voldemort's threat and eventual rise into power comes from the fact that most people even fear mentioning his name. This also gives him an air of mystique and power which draws in followers. If he was just a known criminal people would likely have a lot less interest and would report anything suspicious to the authorities easily

These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

They absolutely should be treated differently, because they are different. They are not even in the same league

They should not be governed by the same rules.

This idea is also completely absurd, Sharing content has nothing to do with extremism

this is a difficult matter. in one way, extremism, hate speech and abuse is violence aimed directly at other people, whereas sharing of owned content in sufficiently large part is more akin to theft (though by no means the same!) in that it targets people's ability to monetise their rights to their possessions. (such as selling copies, lending, licensing, etc.) naturally, these matters can get blurry, such as undercutting a person's ability to make money as part of a larger abusive campaign against that person. since what this law wants to target is piracy of

media, we have to consider whether the victims would be people directly, such as an independent artist, or a corporation. If the target is a corporation, sharing can only have the quasi-theft effect, not the effect of directed personal violence. Therefore these matters must be kept separate, no matter the inconvenience for rights-holding corporations.

This would really limit the social power of the internet;

Time has moved and now every internet user is a little publisher of its own on platforms like Facebook or Twitter. Sharing content of others is part of a culture and mostly it is intended by those who provide this content. In days where information floods us, the normal user is not able to sort out what is rightfully shared and what violates copyright rules. So there is a big difference between extremism, hate speech and abuse, which are clearly not "sharing" but initiating.

Too much regulation stifles creativity. There are alternative ways (e.g. concerts, crowdfunding, donations) of ensuring the creators get rewarded. The transfer of copyrights to middle links is reprehensible, especially when copyrights are extended into near eternity (Happy birthday song, Mickey Mouse, etc.).

Use laws to curb abusive behaviour online. The internet needs to be monitored to make it an abuse free environment. Copyright laws do not sufficiently address these issues

We should not mix apples and oranges. Sharing copyrighted material constitutes one class of problems of a mainly economical nature, spreading hate speech is another category with social and political consequences

When copyrighted material is shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society.

Why compare those two things as if they are equals? Feels like comparing apple with road apple to me

Why not? It is not the same problem. Hate speech and inciting hatred should be handled due to its propensity to break society, stifle civil public discourse, indirectly lead to a breeding ground for violent acts and the subsequent disruption of society. Maximizing profit on licensed works by charging a fee for every 'technical replication' (copies made for technological reasons) of such a work is backwards. Realizing that the world is different and that reality slowly changes is how the law should work. It should adapt and adjust accordingly, not try to replicate the old status quo under a new technological paradigm. Information and content are no longer physical products, in the sense that traditional logistics apply. The companies that own this content refuse to understand this from a business perspective, as they perceive it as hurting their profit margins. Instead of adopting a more reasonable approach to a world where their products can (and will) be replicated and distributed ad infinitum, at no extra cost, they cling on to the exact same physical price tags for a limited 'single use' emulation of a physical hard copy of said work. They introduce technological restraints that (intentionally) limit the portability of such a work within my personal library of purchased content. I cannot port a book purchased for my Amazon Kindle for consumption to any other digital device, unless Amazon wants me to. When Amazon discontinues support for previously purchased devices, I lose all of my content, or at least my only pathway to access them, unless I buy a new, Amazon

certified device. Or perhaps, one day, amazon goes bankrupt. 'My' content is gone. Users are confronted with a world in which all content is equally priced to a physical copy, however in return they receive a 'lease' on 'their' copy of a work. This lease is completely under control of the original content owner (up to the method of consumption is dictated) and the only way around this is 'illegally' pirating your own purchase. Punishing this as you'd punish extremism is absurd. Punishing this with a comparison to theft, or the destruction of an original work is absurd. Punishing this at all is absurd

yes i agree, because sharing content means usually informing others and/or educating others. My belief is, that sharing content, that you do not own is not inherently harmful to society. This sharing enables people to learn and educate themselves, without having the financial means to do so outside the internet. there is a difference between a student, that has to study all day, who cannot work (otherwise wouldnt be fulltime study) and a person, that has already a job and can afford to use his financial means to get content. This relation is not even harmful to society, because the person wouldnt have access to this content in the first place, therefore no profit is lost and no harm is done to society. There is no evil intention behind sharing information and content in general, since humanity has shared stories and myths for several thousand years now, without copyrights. To say it is the as to undermine a society by hatred and/or abuse would be a lie. In my mind it is more important to control, that the media is not censored, so that in one country there can be a completely opposite opinion about a situation, than in other countries, having the same fact to go on to begin with, that is called propaganda.

yes they are different values

yes, because I believe they are two different things and should not be treated with the same rules

Yes, hate, abuse and extremism hurt people sharing pictures or snippets of film do not.

yes, i agree. sharing is good for developing production and creation of new, it enforces creativity, stimulates exchange of ideas and makes community members closer to each other. It facilitates information, ideas and news sharing and creates a space for joint work and cooperation. This has nothing disrupt or undermining to be treated as punishable ;

Yes, i.e. it should not. These rules serve the protection of all users indiscriminately. They are intended to protect our freedom (e.g. from being insulted or worse) and to prevent users from instigating others to crimes. To apply the same rules, however, to copyright questions, serves only the financial interests of a certain group and is liable to misuse.

Yes, of course

Yes. Because they have different logics

Yes. Existing laws seem to cover this well

Yes. Extremism, hate speech, and abuse are detrimental to everyone. Sharing content, whether it infringes on the creator/owner or not, is only detrimental to the monetary interests of the rightsholders. These two issues are not equivalent

Yes. Hate has nothing to do with money interests.

Yes. I think it is called Freedom of Speech? Has America left us?

Yes. Online abuse and hate speech are easy to block by content creators. It is rare that extremism is a serious threat on the

world wide web. Online threats and abuse are more often trolls than actual threats

yes. Perspective, please

Yes. The internet should be an open place for discussion and intellectual discourse. Just like discussing ideas around the kitchen table, borrowing books from another person, sharing links and credited content should be completely legal and are a cornerstone of the internet.

Yes. We are talking about literary material and copyright not extremism and violence

You have to differentiate always. No one-size-fits-all approach. Opinions must be respected even if you dislike them.

Abuse of copyright is not the same thing as abuse of people. The goals and standards in addressing these issues have little to do with each other. Any regulations should be kept similarly separate

Any laws implemented should be used to curb abusive behaviour online

I agree that sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online, because this is what Internet freedom is all about.

I agree with this Legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment

I fully agree, content sharing shouldn't fall under the same rules used to punish extreme and harmful behavior online

I think I agree, but don't really get the connection. I may be 94 years old but I'm pretty naive about matters pertaining to the internet

It is not the same.I agree that I need permission to share content owned by others,but not by the same rules that we use to punish extremism or abusers online

Law abiding citizens should not have the same rules applied to them

No. First of all only personal content should be protected by the law. Especially this should be protected from corporations. Majority disputes regarding private content should be regulated by a civil law.

No. I can see how some of these things could overlap. It is very difficult to prove intent but I believe intent is the dividing line. Sharing is not the same as hate speech or abuse

No.Because it loses it's power against extremism, hate speech and abuse, as it is not as harmful to share as it is to hate. To put otherwise, it's not that important the loss of money that occurs from copyright laws as it is the loss of lives or emotional harm. Furthermore, sharing content can improve your life, open minds etc... it not that bad...

Of course they shouldn't. Why should they? Completely different activities that have zero to do with each other. For one thing, combatting hate speech and abuse should be given much higher priority among police and the justice system. Makes as much sense as governing arson, murder, and jaywalking with the same laws

This is an infringement on our right to freedom on the internet.;

While I doubt that punishing extremism (Is advocating pacifism or communism extremist? Is Tibetan separatism extremist?) and hate speech (Should Ukrainians expressing anti-Russian sentiments, or Tibetans speaking poorly of the Chinese, be jailed?) is appropriate, I agree. The balance

between free speech and copyright protection is already overly in favor of the latter, despite the importance of the former. Should these disparate offenses be lumped together, the resulting legislation is likely to be inadequate, as well as overzealous. Furthermore, while the necessity of hate speech laws is debatable, harsher copyright law is already proven unnecessary, as media industries take in record profits, despite convenient pirate alternatives. Recall that the original purpose of copyright law was not to limit copying - that is merely the method. The purpose was to promote science and the arts. And that is has done, even when it was much milder

Yes, because they are different things.

Yes, I agree that sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that are used to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online, because there is a major and obvious qualitative difference between these forms of content. Pictures, videos, etc. are generally not harmful in themselves, and provide only information, ideas, pleasing or otherwise entertaining views or music, and so on, whereas extremism and hate speech and abuse are meant to cause or promote harm

Yes. Seems a touch excessive.

absolutely not, sharing is no crime: it's growing together, it's culture

Agree. It is very different. I believe, how, and why a piece of content is borrowed is an important part of the facts that should be considered.

I agree, because using the same regulations for content sharing (which is, in the end, information) that is used against violent/dangerous behaviour is nonsense.

I agree. Because it's disproportionate

retribution and limits freedom of thought and speech over the internet.

They are two completely distinct things. The first is a financial issue (and mainly for the rightsholders). The second is a moral issue. I am less concerned about the first one as there are already sufficient means of protection in place (the current intended changes are only meant to place control on people's lives and to take away even more money from people to which they have no legal or moral right. These kinds of changes would only protect the interest of big companies generally who have the time, the money and the manpower to go after such issues).

Unlawful use of copyright of others should be punished normally. Lawmakers should draft specific punishment for these acts

Yes, I agree. It seems this is the whole premise of social media

A dialogue is always important in matters such as these. An initial cease and desist or at least an attempt to contact content providers is essential to preventing these laws from being abused into a method of silencing those that large organisations do not agree with. It is important in our society for both sides to be able to communicate and reconcile their differences in a legally appropriate manner. Illegal content should be tackled in the cyberspace in a similar fashion to how it is tackled in the real world, though it is important to differentiate between some crimes which are only possible digitally (for example, digital replication or "copying" of content without harming the original content's physical integrity) and those which are possible in both (for example slander, hate speech etc.)

Absolutely! The Right to Freedom of Expression and Association (provided

for under article 19a of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights) protects amongst other things the right to hold and express opinions, including political ones and ones which in certain circles might be considered as being dissenting, without needing to fear any form of reprisal for doing so, provided these activities are conducted in a manner that is peaceable and does not seek the deliberate erosion of the rights of others

As long as the original producer of the content is recognized, it should be fine to share what they have created - especially if they were aiming for others to do just that. So no, it should not be governed by the same rules that are used to punish extremism and abuse. That is a completely different matter.

Badly written question. I think like any information it should be judged as whether it is proper public debate or just hate speech. There is already Racial discrimination laws like Australia 18C (Though shalt not vilify) which is tempered by 18D (Unless this is a useful public debate or study). I would add an 18E which is that any comments must be noted as factual or not. So if someone sees what you've written and it says "All XXXX are YYYY" I can say, actually, no and they have to say. It is my opinion that All XXX are YYYY based on this link. However this is disputed by people who have read this link (see the use of links and why we need to keep them free) So we allow people freedom of speech but we require them when asked to justify the basis of that speech and provide an alternative opinion if that exists.

Copying and selling other peoples work is dishonest, and anyone doing it should forfeit their ill gotten gains. However extremism, hate speech, and abuse online should be considered serious crimes that

merit serious punishment. Everybody should be allowed to give their views and defend themselves and their content.

Copyright infringement is a rather different thing than hate speech and online abuse, most jurisdictions have separate laws for the two. It should be the same on the web - creating a new legal framework to lump these two is the wrong approach. Let's work with the existing laws against both hate speech and copyright infringement rather than creating a new system to try and cover both of these very different cases

Corporations aren't going to be affected in any significant way by people sharing small snippets of their products. The sheep will still buy

Existing laws governing speech and expression have been crafted to be blind to the origin. After all, they are the same regardless of the media of origin

I agree fully, as infringing crimes are NOT as bad as extremism, murder, hate speeches or abuse. Infringing is in general publishing something that isn't yours. It may very well be called stealing, but even theft hasn't got as harsh punishments (in the majority of cases)

I agree that sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online - to say otherwise is punish individuals for not being corporations (i.e. vested interests).

I agree, it should not be governed by the same rules. It is totally out of proportion

I believe in freedom of speech. I would far prefer to read things I don't agree with than have it banned and thus go underground.

I do not necessarily agree. This is a

issue that needs to be looked at with care and moderate regulation to find those that originally made such hateful or abusive content and actually punish them (something that doesn't happen the vast majority of the time until it causes emotional affects like suicide to others) and in the meanwhile the content expressing such extremism or hate should be removed. This should be done by users requests such as it already is on Facebook. To be clear this should not be a law in which only police and governing authorities choose what is "extremist" as there may be political censorship, but a continued importance of safety impressed upon the internet community

I don't believe there should be ANY rules to free speech. Speech with the sole purpose of causing injury to a single person or groups of people should of course be held accountable for any resulting crime. But again, a healthy society would simply ignore hateful speech. Since this is not the case in our society we should be focusing our efforts on transforming us into one

If we end up with all sharing content being governed by the same rules as extremism etc we would all end up being punished for little or nothing it would get way out of hand that could see someones life being ruined and/or a childs life. ;

It of course depends upon the content. Sharing content is informative, creative and bonding. All content cannot be governed by a single system. If a person personally owns a piece of content, they ought to be able to do with it as they see fit, except if that content is harmful, abusive, or illegal. Copyright infringement and hate speech are simply two totally separate subjects and labeling them similar offenses under once system is absolutely bizarre and invalidates the actual impact very real illegal and harmful material creates

Most content shared is free advertising. This means more precious profit for the corporations.

No, because sharing is empowering and unless it is subject to copy right infringement it should be allowed

No, they should not be as there is a world of difference between sharing something you find interesting or amusing and promoting extreme points of view or inciting hatred. It is nonsensical to imagine them to be the same.;

nolts the difference between the minor question of intellectual property rights and the well-being of society

Not all sharing of protected material is actual piracy and that grey zone must be acknowledged. Certainly attempting to control this kind of behaviour with the same level of force used to punish extremism and hate speech is abusive

Of course they should not -- the two situations are significantly different

Our laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behavior online, rather than creating a new system.

sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online

Sharing content should be totally free, end of discussion.

Sharing content via links should not mean that we are 100% responsible for that content, especially since the content for a link is largely dynamic in nature. The nature of a link is linking to an alive and changing resource and not a static copy

of data. Trying to regulate that away will change the internet in stifling and breaking ways and uneven the playing field. It will make it hard for people who have little or no resources to do any linking and commercially disable platforms of freedom (such as YouTube)

The law should be the arbiter of any censorship, NOT a company, or any other body

They should have different rules to fit different particulars. They are simply different, and there is no good reason to pretend otherwise

They should not be governed by the same laws. so Yes I agree with the premise of the question. As to Why they should not. Sharing the content is of benefit to the owner. if it is available on the open internet then I am doing them a service by promoting their content I am directing My and anyone I share the content with's "Attention" to their content. Attention is the currency of the net and the world always has been. The Chinese knew this 3000 years ago, the fact that we are even discussing this speaks loudly. The fact that the EU is even considering such a badly thought out policy is extremely worrying and stinks of Corporate Fascism.

They should not be treated as such. This is simply an invalid equivalency.

yes - 2 different issues

Yes - basically it is two different crimes and that it happens on the net make no difference

Yes I agree. Free speech within Europe has been one of the keystones of our development.;

Yes, 'Information is the currency of our democracy' if we censor it, we dont value

a support democracy's free circulation and the priority of it's wit and reason being fully conscious and informed as can be.

Yes, because that's ridiculous and policy makers thinking it isn't is frightening.

yes, sharing generates exposure for content and is a positive thing. Extremism and hatespeech are not positive things and can be criminal

Yes. Because freedom of expression and the sharing of ideas and information is why the internet exists

Yes. Because that is just typical overreaching by the government to justify a total surveillance state

Yes. Because these things impact on our freedom of speech and threaten to turn the web into some sort of Orwellian device.

Yes. Content sharing, to the extent it's an offense, would be a form of property crime at worst

Yes. Freedom of expression is a nuclear principle of what Western Democracies (should) stand for. Censorship should not be allowed to trump such a basic freedom

...I am not sure how these things are linked. If it's a question of people on, say, Facebook sharing links to hate speech, then it's up to Facebook to create policy on that. They seem to be going for "if someone complains and we agree, we'll take it down", which seems pretty reasonable. I assume there are already laws of some kind dealing with hate speech by itself, so that should already be in place for dealing with the source. The problem with taking down links to unpleasant things is that they can be educational. There's a big difference between "this site agrees with my prejudices! All X are Y!" and "this site is saying this

A certain regulation is needed but, obviously extreme rules should be applied ONLY if the content is clearly violent, potentially terrorist and so on. All that occurred in Paris last friday can teach us a lot of things

Absolutely. Speech should remain Free, whereas Violence should never be tolerated no matter how 'legitimate' it may seem, and that holds for governments even more so than for regular people

Agreed. Those are all different cases

Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

Good grief. I wish there were more rules on hate speech (Fox and folks like Limbaugh) and community elsewhere. People share tons of information for free. Let them be. We are all enriched.

I agree because hate speech and extremism has nothing to do with sharing something online. It's something else completely different

I agree, because internet is a free community, and all that is shareable should be freely shared.

I agree. sharing content owned by others doesn't hurt anyone, and should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online

It is totally not the same thing

No sharing content should not fall into the same category as extremism, hate speech or abuse - the

damage, if any, is so much less

No, Because it's not hate speech
it's freedom of speech

No, because we share what we care about, not what we necessarily own.

No, it's like trying to govern private conversations just because they're taking place in the street

no, we need to preserve consideration if we want to live in groups

No!

No! Sharing a link to something as simple as a video or a cute picture is nowhere near the same category as telling someone to go kill themselves, or anything like that. And it's insanity to think so

No. Simply as the one is a public order issue and the other a potentially commercial one. Measures to combat hate are way too draconian and were not designed for the purpose of copyright protection

Of course not. It's human nature to appropriate, share and enjoy cultural items such as images, music, food, literature etc. In fact it a genuine antidote to all kinds of unpleasant nationalistic and racist hatreds. Maybe creators deserve some form of compensation but our human world depends upon the sharing of these creative forces

other than it does not have anything to do with extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. I guess they are trying to use them as a gateway to pass such laws. I don't read online texts that push extremism, hate speech, or abuse on anyone. I also don't put my vote behind any system that tries to censor. So NO NO NO to #Q5 My message to all the GOVs out there is simple stay the FUCKING BLOODY HELL

OUT OF THE INTERNET we will never let you control it, we grow weary of the old fucked up ways of shills from the past.

Sharing content belonging to others to make money from it is a legitimate concern, which should not be confused with free speech or abuses of free speech.

Sharing content owned by others should be punished under copyright law when applicable, not under extremist or hate crime law. Let those laws apply to content deemed hateful or extremist.

Sharing is a positive action and it is at the heart of innovation and progress. Even in cases of abuse, it cannot be compared and treated similarly to negative actions like extremism and hatred.

SHOULD NOT BE GOVERNED EQUALLY

The same rules which punish extremism online should not apply to content owned by others. It is important to take action against hate speech and abusive actions, sharing content is not the same issue.

The Web is the Creative Commons, belonging to people, not corporations, or governments controlled by corporations, rather than by people

These are completely different things. Freedom of speech should be generally granted to all people

Yes - simple sharing and extremist/abusive content are usually two completely different things

Yes because sharing is not like publishing.

Yes I agree that the rules should be different. There is no comparison between sharing content and the other things listed in the question. I believe that each blogger, video poster or photo posted on

the Net should be available to be shared as long as credit is provided to the author

Yes, I agree

yes, I do

As long as the shared content is LINKED to the original poster or CREDITED, it's not illegal.

No, because sharing is an activity which spreads information.

Content owned by others should not be governed by the same rules for the other crimes because even if there's an economic loss for rightsholders, there's no damage to people or society and even the loss could be recovered if doing so in a smart way (Thinking how many people has started to buy Game of Thrones because of chapters they downloaded illegally)

I agree because these things are not comparable.

Of course NOT. It would be a step towards thought control

using content put out into the public domain, has always been shareable, by listening to the radio, television, etc. Advertising pays for this many times over!!! industry is greed and corrupt ppl only continue to pad their bank accounts. Crimes against human beings are one thing, crimes against inanimate objects another and against corporations[which are NOT people!] is yet another

Damage done by illegal copyright sharing is simply economical and often concerns huge media corporations which are quite able to defend themselves. But hate speech/online abuse/harassment etc do their damage to individuals (often young and inexperienced ones) who do not have armies of lawyers at their beck and call

and who are much more easily duped - and who therefore need more protection. These two situations are extremely different.

I agree. Science, history and art should be shared because it's a human heritage. Negative feelings like extremism, hate speech and abuse are not a human heritage but ignorance and it should be ignored/censured because it's unconstructive. As simple as that.

I believe that producing or sharing hateful speech should be treated alike regardless of platform. However, due to ease of linking I think a carefully nuanced approach to online material needs to be taken so that critique of hate speech, for example, is not held to be hate speech in itself or seen as promoting hate speech.

please keep your legislation off my life. thanks. ;

Sharing content owned/produced by others benefits that owner/producer, that is organic advertising at its core. Whereas hate speech, in all its forms no matter to whom is addressed, creates the proper environment for everything that is bad in the world to develop.

no..because sharing a song you like is nothing like sharing a hate message that could harm others. there is no correlation between the two issues

yes of course!

Yes. Governments are constituted to protect life and property of the people who put them in office not to help Corporations to reduce what is ours at birth Do this in transparency for all to see otherwise governments will be left in the dustbin of history. One thing history has taught us and that is Governments have murdered more people than wars have. We are watching you.

Again, most definitely not. Extremism, hate speech and abuse are VERY different from simply posting a video or a picture online (except if it's a whole movie for example).

Again, there is an 'innocent until proven guilty' doctrine at play

Agree it needs individual review in a contextual fashion

Agree, information should be freely available

Agree. I need to be able to share information from the net

Agreed, they should be treated differently. It straddles the edge of culture and normal communication. People communicate, and this is simply how it is done in a more modern way.

Basic human rights still exist, even on the internet. It's the context that's important, not content. However good Content keeps people coming back.

Certainly not, this is against freedom of speech & information

correct, sharing what someone else posted should be handled as a normal way users interact online. This does not fall in the same camp as anything that incites hate and discontent, threatens the livelihood of anyone, or anything extremist. Sharing content is part of what the internet is built on, it is a normal thing people do and have done since long before there was an internet. It is a human need to share.

disagree, sharing knowledge is not same as sharing explosives or pot of soup or cup of sugar... knowledge is not perishable, can become obsolete but never perish. use of someone else knowledge is actually leaning, i understand that creator of the content need to live

and earn money, i think it should be then renumerated, but not penalised.

Don't shoot the messenger. People have the right to look at the content or not

Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system.;

Extremism is an abused word, it triggers the wrong switches and gives a person full access to what he shouldn't want to know. In the EU we believe in innocent until proven, don't let us turn into a bloody police state.

Extremism, hate speech and abuse fall into one kind of debate about free speech: essentially one about the expression of opinions. The question of where the balance is drawn is contentious and varies across different countries and cultures. Copyright concerns are motivated by a completely debate: copyrights exist so that content creators can enjoy a reasonable financial recompense for their creation. The debate constitutes when selective use of copyrighted content is fair: for example parody, or a critical review, or as a teaching aid. The balance is between financial considerations and free speech. This is a completely different question. Conflating the two issues would clearly tend to shift where the balance is held to lie in favour of the copyright holder, for all the wrong reasons

Extremism, hateful speech, abuse are directed at persons and society, not corporations. Different rules should apply

Fair use should not be governed by laws written for extremism, hate speech and abuse, UNLESS they are violating one of those laws in a provable fashion.

Governments shouldn't punish any comment on the internet, not even if it's considered hate speech or abuse. What is considered hate speech in one country is perfectly accepted in another. Again, locally bounded legislation cannot (and should not) try to solve these expressions in a democracy. When using the internet you have a choice to read or not to read these opinions, and this freedom should be protected, not its content. We're not China.

I agree because the focus should be on the dangerous stuff, not the moneymaking business

I agree this is not the same, and doesn't deserve same penalties. In order to evolve together we should be able to share information and creations made by others. ;

I agree, there's a sharp line between violation on humans and money related things

I agree, they are unrelated

I agree, we should not be seen as such criminals as extremist etc.

i agree, yet i think that hate speech, extremism and abuse should not be removed without due process either, if someone abuses online or promotes hate speech, start a trial against them. just blocking the website is madness, because it threatens the basic open infrastructure of the internet.

I agree;

I agree! Simply because most likely it will not involve violence nor bodily harm

I agree. Blogs, videos & pictures are quite different from hate speech and other online abuse & should be treated differently

I agree. I think there should be

more attention for referencing the creator of the original content.

I agree. Perhaps some mechanism for protecting content should be offered to those who want it

I agree. These are different issues, intent is very important.

I am fully opposed to have free expression limited as it is proposed. Understanding some times free expression is abused, or does not have the same value in different cultures. Nevertheless, I prefer to cope with completely opposed opinions myself. Free speech in Europe is different from Iran Or China as examples.

I believe not. Just as we punish criminals differently to different degrees for different crimes, the same applies here. Of course the Movie and Music industry wants you to treat Copyright Infringement as if someone was murdered, but that's just not the case. Maybe they shouldn't be paying their artist 50 million a year, movie, or album... Maybe their CEOs shouldn't be making 50 million or more a year.

I do not agree that sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech and abuse online because they are not the same thing. Sharing information for the benefit of society is not the same as harming others.

I do not like censorship of any kind

I don't believe sharing content owned by others should be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech and online abuse. The two are distinctly different. Content that is deemed ok by current law should be freely distributable.

I don't think extremism and/or hate speech should be abridged. however abhorrent I personally find it I believe in the absolute right to free speech. Only stopping short of the right to yell fire in a crowded movie theater

I fully agree. Because hate crime harms people. Sharing media does not. All that media sharing does is make the rights holder no money, which is what they resent. To label something like that as strongly as a hate crime is downright preposterous

I heartedly agree, on the grounds that copyright remains distinctly in the civil domain - tort law - whereby economic damages are recovered, is the most appropriate for an economic loss. Extremism, hate speech and abuse online constitute criminal law for the fact the damage they do isn't explicitly or exclusively economical - indeed, all three fall under a form of emotional abuse, which cannot be weighed on any set of scales to determine cost. How much does it cost to help a woman frightened of her own shadow because the man that was stalking her sent messages of harassment and threatening death? We may never know, because the traumatising event has no basis in economics. Indeed, the man may have to be jailed for the protection of society from a potential physical threat. How much does it cost to recover a loss of 10 pirated CDs at £5 each? Well, we know it's a loss of 50. It's a calculable loss. Emotional trauma doesn't factor in, and neither does it in copyright law. Did the pirate of the CDs threaten anyone? No. Is he a physical threat who needs to be isolated from society? No. So jail is not appropriate - but a reasonable recovery of losses is. Should the pirate pay the £50? Absolutely. The two are clearly distinct: both in their causes and means, and also their outcomes. They should therefore remain distinct in law

I'm against link tax and I want no censoring links online because I'm for freedom of speech, also online and it should be available for everyone;.....

If they share it, it is shared. period

If we want to consider our society as information and knowledge society, how can we freely share information with the risk of being punished with rules that are meant for extremism?

If you use your freedom of speech by retweeting any hatemonger just to show the world what an idiot he/she is, you should NOT be the one prosecuted for that hate. A child can see that this is a bizarre situation, an certainly NOT in the best interest of european citizens!!

info and news is so quick today.... people demand to see pics ect right now, so the rules have to be diff..

it is a slippery slope to full control of all information

It is ridiculous to punish sharing content using those rules.

It should not

It should not be governed by the same rules as those that govern hate speech. Simply put, people need to be able to freely discuss any topic with references. Therefore, I should be able to link to (say) the KKK website, provide pictures, etc., and not face punishment for doing so. I might simply be criticizing it, writing a parody piece, etc

It should not be governed the same. While I don't share media in that way, people who do often don't even understand that it is wrong. Many are young. But regardless, their intent is at worst comparable to a shoplifter, but most often probably

just either done without truly thinking about it (and with no intent to harm anyone) or because they are broke and powerless with little recourse. It is not the action of a hardened criminal and it hurts no one physically nor does it deny anyone else freedom or dignity. At most it takes some of their money and at worst should be punished only for that.

It should not. The latter hurts actual people while the former, at absolute worst, can be compared to theft. It would be like making theft equivalent to assault. The only exception is the sharing of content is equivalent to abuse, such as sharing private photos to try and shame someone, but then it should already be counted as abuse and as such already fall under the existing laws. The only thing that might need adjusting is the definitions of abuse.

Mostly, except as I said before - those things that condone and encourage rape and animal mutilation, etc.

no , we need access to info dissemination and free speech

No it should not. The sharing of information is at its core better for people and helps them to learn and expand their horizons.

no Most are not harmful

No regulations. if somebody else has the power to rule is the end of freedom.

No, it should be the same rules, hate is hate Etc

No. Because equating the two is an example of a simpleton, or an oligarch who thinks they have the right to control our lives

No. Because those are two different things, one legal, one not legal. however, if there is an outcry about

content that is prejudicial to others, it is important to judge and make rules

Not at all. Intent and real harm has to be taken into account. Also the concept of proportionality

Not sure

Of course not - extremism, hate speech and abuse online is forbidden always and for everyone, no exceptions - on the other hand - licensed content is forbidden only for those, who don't have licence. ANd that is a really big difference! Licensed content is not against law in principle, extremism, abuse, etc. is

Of course they should not: sharing content owned by others is an economic offense, often with no great financial damage to the rights holder. Intrusive legislation to prevent such practices is out of proportion. Abuse and inciting hate is something entirely different.

Of course they shouldn't. The argument is always that it's for the good of everyone because it's the same laws used to counter hate, but guess what? If you want to counter hate, do it. Go after those people. Don't disingenuously abuse people's morality to enforce totalitarian nonsense on their lives. We're not naive. We know the gambit here. The gambit is to kill an internet that's proving to be way too much of a nuisance to big business interests. We've only just entered the era where the populace can wield the internet to protect their own interests, so it's no coincidence that legislatures everywhere are moving in to crack down on it. Gotta protect the donors! Gotta protect big money! I'm not afraid of muslim refugees. I'm not afraid of Jihad. I'm not afraid of what the news is telling me to be afraid of. I'm afraid of corporate America and corporate Europe establishing an economic

dictatorship. This is just one incarnation of that ambition, and it must be stopped.

Of course, yes. Extremism, hate, etc represent serious threats to people. Sharing content, even if stolen, is NOT serious. If very many do the same, it adds up to a serious effect on the company that owns the rights, but maybe that's worth considering. It's ridiculous to blame single individuals for the actions of millions. If millions "steal", maybe some definitions of the word "property" have changed. Real ownership can be had over specific objects, like a specific house, a car, an original painting. If someone sees the house, car or painting, likes it and makes a copy, the copy is not at all owned by the owner of the original. It's completely owned by the guy who made the copy. Today, making a copy can be extremely easy. The copy can be indistinguishable from the original. They're digital. Thus the idea is the item. To protect an idea as if it was a physical item is a new idea. It is similar to claiming that a word belongs to a company and anyone using the word has to pay. This industry must realize that it had a very short golden age when they could gather billions, but that age is gone and will never return. Good riddance.

Of course! The intent and quality of these two very separate types of activities needs to be reflected in the rules and laws

Of course. The crime fitting the punishment is an intergral part of any just legal system.

Only if its like stalker behaviour or bullying... Peoples lives can be ruined by online sharing of sensative materials.. I say that if u can prove ur in the picture U have the right to decide what happens...

please protest the internet for yourself, the world and everyone !

Property rights are private rights, in stark contrast to the state's regulation to public rights to safety

Q5 No, there are already laws in place to deal with extremism, hate speech and online abuse. The rest of the internet should not be censored or governed by the same rules because that stifles freedom of speech and freedom of information.

Same rules: those enacted into law.

Sharing content and links is harmless, even necessary in exchanging views and ideas. On the other hand, name calling and hate speech may ought to be removable by the victim.

Sharing content is an excellent way for people to share news and get family and friends involved in current event issues

sharing content is NOT extremism, hate speech, or abuse!

Sharing content isn't the same as threatening, hate speech or abuse online.

Sharing content should be allowed, except for profit

Sharing content should definitely not be governed by the same rules as the other items. They are completely different issues. Sharing content without permission should be subject to proof and subsequent takedown. If permission is granted by a creator of content, that should take precedence over any intermediate "copyright" holder

Sharing content should NOT be punished in the same manner as, say, extremism. Why? For the same reason we don't punish a shoplifter in the same manner as one that murders another human being. Excessive and oppressive punishments never have positive results. Historically

the effect is quite negative and, at times, detrimental for all involved

Sharing copyrighted material is actually promoting that material. Abusive messages and bigotry are generally deemed illegal and should not be allowed

Should not be governed by the same rules as they are simply not the same content

should not...censorship carried too far!

The fact that questions like this have to be asked makes me so sad. It's like people have gone completely mentally insane, all of us. why the hell would you govern two very separate things by the same laws?

The rules must be the same for sharing any content but it will take time to develop a just and well-balanced enforcement of these rules.

There are laws in place that deal with hate speech, extremism and online abuse. Content other than that should NOT be governed because that goes directly against the right to freedom of speech and the right to share/impart information.

There are obscenity and privacy laws abounding, these should be used appropriately and sparingly. Content owned by others, for example pictures, videos and blogs should be in no way lumped together with extremism, hate crimes and online abuse

There is a difference between people security and copyright infringement.
Lts not mix these together

There is no such thing as bad publicity, and we hear licensed songs on the radio all day long and see expensive cars yet that is no copyright infringement.. Logical Guys!

There should be separate systems and

rules for different kinds of content.

they should not be. they are seprate issues

This is an overly emotive question and so I'm not going to answer it. I find it annoying when organisations like yours do this as it invalidates and undermines the rational and necessary work that you do. It makes me not want to take part in your surveys. I hope you're reading all the responses before you send them.

This is just commercial risk to a product, it should not be punishable by law.
In case of illegal commercial use
the opposition van do a civil suit.

This is quite a leading question, to which any sane person will say no. However, if we want people to be able to substantiate claims, links are the tool. Imagine Wikipedia without corroborating links...

To punish is okay, but on a lower level as extremism and so on.

Unfair;

Well, I believe we should punish people sharing those kind of things, yes. But isn't that why we have laws for?

While copyright infringement is wrong, it should not be considered the same as hate speech and online abuse. They should not be governed by the same rules. Hate speech and online abuse is much worse, so the rules should reflect the infringement.

Why would you consider removing the already effective rules that punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online? The sharing of such material is wrong. Even creating a new system is fraught with peril. Lawmakers have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment. The existing

laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to thwart abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. When copyrighted material is illegally shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework

yes because its not that at all its just part of being a world wide community and if the authors don't want that it is pretty simple - don't put it on the internet, that's always been the way & it works

Yes I agree, because it's pathetic as existing laws are sufficient. Free expression and freedom of speech are universal human rights and restrictive laws such as being proposed take these rights away. ;

Yes I do.

Yes I fully agree with this.

yes Knowledge should be shared, hate messages are something you should decide whether you accept it, it depends on your criteria

yes- freedom is not the same as extremism & hate speech

Yes, absolutely.why? If you don't know the answer to that, then why are you here..?

Yes, because it's only fair!

Yes, because property crime is very different from violent crime. For example, it neglects the big difference between stealing and pirating. If you steal something, it's gone. If you pirate something, it's still there, you just made a copy for yourself. The use of

others of the thing you are pirating is not impaired in any way, so this is NOT violent crime (like hate speech, abuse, etc.) and should not be governed by the laws against violent crimes.

Yes, because sharing information is vital to building new ideas and not a crime

yes, because the internet is and has to be a free communication system.

Yes, because what is published on the internet is part of the common and whoever publishes it tacitly agrees to this

Yes, I agree. Because extremism and hate speeches are really threatening the freedom of life!!

Yes, I agree. Because hate speeches, glorify extremism etc. are awful crimes that should be stopped immediately. These are acts of terror to destroy Europe and the whole world, but telling the truth about IS and islamisation is necessity number 1 today. We have to know what is going on in the world. I just fear that we are to late because we have very very coward governments in Europe!

Yes, I agree. Sharing pictures is not extremism, hate speech or abuse. What's next, punishment for sharing a meal?

Yes, I do, because if not the freedom of speech and expression is in great danger.

Yes, I do. The reason for implementing the same rules is that the same medium (the internet) is concerned. Therefore, institutions with financial interests, and those who who have an insatiable urge for power and absolute control, will benefit from this, in ways simple users cannot imagine, and which have little or nothing to do with the alledged goals. It is another step towards the annihilation of privacy, resulting in total control. If anything destroys any trust in the

Powers That Be, it is legislation like this.

Yes, it involves a totally different set of ethics.

YES, it should NOT be governed by the same "rules." The INTERNET is OPEN for the sole purpose to protect TRUE freedom of speech and the TRUE free flow of free information and as the ONLY TRUE legitimate measure still open to continue to prevent naysayers from utilizing methods of CENSORSHIP to "protect" us from the "truth" while they use the cloak of the so-called "democracy" they profess to encourage and uphold/stand for while systematically dismantling it from within

Yes. "Sharing content" is citizen journalism and must be protected

Yes. Comparing the sharing of content to extremism is like comparing a misdemeanor to a felony. Only an idiot would think the two should be punished in the same manner

Yes. Hate speech and abuse deserve to be removed ASAP. However, I often try to kick some views to pictures, videos, and blogs via link rather than copying such directly. In all seriousness, if I have to pay for links to sites or content produced by others, I'm going to stop making links altogether and just copy/paste, denying the source some views and possibly fans/followers/customers

Yes. I agree because they are two different things

Yes. It's ridiculous to compare this to hate speech and abuse

Yes. Sharing content owned by others is to pay a tribute to these others, to the creators of the content, not a crime is it? The European Union is becoming more and more a dictatorship...

Nothing I want to live for!

Yes. There are very different things.

Yes. These two categories of illegal content are vastly different from and orthogonal to one another, and should never be put together under a uniting framework. Copyright infringement is nowhere near as impactful as hate speech or abuse, and arguably consists of more gray area. Indeed, the two require such different approach (and reproach) that joining the two would prove a grave mistake and, again, a disservice to the users.

Different framework

Different rules and solutions should apply to different problems

Eventual damage to property is not equivalent to damage to people. The former can be remedied, the latter must be prevented

Free speech should be total for anything other than extremism or hate speech;

I agree. Sharing should follow the rules of free speech. Only copyrighted content should be subject to takedown notices

I do not agree with governing sharing of content owned by others with the same rules as extremism, hate speech, and abuse. Extremism, hate speech, and abuse are significantly more serious issues, sharing of content owned by others does need rules and punishment but it should not be the same ones.

No, sharing content online should NOT be governed by the same rules that are used to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. These rules are too harsh and too extreme to apply for the sharing of content.

Too much gets put under the extremist banner these days
Pathetic, there are no links

Why is this a question? Are decisions like these what our tax money pays for? The punishment for piracy in the US is already absurd beyond the point of argument. No, content sharing under no circumstances should be governed by the same laws as hate speech, abuse and extremism online. It's not the same crime, not the same scope. One may say that it's damaging in terms of profits but the reality is if your content eg. pictures, music, videos are worth the money, and the experience your audience will pay for it. To support you, and because they want to see more content. In an emerging age of convenience and accessibility, companies must adapt to changing customer needs if they want to remain in business. It seems a lot of large brands are still in denial about that, namely the music and movie industry. If you can not provide content that people WANT to pay for, then it is you who should change. This is a basic concept in social media. Sharing. Posting, making a discussion. If we can not post a copyrighted image online then that is a violation of the human rights. Freedom of speech. Get off your high horses and reevaluate your ideas about the internet. Political action is not the way to change it

yes it's not commercial.

Copyright infringement is a grey area which doesn't generally harm other people, other than economically, perhaps in some cases. Extreme hate and abuse online is a serious human rights violation, and should be treated much more seriously

Definitely not by the same rules as it would shutdown debate, knowledge, and joy!

depends - if using to promote extremism, etc - then punish

Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system

generally, the use of content is a civil matter, not a criminal one and should be treated as such

Hate speech is a criminal matter, and should be dealt with by the courts, and not conflated with copyright issues. Conversely, the US "DMCA" experience shows it is a present risk to free expression. The mere assertion of copyright can be used to legally prohibit opinions and commercial products such as garage door openers, by an unpunished fraud upon the courts. It would be substantially worse to lump copyright problems with hate speech and extremism.

I agree that economic and business issues are completely different from hate, abuse or extremist web sites. Laws for the latter could perhaps be strengthened and applied under a new framework. The business issues are already covered under existing copyright laws and, if anything, should be moderated somewhat

I agree. Hate speech hurts people & has a lasting impact on people. Illegally shared copyrighted material only affects business income. The two issues are different and shouldn't be governed by the same system

It should NOT be an issue to share pictures, videos and blogs since they have already been put on the public internet for the rest of us to see or watch or read. Extremism, hate speech and abuse are not even in the same category as the others, not related at all, so all of these things should NOT be governed by the same rules.

No - attack the source instead,

not the messenger

No I do not agree. There are already existing laws in place that are more than adequate

No it's private, not for publication

No, these are two entirely different problems. Regulating the sharing of content needs an open and honest discussion, taking into account the reality of a large part of the population and how they think they should be able to use the internet, and share content online

No. We will have situations like on Thailand, that a user has been arrested for placing a "like" on a photo and sharing it.

Not at all. Sharing is part of the human nature and is an inherently social behaviour, while extremism, hate speech and abuse are anti-social behaviours.

Not the same rules, copyright and ownership of content cannot be compared to hate speech and abuse, and should be covered by free speech, therefore not governed by the same rules

Of course, not being able to share would hurt non-profits, the music industry and others

Of course. The later have direct victims. The first does not. It is a false equivalence. No health or life is threatened if you share content.

Sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. Because sharers of such content are causing no direct or indirect harm to other human beings. The only "harmed" party is alleged or projected profit. Profit should not receive the same legal protection

as people. It is morally wrong and unfair and it doesn't reflect social consent.

Sharing is the opposite of violence. Sharing is the Human spirit at its best, when it's not alone. Sharing is our History and the story of our survival and growth, it is the opposite of abuse, hate, extremism, violence.

The same concerns we have when writing in our own words have to apply when we share others' ideas and works. But they are not the same thing.

The sharing of content ie: pictures, videos, blogs and such is in actuality a form of word of mouth advertising. Extremism, hate speech and abuse are not even close to similar. It really is time you idiots in government grew up and paid attention to reality.

There is a massive difference between hate speech and extremism and sharing content owned by others. These two matters should be dealt with separately. Listening to a song on sound cloud should not be in the same category as online abuse. It's not rocket science

These definitely are in different leagues. Extremism etc has a very negative and limiting impact on others causing fear and more hate. Sharing content and potentially sharing copyrighted content is about sharing creative products, which at worst will have a commercial impact and at best will have positive effect. Limiting this sharing by proactive monitoring or other measures might also lessen the positive effects.

These issues do not fit under the same framework. You need a different set of rules for such different circumstances. Sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should definitely NOT be governed by the same

rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online

They should not be treated the same. Self expression is a normal part of the human experience

Two separate problems, two separate answers. Copyright infringement is economic and can be governed by existing laws. Extremism, abuse etc needs a different set of rules and regulations and punishments

Yes because there's too much room for misinterpretation!

Yes I agree. We're dealing with different issues and contents and like in whole things, balance and common sense must prevail. The goal is always punish or get people's money. I don't defend a society without rules, but one where rules apply to anyone in the same manner

Yes, because otherwise it would be censorship.

Yes, I do. Because these two issues do not fit under the same framework.;

Yes, sharing content that has been in the public forum and is innocuous should be treated in a far different way than hate speech and abuse. There is a need to make anonymity less easy for people who are depraved and disturbed as they pose a real threat to the innocent majority of people

Yes, we should not change our way of life just because there is a risk. Sharing, blogging, etc is a right of freedom of speech.;

Yes! When I'm sharing a silly video clip with cats, I shouldn't worry if the music used in it is legal. On the other hand if I was harassing someone (truly harassing them, not just disagreeing with them), then I should be punished

yes. Liberty.

Yes. The mental and emotional damage suffered by victims (who are PEOPLE) of hate speech and the like cannot fairly be compared to the largely financial damage caused to CORPORATIONS by illegal sharing of copyright material and the like. The same rules ought not to be applied to both these cases

Yes. The same rules should apply to any information, but freedom of linking shall prevail.;

absolutely. libraries should burn and librarians should be decapitated. o really ?google should absolutely burn since they share content used by all. what quarter brain puked these ideas ?

Copyright infringement could be viewed as stealing from someone, while extremism, hate speech or online abuse is harming someone. We don't have the same rules for stealing as we do for violence.

Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online. There is no need for a new system. Illegally shared copyrighted material, and extreme and abusive messages, are very different issues and don't fit under the same framework

I agree. These are benign and often unintended crimes, even sharing copyright protected material is often of positive effect for the copyright holder due to exposure and also if they can get ad profits etc. (For instance Awolnation - Sail, Nanalew version has 183 million views, official Red Bull Records version 22,5 million. All profits still go to Red Bull Records, although she tried to get compensation). Stop bowing to corporatism

and copyright trolls and implement fair and forward looking copyright laws

I agree. They are two different things

I don't believe it is the same issue

I'm not sure that I understand the question. Indeed there is a difference between these 2 kinds of penalties but I'm not sure that we have to create now another organization just for that.

no it's free speech

No they should not. The rules used to govern hateful and intentionally damaging and cruel behavior should be much more severe. That said, no one should profit from selling someone else's content unless they are paying the original content owner, and have come to an agreement with them. But sharing is nice. We are taught to share...we probably shouldn't criminalize it and still have the audacity to call ourselves a decent society

No, because it's obviously not the same thing

Yes, I agree. However, if a picture or other content is posted on FB, for example, no one should be able to take that content out of FB! Otherwise, big penalties

Yes, sharing content should not be subject to those rules unless it contains examples of extremism, hate speech and abuse. Surely this would act as a trojan horse to punish those who share content deemed as 'inappropriate' by some (who?) disproportionately.

Yes, this is common sense. Why is this even a question? It just shows how ridiculous things have become!!!

Yes! These things are not even remotely close or connected in any way.

Yes. Because one is sharing of creative works. Extremism, hate speech and online abuse will never be acceptable.

I agree. Because the art creativity of others encourage our own art creativity. Together we create better, nicer world :)

Yes, i agree.

Yes. The copyright laws need to be completely revamps to ONLY protect the original artist or company. These rights should NOT be transferred or anyone or any company.

Absolutely. I know of many who download a movie (for example) in order to see for themselves whether or not the movie is actually worth buying. If they find a movie that they love they always end up buying it. If this was not available, they would never consider seeing or buying the flick. Hollywood doesn't exactly tell the truth when rating a new movie. On the other hand, someone mass copying movies and selling them should be in prison.

I agree that sharing content should not be governed by the same rules used to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse. That would be going too far, would be too harsh, too extreme and totalitarian. There should be no Internet censorship in the name of extra profit

Regulation on the internet is fruitless and pointless. Once on the internet, always on the internet

They're totally different activities. Even more, the standard broadcast TV is an outdated content delivery system. Even if you have cable, it's just much more convenient to download the TV shows and viewing them when you have the time, than when the broadcast company wanted to broadcast it. If that has some similarity to someone putting a bomb

on a bar, i don't see any. At most, the guy could have viewed a show he didn't have the right to view, so pay a fee, or something like that. If it's for the act of sharing something, he isn't at fault if someone downloads a show that he isn't entitled to view. With that way of thinking, we should sue the car makers because of all the traffic accidents involving cars.

Yes these 2 issues do not belong in the same category of crime. The existing laws are sufficient and working well

Yes. As long as it's not extremism, abusive or hate speech, it should not be treated as such. To treat anything outside of it as such would cause people to be afraid to share anything

Absolutely not. Sharing content is a positive action, whereas all of the others are negative. I don't think laws will solve the supposed problem. I think that we need to remake the system so that all content creators can earn a good living and so that providers that don't really support creators are shunned. I think bad providers are a much bigger issue than individuals. I use free open-source software but I also make a donation to the developers of the software because I believe that their project is worth supporting.

Absolutely. Treating terrorism and file-sharing with the same standards would be madness in real life, why would the web be any different?

Alleged use of copyrighted material and allegedly abusive content should be treated differently. In both cases balancing private and public rights, and supporting a lively internet.

Because is not the same.

Copyright is not a right, but a privilege. It is a temporary monopoly to exploit

public property. Private monopolies are abhorrent and should be ruled by civil law, never the criminal code

.....
don't know

Economic effects and psychological effects should not be considered as the same things. Sharing content that we do not own, such as a picture for which we did not pay, creates economic harm. Sharing content that generates harassment or hatred or abuse produces psychological and emotional distress on individuals or group of individuals. It has to be punished more harshly and more efficiently. These two issues cannot be ruled by the same framework

.....
Everyone has a right to freedom of expression. Censorship is typical of dictators.;

.....
Free speech is not hate speech. Everyone should have the right to share whatever they want.

.....
I agree that separate rules should exist for sharing content as opposed to criminal acts of terrorism and hate crime ... this is a NO BRAINER and only the greedy corporate mentality could think otherwise

.....
I agree, because we have the right to share and collaborate online, and no one has the right to censor these rights

.....
I agree. The free of speech is indeed a delicate topic, nevertheless, sharing ideas/pictures/etc made by others, should be possible as long as it isn't hate speech or any form of abuse towards others. Also, as long as the reference to the original source is mentioned.

.....
I agree. This is a matter of the fundamental human right to freedom of expression

.....
I believe in freedom of speech, including

the freedom to engage in "hate speech" and "extremism" (whatever that means), and of course the freedom to link and share content. If people are really unhappy that their content is being used, then they should ask that it be taken down. The only speech that should be regulated by the law is: advertising content for truthfulness, legitimate and believable threats against someone, and criminal activity. The rest should be free, and that includes speech which is: unpopular, politically incorrect, "extremist", "hate", "offensive", "derogatory", and which irritates the powerful. As the expression goes: "It is not popular speech that needs to be protected, but unpopular speech."

.....
I believe sharing content should be governed by a different set of rules. Mainly that if by sharing said content, more exposure is given, and proper attribution is done, it is quite different than hate speech, abuse, etc. YouTube already does monitor for music used, although I used a song I had licensed and it got flagged. It was cleared up fast enough but errors are made

.....
I do agree. Why? Because they are not the same in any way

.....
I don't know what to answer for this question

.....
I feel anything put out on the web by an individual is public property at that point

.....
If sharing is with the intent to increase awareness or knowledge then this should not be treated in the same way as those posting woth the intent to incite hatred or encourage extremism. This could easily be weighed up by a court in the cases where punishment might be deemed suitable.

.....
It shouldn't. Obvious reasons

.....
Legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where

individuals can be free from abuse and harassment. Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. When copyrighted material is illegally shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

Most cases of content sharing bring a positive effect to the content creator, except in cases of plagiarism. Punishing sharing could have a marked negative effect on the creative aspects of the web and therefore should not be considered an option.

no because it is not the same thing at all

No it should not. These issues are different - one is economic in nature and the other one personal (emotional)

No, because culture should be shared, and everyone should be able to see what we want

No, the later represents a violent and harmful intent.

No.Because people have the right to express their feelings

Of course not! They are very different problems, one is merely economic, the other is much more severe.

Of course not. For the same reason we distinguish between violent crimes and misdemeanors!

Of course they should not be governed by the same rules. Because we must protect people and their rights in the first place,

but things like property rights just must be protected secondarily to the rights of people, like information, communication, freedom of expression, education...;

People should be allowed to share as long as there are no infringements of human rights

sharing a picture is not abuse... the people who are wanting all this are just money grabbing tyrants and control freaks - I remember the internet when it was a free communal space where we all shared with one another.... Now it's like a strip mall with no free parking

Sharing content in a community is quite distinct from hate speech and incitement to violent acts and should be treated differently

Sharing content is not the same as extremism, hate speech, and abuse. Pointing to online resources by links is not a theft of intellectual property

Sharing content that way is like "citing" what other people say. I should be able to cite other people to be able to criticize it. If a newspaper publish a photo that I think is modified, I should be able to show it to better criticize it.

The answer is directly related to the contents nature and purpose, the problem is that the parameters to qualify free speech as extremism and hate are becoming rather blurred

The damage and extent of those crimes is completely different. People will lose all respect for the law.

The fact that hackers expose corruption and the disgraceful behaviour of those in power should be lauded not criminalised. ALL whistleblowers should be given protection from those who would use their

positions to subjugate all those whose opinions they just don't happen to like. In fact, I don't want those people who consider themselves better than me sharing the same bandwidth as me. Get them off!!!!

The punishment should fit the crime! Also, the "damage" done by such sharing should be proven before any punishment is applied.

we are not making money by sharing so let us share

We should never put them in the same basket. Extremism, hate speech and abuse online is against an individual person. (usually). Whereas sharing someones elses pics, vids or blogs is not against their character, it hurts their pockets (finance) not their feelings (as such).

Yes "why or why not" stupid question

Yes I agree but there should be some limits to the sharing of original material (this is not easy technically). On the other hand we need to be VERY careful to put censorship in the Internet under the label of hate speech or things like that. Only VERY clear negative content (like instructions on how to build a bomb) should be excluded, always with a court of law participation and with full transparency (for example creating a public page where a list of excluded pages is included)

Yes, because ownership of content does not meet the strict criteria to the listed exceptions to the right to freedom of speech

Yes, I agree. The consequences of sharing content are not a form of extremism. But I also have to point out that solid "free speech" society has to accept that free speech can also be abused and that independent people have the duty to bear opinions, which they don't agree on. And

that in a society with truly free speech, the people also have the right to be wrong, and therefore also have the right to express, for example hate and extremism. We can not have free speech and regulations on it, at the same time. But we can decide in which direction it should lean

Yes, we just copy, we don't steal

Yes. Sharing and collaboration is the key for the new economy and knowledge based society

Yes. Totally different.

Your taking away their freedom of expression, sharing a song should be judged the same as extremism and hate speech

You're just sharing something... you put it out on the internet to be seen ... we shouldn't get in trouble for sharing something someone wanted to be noticed...

Absolutely not, there is a huge difference between sharing content and other crimes, just because copyright holders are powerful organizations with fat wallets cannot mean their rights are above others

Because that rule infringes freedom of speech and privacy

Content sharing should not be punished, assuming credit is given to source, and there is not theft of material for commercial gain. The Web should be dedicated, as the National Geographic used to say, to the "increase and diffusion of knowledge", and therefore not hampered or shackled in any way

Different crimes, different laws. It is even an offence to consider these things to have the same level of damage

extremism, hatred and abuse is entirely different to sharing links and content - and

therefore require different treatment

Freedom of speech should be a guiding principle for the net. Extremism must be that "extreme", I may hate Nazis and should be able to say so and share the same with my friends. In terms of hate speech, I should not be able to promote doing harm to Nazis, Jews, Blacks, Arabs, Native People, Developmentally Delayed, Feminists What is defined as abusive online should be bounded by themes of injustice, threat, maltreatment, before being considered punishable. For example there is a big difference between saying to a suicidal person "that is your right" (may be insensitive but not abusive), and saying "You should not use more oxygen, just do it!"

Honestly, I don't know where to start extremism, hate speech, and abuse online are dangerous to people. The other bit serves merely to defend outdated businessmodels

I agree because we need to be honest on what is proper social behavior

I agree that sharing content should be a right for all mankind. It's developing the society forward. It's not the same as extremism, hate speech and abuse online. Let the law deal with it.

I agree with the above statement. They are completely different

I agree, because casting the net too widely only hurts democracy while doing nothing to control illegal content

I agree. Copyright infringements should not be treated equally to criminal things like extremism

I agree. It is two quite different things.

I agree. It limits our freedom of speech on internet.

I agree. Shared content is merely a pointer/reference to the original media and the original link creator is thereby governed to follow copyright.

I agree. These are completely different crimes under very different legislations, and they should remain separated. For those interested in extremism there will always be uncensored platforms where they can be free to express anything, call it Darknets or whatever. Relations of this are futile, and will only push these people even further out in the darkness where it's even harder to set them straight. See the state of illegal drugs for reference. It's completely absurd that people sharing content should be viewed the same way. Both attempts to regulate these two very different things are for nothing, but even more so for those sharing legal content. It's a huge waste of resources which generates close to no results.

I believe that the sharing of content should not be looked at in a similar way to how extremism and hate are monitored. It could be misused and misinterpreted, which would lead to a situation where free speech would no longer exist.

I do not agree with the idea that harsh punishment is the way to go. It's easy to see that piracy of content is reduced when easily accessible legal means are provided. In my mind the focus should be on competing with piracy rather than combating it

I don't really know enough to form a good opinion on that I'm afraid!

I don't think it should be governed by the same rules as those things at all. If someone puts it on the internet and doesn't fix it to not be shared or say it can't be- then it's open. But if they do say it can't be shared-then yes,something should be

done about it. But just sharing is not the same thing as extremism,hate speech or abuse,unless, that is what's being shared

It is absolutely preposterous to think of taxing links on web platforms. First of all, web platform is a terrible terrible term, much to broad and frankly doesn't mean anything. Secondly, generating previews of content can easily be generated, and often is, on the end user's computer. You have to realise that computers don't lend themselves to legislature founded in the century before the last one. We are past that. The winning strategy now is to embrace this fantastic new technology and move forward.

It should be governed by the same rules

It should not, because its silly.

Legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment. Think Iran and China here. Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. When copyrighted material is illegally shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

No, because those two things are completely different and has no relation at all!

No, it should not. Simply reposting what someone else has said or done is not the same thing as doing it yourself. Judge each case by a case-by-case basis.

No, it would be completely out of

proportion and trivialize the genuine crimes that hurt PEOPLE rather than the potential profits of big corporations

No. Content shared in order to facilitate the commission of a crime should be governed in the same way that any other accomplice to a crime is.

No. They address 2 different issues

not unless parameters are applied VERY VERY carefully

Sad this question has to be asked...

Sharing content owned by third parties is already governed by different rules in some places (e.g. private copying of copyrighted content to people you know more then fleetingly is allowed in some places). Copyright should not be used as a tool of general censorship or as a method of maximizing profit - but as a tool to encourage creation and enrich the public. Much of what today is considered infringing neither harms nor robs the author of anything and to relentlessly enforce a strict copyright regime on everything would only serve to make the world poorer.

Sharing is not the same as stealing, no matter how much the media industry wants us to believe it, and even if it were, petty theft is nowhere near as bad as e.g. terrorism. There needs to be different set of rules for benign everyday activities performed by ordinary people and malign use of information technology by extremists, haters and perverts.

Should not

should NOT be governed by same rules. Sharing content is at the most, theft. Extremism, hate speech, & abuse can lead to bodily harm or murder

The sharing of content MIGHT, arguably,

have an economic cost to the content "owners" but the potential damage pales in comparison to that of REAL criminal activity - including the dissemination of extremist views and hate toward identified groups on-line

The two should definitely be governed by different rules. The simple reason being that sharing content in the vast majority of cases has no malicious intent. It is simply the act of one human being sharing an experience with another. In the case of hate speech, there is a clear, provable ill intent that needs to be curbed. As such, the two cannot be compared to each other

There has always been a delicate balance required between allowing free speech and curbing criminal or abusive or 'hate' behaviour. However copyright regulation and maintaining this balance between free speech and abusive behaviour should not be treated the same way - a different framework is required for the economic/business regulation of copyright than that for the regulation of political messages

There must be differentiation in the law to address both situations

When we, the technology, and the world around us evolves, we need to make sure the rules do to. Preferably by people who understand what they vote on, sadly enough this proves we need to show them how

Yes I agree because they are different activities with different consequences

Yes I agree, because they are not similar issues

Yes sharing ideas that are not intending to insight crime is a whole different category than hate speech and abuse. Blanket rules are based on the inability to think.

Yes, because sharing content is simply a copyright issue and should only be subject to the copyright laws.

Yes, I agree that sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online.

Yes, if the sharing is nonprofit

Yes! If someone sells heroine or tobacco (or smuggled tobacco), should they be governed by the same rules?

yes. hate crime can kill. showing examples of literature, art, or other non offensive media which doesn't harm others shouldn't be a crime

Yes. They are two completely different issues

...too simplistic... lacks intelligence....!

•Legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment. •Our laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. •When copyrighted material is shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. •These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

1 No2 These are adequately covered by current rules on copyright etc.

1. I agree that information of all types should be able to exchanged freely with others. 2. The sort of views that should be governed differently are

those that contains:- extremism, hate, abuse and intolerance or try to incite others to violence or mutilation. These type of actions should be treated with immediate removal of the content and the offenders possibly caught and punished in a judicial manner

1. Sharing of content on the internet should continue to be free and open. 2. Abuse and violence speech on the internet should be subject to the same laws as apply in other areas of society.

A clear distinction needs to be drawn between *promoting* hate and abuse, versus *highlighting or commenting on* such behaviour. To criticise abuse on the web, it is natural to link to the material one is criticising. This cannot, in itself or in isolation, be taken to imply endorsement. Further, the content of a link can change, so those linking to material cannot be assumed to be aware of the current content.

Absolutely

Absolutely agree that normal content-sharing should not be governed by the same rules applied to criminal acts

Absolutely agree, the Internet should allow people to communicate and share things across the world.

Absolutely agree. In a free and democratic society, stopping the reasonable and fair sharing of content will stifle debate and the open exchange of ideas.

Absolutely disproportionate

Absolutely no. This will lead to punishing innocent owners in any way the rulers wish and restricting and oppressing the freedom of expression.

Absolutely not

Absolutely NOT!

Absolutely not. All you're doing is sharing something free someone else has made. Even if what you are sharing IS extremist, hateful or abusive, you aren't the one who made it. The only time I think something should be done with sharing content is in the case of reposting an artist's art without their permission, because you're gaining attention using someone else's hard work. And you did nothing for it. But I don't think such a thing should be bothered with unless the artist specifically asks to have something done, like have it taken down and give the poster a slap on the wrist

Absolutely not. It's just sharing of knowledge and/or promotion of other material.

Absolutely not. The use of such regulation is completely disproportionate and allows authorities, governments etc far too much power. This only leads to repression of truth.

Absolutely not. These are not the same activities and are not even remotely related.

Absolutely not. These crimes, when actual crimes have even been committed, are orders of magnitude apart.

Absolutely yes

Absolutely. It is absurd to criminalise people simply for fostering interest and curiosity in others and helping to spread information which improves people's awareness and understanding and surely improves the quality of our experiences and knowledge.

Absolutely. The reason is obvious to anyone with a modicum of intelligence and/or common sense

Absolutely. Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. When copyrighted material is illegally shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

Again, sharing content should certainly not come under laws designed to punish or prevent abuse. The two are very different things. Hate speech and abuse do far more harm than any copyright infringement ever can.

Again, two questions. You forgot the question mark at the end of the first sentence. I don't understand the full ramifications here. Your point sounds good, but is it really that easy to segregate the issues into black and white. I'm just asking. I don't know the answer.

Agree it should not as there is risk for misuse of interpretation of the rules. With that said it is difficult to answer this without reading the rules in question.

Agree it should not be governed by those rules. Most of it is harmless, people enjoying communicating, and no-one is making a profit or taking earnings from creators. In fact such activity probably publishes them further afield. Attribution should be respected, though

Agree, these are two different levels of content. Hate content, animal and human abuse, pornography must be punished. Sharing content may consist of differing levels-- with permission, with citations, with reference, or with none. One size all doesn't fit

agree, they 2 completely different things

Agree. Different issues altogether. The latter is obvious criminal activity. Most people are not criminals

Agree. Freedom of speech within the law should not be censored

Agree. Sharing content owned by others should be covered by existing copyright, and breach of laws. Laws to punish extremism, hate speech etc are also much to heavy and liable to censorship. Free Speech!

Agree. Sharing is not creating, information should be freely accessible to all. Censorship should only be allowed AFTER a crime has been proven in court

agreed, although any of that material becomes public the rules used for extremism hate speech etc may apply (still a dangerous precedent)

agreed. protection of free speech.

Agreed. Simple sharing of content, particularly that freely available, or available under Creative Commons licence should have no penalty at law. Other material should only be shared with the permission of the copyright owner, but doing so without permission should only result in a civil complaint not a criminal charge.

Agreed. The web should remain free. Publishing content should automatically make it for public use.

Agreed. They are very different, thus it's appropriate to treat differently. Again, if "unfairness" is being done then those cases should be decided by a well constituted arbitration process.

Another tricky one... Sharing a link is very

different from copying. If I share a link to a blog, people can click that link and go to the actual blog, and all credits for the blog will go to the blogger. If I create my own blog and just copy the posts from some other blog, that's clearly a bad thing. However, sharing a link directly to a photo will create traffic to a webserver without the owner really having a way to get money for it. But again, if the photo is signed, it will raise awareness that the creator exists, which in turn makes it more likely that the creator can make money on their work in the future. Sharing a picture and actively encouraging people to harass or kill other people are two very different beasts, and should be treated as such. It should not be punished even remotely similarly

Any content displayed on the web should show source and the level of freedom to re-circulate that content

Any problems of shared content owned by others are dealt with by civil law. Extremism, hate and abuse are dealt with by criminal law. There is no need to change this system for the Internet.

As long as a user's content doesn't infringe the rules on extremism, hate speech and abuse, then users should have the right to post that online. It is like taking away someone's right to free speech. It is like making the internet into a dictatorship. People need the right to speak freely what they think as long as it doesn't infringe the rules which I mentioned above. Human psychology demands that we can speak freely. Have a look at what happened in countries where people couldn't speak freely, the people rebelled and overturned the rulers. Don't end up hating like that if you want to keep your customers.

As long as credit is given everything should be allowed to be shared online like free speech. I am not even sure

that existing rules to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online are fair, adequate or contravene free speech.

As long as the content does not contain abuse, hate speech or other negative content then it should be shared freely.

as long as the content shared acknowledges the source and it isn't claimed as a person's own then comparing that to extremism, hate speech and abuse is outrageous.

As society becomes educated in the use of free speech users of the WWW will become aware of how to or how not to conduct themselves. Many profit making companies are exploiting the Net and the public through skewed advertising and exploiting individuals especially on charitable matters where fortunes are made and most of the money collected is unaccountable. Surely it must be better to allow the WWW to develop and evolve in a natural way

Awful question but if you share hate speech etc it is the same as using it. isn't it?

Basically if you put a picture or an opinionated blog online to share, it will be used and shared, maybe not how you imagined it might be. But people must be responsible for the stuff they write or say and be held to account for it. If it breaches the rules of violent antisocial extremism, racism, hate speech, personal abuse and insulting on a public forum.. then those people should be punished and held to account

because hate speech causes harm to real people. Organisations don't count as real people. They are unimportant!

Because it is an abuse of the right to freedom of speech / thought

Because it isn't extremism,

hate speech, or abuse;

Because sharing content, even where owned is not an offense of the same type or magnitude as extremism or hate crime.

Because sharing just brings something to a greater audience. Where extremism, hate speech, and abuse online are actual harmful actions

Because that would mean that you can't link to products you're reviewing can't post pictures etc without permission and they (manufacturers) won't give support if it's not favorable

Both property and freedom of expression are being challenged in today societies, they are however separate debates. Offending property rights is laughable. Taking offense from trawling a public space is also laughable. Its a common ground, used by humans, charging rent and shutting down debate is inhumane

Breach of copyright is a civil offence, whereas the others are criminal matters - at least in England. There is no case for using criminal sanctions in civil cases of course, if someone's "blog" is spreading racial hatred, then that needs to be addressed - but that is because of the racial hatred, the medium of promulgating it being irrelevant for the purposes of taking action. Most "shares" in my experience are mere links to the original source anyway, rather than wholesale "copy and paste" jobs - and I see nothing wrong in that.

Can't answer yes or no to this - it depends on the nature of the sharing - hence sharing beheadings I would wish to see removed speedily and investigated

Clean and harmless contents should not be governed by rules.

Clearly sharing content should NOT be

governed by the same rules we use to punish extremism, hate speech and abuse. That would be like equating shoplifting and deliberate psychological torture. These are 2 completely different issues.

Common sense and human rights values should rule the obvious.

Complicated question. If you're sharing it, in some way you're promoting it so there is responsibility. Again, it would have to be done on a case by case - in a court of law. Many times people share things without really knowing what they are or even viewing them thoroughly or even at all

Connecting this question to extremism & hate speech is very irritating to me & I consider this comparison as influential, even manipulating: Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. When copyrighted material is illegally shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework

Content control beyond limits is, by itself, extreme. We should maintain balance. Not abuse the free content uploading, not abuse the content downloading. Is this much to ask?

Content sharing has been covered by an evolved set of rules, carefully balancing the rights of content owners with the ability of people to share information. Any abuses can be adequately dealt with by further adaptation of these existing rules, rather than imposing a costly, draconian new set of laws. Abusive online behaviour is a completely separate issue

to copyright infringement. Laws to tackle one, should be individually crafted, so that they do not over-reach their boundaries and unfairly impinge on other areas

Content sharing is a divisive issue because many content creators actually make their living from the content they create and 'free' sharing can seriously impact on their income. At the very least, content should always be ascribed to the originator and not displayed as though it were the creation of the copier. But, clearly, the sharing of most content should not be subject the stringent laws that apply to extremism and hate speech. Most content sharing is, or should be, subject to civil law, whereas extremism, hate speech and abuse should be subject to criminal law.

Content sharing is not terrorismAttempts to censor or control the Internet by clueless politicians acting for spies or monopolists are doomed.

Content sharing should be governed by rules already in place re Extremism, Hate Speech & Abuse. Why do otherwise?

Content sharing should hardly even be a 'crime', and to the extent that it is, the rules and penalties for it should not be the same as those for more overtly criminal acts like fraud or abuse / harassment

Content should be not be governed by same rules as hate speech,etc. It is very important people get to see and read about things the mainstream media refuses to cover.

content should not be governed by the same rules to punish because the usage of said content is not malevolent

Copyright allows for fair use of quotations, extracts, and other use which does not detract from the copyright holders rights

Copyright and free speech are two different and orthogonal issues. They should be governed differently.

Copyright infringement and extremist hate speech are different issues. we already have laws about inciting hatred and violence which should apply here as anywhere.

Copyright infringement is relatively petty compared to hate speech. The two are not the same kind of 'crime': copyright infringement is a civil matter, and should remain so hate speech is criminal. and should be treated as criminal.

Copyright owners do have rights even more than comment makers just expressing their own opinions

Copyright should not even be in the same paragraph as hate and terrorism. We need appropriate due process put together by all of us, not just the CEO's.

Copyright violation is in a different category from extremism, hate speech and abuse online. The same rules should therefore NOT apply

Copyrighted content is a civil matter based on actual or potential financial losses and rights to usage/ownership of a creative work. Extremism, hate speech and abuse are criminal matters, due to their actual or potential physical or emotional harm. Anybody who is considering conflating these entirely different matters is lacking a basic understanding of the principles of our legal system, and needs to consult legal experts before proceeding. Again, sharing another's content is usually beneficial for the owner as it is free publicity! People SEEK shares and links. This rule would be entirely unenforceable and this should be apparent to anybody who considers for a moment the way that the internet works.

Corporate profits should not be conflated with matters of public safety or national security. News publishers already profit from heinous acts of criminality, just look at the front page of any tabloid rag published this weekend. NewsCorp maybe missing out on a few extra pennies from online linking, should not be punished in the same way that a spree-murderer shooting up a concert venue is. The two are clearly poles apart.

Corporations should not be allowed to use the hysterical linking of copyright "violations" with far more extreme activities in order to censor, tax, and control the entire content of the internet for their own profit. The internet should continue to be a resource for all users, not just a censored revenue source for the greed obsessed corporations. Supposed financial losses are not on a par with the very real damage caused by actual abuse of individuals and society generally.

Definitely need their own set of rules, the shades of grey are too varied

Definitely not. Why is a picture counted as extremism? This is utter madness

Depends on the intention of the sharer.

Depends on who owns it - generally should not

Depends what's being shared : i'd draw the line at any abuse pics of children or adults;

different harm

don't know

e already have enough laws in place. We do not need more and we do not need to pay for links. We just need to make the laws work but not by impedeng the free flow of information.

Each site should provide a mechanism that ... - allow the uploader to specify the sharing policy per posted text and/or file - make that sharing policy clear for any user reading (or viewing, listening to) that posted text and/or file Furthermore a cloud service operator must not claim ownership for everything the user shares. Currently anyone can violate copyright laws by uploading a simple selfie to multiple social media platforms

Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system.

Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. When copyrighted material is illegally shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework

Existing laws should be applies. Don't try and create a whole new system. If you want to change anything ban hate talk, emotional and mental abuse spread over the internet. That is what needs to be stopped

Extremism and hate speech and abuse and pornography should all be restricted in some way. Everything else it is fine to share. If I owned pics, or content which are available and they are shared that is ok. If I don't want to share them I would safeguard them in some way, or not make them available online.

Extremism and hate speech are totally

different from sharing information, and should be treated differently

Extremism, hate speech and abuse are all terms coined by someone else somewhere else that may or may not apply to me depending upon the context. I'm against censorship of ANY KIND. Period. I don't believe that information, which is a universal and unalienable right as far as I am concerned, can be owned by any one person or corporation, or entity. Once it's left your mouth, pen, brain, it is fair game to the processes of evolution. Punishing anybody for something that they have shared, said, or thought is a crime of the highest order.

Extremism, hate speech and abuse are completely separate from content. The two subjects are not linked in any way and should be the subject of completely different laws, processes and frameworks. Existing laws already address extremism, hate speech, abuse, libel, revenge porn, etc. These do not seem to require revision -- if they do that should be addressed separately, not under this framework.

Extremism, hate speech and abuse online are more serious infringements than sharing content owned by others. So, punishment can't be the same

Extremism, hate speech and abuse online are not the same thing as sharing content and should not be governed by the same rules.

Extremism, hate speech and abuse online is still as damaging as it is offline. I do not see why this should be tolerated online if it is not tolerated offline.

Extremism, hate speech and abuse online, is morally wrong. It lead to lives being destroyed and war. We can all treat each other better and perhaps, in the near future

really and truly become civilized society;

Extremism, hate speech and other abuse online is no way the same as sharing per se. The only way this activity (sharing pics, blogs, etc) should only be regulated when the laws governing hate speech, etremism, etc have been breached.

Extremism, hate speech, abuse and Paedophilia should always be prevented. This should be based on a minimum lists of expectations that each provider (Facebook, Twitter etc) should adhere to. Additionally there should be the capability for end users to say that something fall into the aforesaid categories and be subject to action by the provider However there should be a chance for the person who makes the offending 'comment/posting etc' to justify why it does not fall into these catagories (such as parody etc)The EU should state as a minimum what is expected, but then leave the full implementation of these rules to the providers

Fair use rules should apply. Where someone has placed material in the public domain users should be free to reuse and redistribute it within reason.

Firstly we nee freedom of access to spread truth in support of democracy and the rule of the citizenry where others seek to lie. Many organisations work for authority or global corporations clandestinely and must be exposed along with their falsehoods

Freedom of expression is vital in true democracies and should not be compromised by the legitimate need to restrict violent extremism, hate speech and abuse. We are in danger of giving big corporations control over the flow of information to the detriment of freedom of expression and of new entries to the market. We must always be wary of vested interests and their well funded lobbyists.

Freedom of speech is a human right, whilst some share hateful views, others share the same items to humiliate them. Context is always required, so the prevention of sharing by default is not the correct response. It will cause other problems. This law is so poorly thought through, and is unpolicable, will radicalise some and create more anonymous internet usage.

Freespeech This is only being devised so activists do not share the truth about war criminals and their acts like Apartheid Israel & Saudi Arabia & Nigeria etc etc David Cameron is a war criminal and aids and abets war criminals!

Friendly sharing is different and much less problematic than hate speech

Hate speech should be treated the same however it is produced

Hate speech wounds people and can be used to foment discrimination or violence . It has caused lots of pain . It needs to be censored . I'm sick of the media allowing idiots to just spew nonsense . Peacefully sharing videos and memes or blogs is an different thing

Hate speech, extremism and abuse are extremely serious issues that can lead to radicalisation, suicide, exacerbating mental health issues and so forth. They can put lives at risk. They are therefore far more urgent to tackle as a result than copyright, where an individual or organisation's right has been breached but no risk to their life is at stake.

Have to tread the fine line between censorship and excluding damagingly hateful and intolerant views - online communities should have ability to respond, censure or even block the worst

Human Rights apply to ALL spheres of life - internet being just one of them.

Hyperlinks comprise the very fabric of the 'Web'. Please understand, the Internet is just a collection of servers connected by IP address. Without the Web of interconnecting hyperlinks, everyone's ability to find the information they seek will be hugely compromised. Old business models have been shown time and again to simply not work online. Those still clinging to old, unfair business practices are not motivated by the interests of the common good. For all the ills in this world today, education is perhaps the most broad-reaching, effective way to address them. By decimating 'the Web', we decimate people's ability to inform themselves. How on earth can a few 'old business' dinosaurs investment portfolios be more important than that?

I Agree - Free speech that is NOT Hate Speech or abuse should be permitted

I agree and there should be no rules or infringement on our free speech

I agree but also think that owners of content should have rights over it. The same rules should apply as for printed content

I agree it should not. Culture is popular and should be shared as such, regardless of whether Disney own the image rights to Mickey Mouse. These companies seem to thrive on their products being part of the mainstream culture and yet try very hard to stifle and oppress any expression or innovation regarding their products

I agree it shouldn't be governed under the same rules

I agree that a separate and entirely independent system needs to be applied as a single, catch-all set of legislation is far too easily abused for political purposes.

I agree that information sharing ought

never be considered à felony, as it is connected to freedom of expression, à fundamental right. Nothing connected with infosharing should ever be at Risk of being called criminal unless it puts someone' life and safety at Risk.

I agree that it should be separate rules for different content. It's simple enough to see what is harmful and what isn't, this is just a case of MPs not understanding the way the internet works and trying to fix it all with a blanket approach.

I agree that it should not be governed by the same rules

I agree that it's shouldn't be governed in the same way.

I agree that sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online because they are NOT the SAME

I agree that sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. I do not believe these are comparable crimes, so it does not make sense to govern them with the same piece of legislation

I agree that sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. The freedom to share the thoughts of others is fundamental to free speech.

I agree that sharing should NOT be treated the same as punishment for extremism, hate speech and abuse online! How is sharing cat videos anywhere near the same as extremism or terrorism or hate

speech? Absurd idea! Punishment should only be pursued if a CRIME has been committed, sharing is not a crime ffs!

I agree that the rules monitoring and punishing extremism should not apply to the daily use of content sharing.

I agree that these two issues are completely different and I believe the existing laws are adequate for handling either issue

I agree that they should not be governed by the same rules as their violations(if there are any) are not on the same level as hate speech and abuse. They are the sharing of information as opposed to the targeting of malicious slander and the support of violence to others

I agree that they should not be governed by the same rules. For the very same reasons that I wouldn't want to be treated like a terrorist, because I'm not one.

I agree we should not have the same rules

I agree with that statement

I agree with the sentence.

I agree with this statement

I agree, because online debate & discussion of images video's & blogs are the life blood of democracy.

I agree, because there is no comparison

I agree, except content which has been shared privately by the owner should not be shared without their consent by anyone else

I agree, of course. Hate speech and other such activities are actively harmful to societies and targeted groups and individuals. Sharing normal content harms no one, and may well be in the interest of the general public

I agree, that they are two completely different matters and should not be governed by the same rules.

I agree! One size does not fit all. Intent is important

I agree. And the reason is that it's not the same thing. Links can be anything at all good, bad, or neither of the two. They can be bad and informative, or neutral and yet still possible to be used in unforeseen ways. And restricting their use in this way will have a chilling impact on a) information, b) free speech, and hence c) democracy. Also, the internet will find a way around it.

I agree. If there is no financial profit then no one is harmed.

I agree. One is primarily a civil issue-the other is a serious criminal matter. Enforcing criminal penalties in intellectual property claims needs to be reigned in

I agree. Personal sharing from peer to peer is not only here to stay, but helps strengthen the "global village". Hearing about someone on the other side of the world having the same or similar problems you do, makes that person more real. Most Western countries have adequate laws against hate speech and are starting to create laws against online bullying. These laws need to be edited to keep up with the times, but are not the same as private peer to peer communication. Bullying is not peer to peer, but rather one person or entity attacking another

I agree. Sharing content is at worst a financial threat. Extremism, abuse etc. is a threat to society.

I agree. Such rules have their place, and I am all for protecting people against abuse and stopping racist and other hate material. but those laws should not be usurped to apply to and try to control

sharing and fair use on the web. We already have copyright laws that fit that purpose.

I agree. The economic and commercial damage caused by illegal sharing of copyrighted material cannot be compared with the massive long-term psychological and social impact of extremist and hate-filled messages.

I agree. The harm done by sharing copyrighted material is to businesses, whereas abusive and harassing messages and content are harmful to individuals and groups of people. You present two separate issues, which should not be dealt with under the same legislative framework.

I AGREE. The rules of copyright applicable to books and music, for example, should not be allowed to apply to internet content. These rules were designed to provide a reasonable income for authors given that each copy of the relevant media would normally be used by several or many people quite legitimately. The attempts to apply the same copyright rules, such that a royalty is payable each time one person looks at an item is quite unjustifiable

I agree. The rules used to prevent and punish extremism, hate speech and online abuse are not relevant to other uses of the internet. These are rule put in place to protect people and make the internet a safer place. If legislators are concerned about people sharing other peoples content being dangerous or harmful they should make separate laws to govern this.

I agree. While linking may or may not have an economic impact, the other items directly hurt people and are more extreme.

I agree. Wholeheartedly

I agree. Owners right do need to be protected, but this is not even in the same category as terrorism etc, let

alone the same level of seriousness.

I believe new proposed legislation is using a “sledgehammer to cracking a walnut” approach. Not all hyperlinks lead to copyrighted material, so to behave as though it does is not the right approach. I have no problem with protection of artists, just that this new proposal would hamstring the Internet as a whole and damage education, freedom of speech and a myriad other things, some of which have yet to be. Do not stifle humankinds growth, please rethink this and take a less draconian step to protect copyrighted material.;

I believe that “sharing is caring”. Human civilization works by sharing and copying. Any attempts to hinder sharing or copying just make things worse.

I believe that free communication, and the development of language and culture, are dependent on an ability to quote, reference and share the work of others. However moral questions require a more nuanced consideration than blanket bans

I believe that sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online, as they are very different things and are much less offensive to those that do take offence.

I believe that sharing content owned by others should NOT be governed by the same rules used to punish extremism etc. This is because they are not the same things. Copyrighted material that is shared has an economic effect if any effect at all. Abusive and extreme messages have long lasting effects on individuals and society too.;

I believe that such content should NOT be governed by the same rules as with

extremism, hate speech and abuse

I believe there should not be ‘blanket’ rules regarding these issues

I can't agree with that but I equally cannot see how you could differentiate between the two situations without snooping or monitoring. Back to who does the monitoring ?

I definitely agree that sharing content owned by others should NOT be governed by the same rules. Extremism, hate speech and abuse online hurt people. Rules about content owned by others is just about the greed of corporations

I do agree that different categories of “illegal” content require different approaches. There is no comparison between copyright and racism

I do agree that sharing content owned by others should not be governed by the same rules we use to punish extremism, hate speech and abuse, as though sharing other people's material without permission may be immoral, it is not as harmful or immoral as extremism, hate speech and abuse.

I do agree, but think ownership should be acknowledged

I do agree. Negative content require legal regulations, positive or neutral not

I do agree. The two things are different and should be treated on their own merits.

I do agree. There's no need for a government to control this.

I do not agree that the same rules which govern abusive, hateful or pornographic content should be applied to the free sharing of information in the form of pictures, videos or blogs. Because information should remain free

I do not agree. I am a strong believer in freedom of speech, to the point that I believe even hate speech and extremism online should not be legally removed, though I equally believe in the freedom to tell these people that they are bigots and examples of the worst of humanity. I am of the opinion that the only censorship of opinions should be done by the owners of the platforms by their own terms of service. As to how sharing content owned by others should be treated, I am of the same opinion. The judgement should lay on the moderators of these platforms.

I do not agree. Sharing music and pictures is not the same as plotting terrorism.

I do not believe that adoption of the Chinese Model of internet censorship is consistent or appropriate with Western values

I do not believe this as it opens up options for people to abuse peoples privacy or well being without fear of repercussions

I do. These rules are already overbroad and do NOT need to be extended. Let the idiots be idiots, let people call them out for being idiots, and if they look like dangerous idiots then they'll be nice and easy for the police to find.

I don't agree with that argument altogether but instead say that having laws at all for this will not work and are a waste of time and money, as well as a waste of money for those who have little, unlike those who make the laws

I don't agree with the concept of "safe spaces", they are a hip term for censorship and punishing people for their speech. Everyone has the right to be safe. No-one has the right to only hear views and opinions they are comfortable hearing. There's no such thing as the right to be

comfortable. I am genuinely worried about any limitations to free speech because it incentivises taking offence. Giving legal recourse to being offended will lead to more and more people being ever more offended because being offended gives them legal powers. We want less people offended not more. Have you ever in a moment of weakness wished harm on someone who was being an asshole to you on the internet? I'm sure most of us have. Imagine you had a system which allowed you to do so, might you have held on to that feeling of offence instead of letting it go and forgetting the whole incident? In this way punishing offence creates more of it. When someone upsets us the right response is to calm down, ignore them and block them from your online platform. In our culture of perpetual offence claims of harassment are used to shut down disagreement and criticism. I've seen this happen many times online. We must ensure this behaviour is not codified to law. The reason it's not right to censor people for their speech except if it directly incites crime is not because it wouldn't be justifiable in some circumstances to shut down abusers. It's because the power to censor is not a power we should feel comfortable granting to anyone in power. Name one person from government whom you would trust to uphold free speech while only banning trolls, genuine abusers and stalkers

I don't believe sharing content owned by others should be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech and abuse online, since these are very different. Sharing interesting or entertaining content should be encouraged, not punished.

I don't feel qualified to comment on sharing content owned by others as I rarely if ever do this.

I don't know

I don't see why the two should be conflated

I don't think these two issues should be governed by the same framework
- hate speech and online abuse are infinitely more damaging than sharing copyrighted material.

I don't understand it enough to make judgement

I have zero tolerance for hate and bullying on the internet, and I support the punishment of perpetrators to the fullest extent of the law. But copyright infringement? That falls somewhere between laziness and bad taste. If someone is foolish enough to provide obvious evidence of their identity when sharing content illegally, I have no problem with them being prosecuted. They *should* be. However I do *not* agree that a huge amount of resources should be allocated toward this exercise, because it's a losing game

i say we keep the spy's out of our private videos and pictures where will the spying lead to teens being locked up for sending private sexy pics and videos to each other will that be classed as illegal porn grandad's locked up with pics and videos of his grandkids on his pc because they think he has kiddie porn and also where is our freedom of speech if we don't like the murdering tories will we get locked up cause we hate the party in power and if they do bring in this law will it only be the public that's watched or everyone including the bankers MPs and the spy's to ;

I think if we're looking at the content as being shared and not being abused in the sense that people are claiming the content as their own, then no, it doesn't need to be governed in that sense. But

it isn't a bad idea to remind people that plagiarism does get people in trouble. We just have to be fair with all of this. The internet is not a tool in which to add more rules and govern. Do we want a society that is blind or do we want a society that today is rich and full of life?

I think it shouldn't be governed by the same rules as extremism, hate speech, etc. because as long as the content is being shared properly (such as there is no monetary gain from content that is not owned by the person sharing it), there is no harm done to anyone. Whereas with things such as hate speech and abuse, people are actually harmed by these actions and thus they shouldn't be held to the same rules

I think sharing content requires its own rules. Sharing content is what makes you look for a content creator. I would not have heard of many artists I like without the freely shared information

I think the current system works and that existing laws have the balance about right. Abusive messages can cause lasting harm and distress - whereas harm caused by infringement of copyright is a business matter. How can these be treated the same? They cannot.

I think the rules should be different.

I think there should be a degree of regulation over sharing content created by others, more specifically in regards to those who are using it for personal gain. It is unfair to allow others to profit while the creator gets nothing, and strong recompense should be accessible. However, for those who are sharing within a private space and with permission, there should not be the same level of regulation.

I think they should be as they produce the same result. The problem is where

do you draw the line ? It could be used to hold back certain views the government does not like for example.

I think we should all be responsible for what we share and sharing hate content, unless to draw attention to the ludicrous nature of it, should be something we take responsibility for. Sharing racist opinions spreads stupidity and people should be made accountable for what they spread.

I totally agree. As long as the sharing links back to the original content, so the content creator gets due credit for their work, then it can only help promote their work. Abuse extremism and hate speech is a totally different issue.

I totally agree. Completely different things and must be treated accordingly. I'm not putting some to jail for stealing a bread like someone who murdered or raped

I TOTALLY DISAGREE with that total-society criminalization. Amateurish things are social-communication tools.

I wholeheartedly agree that sharing content owned by others is fundamentally different from extremism/hate speech/ abuse and should be treated differently. I can understand a desire to discourage certain incidences of people from sharing the content of others however that should be dealt with a manner that corresponds to the situation, this would be significantly over the top, after all the affect tends to be limited to a reduction in potential economic profits.

I would hope that existing rules on (for example) slander would be enough to work with, without needing to come up with a sledge-hammer approach as is being discussed here

I write to add to my previous submission on 16 Nov 2015 the following regarding this

question: In my view our legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment. Given that existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind; these laws need to be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. Finally, when copyrighted material is illegally shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, when it comes to extreme and abusive messages, these can have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework and must be kept separate.;

I'm a big user of the internet, buying equipment, talking to people, finding out things, searching for information. My life would be so much poorer without the facility of the web, as it is, to do all of these things.;

IDK

If content owned by others is to be shared the extremist, hate speech and abuse should be removed first ie it should be governed by the same rules.

If I couldn't share videos, pictures etc I would not be able to know my GREAT-Grand children. My only link is through the internet. By all means watch suspected hate and abuse but we do have brains and choices. DO NOT THINK TO INTERFERE WHERE GOVERNANCE IS NOT WANTED OR NEEDED!! The people will be heard on this!!!

If I were to share a picture of a cat how would that be anything but harmless if the owner of the pittoresk was happy to share???

if its owned by others and your sharing

outside the already existing rules of fair usage then you have the right to share, comment on it. if your sharing it for gain then the law already has rules in place that make it illegal. they should be enough...all i see is a few big media companies buying laws to close off the internet. they dont get that they own it, but it doesnt stop them from trying to buy it. all in the name of profits.

If someone is spreading hate speech and extremism it should be punishable and proven in a court of law. Don't punish the rest of us for the actions of a few mindless idiots. The internet is a wonderful place for information, keep it that way.

If the content in question has no restrictions to it (ie- paywall, privacy content) then it should not be governed. The act (not sale) of stripping such protections should be punished, not merely finding and linking or sharing such 'open' content

If the content includes extremism, hate speech and abuse etc which the majority believe is disgusting and abhorrent, then those laws should be applied. If it does not fall into those categories, then no, the sharing of content owned by others is ok. So long as the originators of the source are given the most appropriate promotion etc then it is respectful in my opinion. Many times such sharing leads to sales for the originator, esp with regards to music and films. You often discover something you might never have, and then you buy their material and/or see them in concert etc;

If the content is in the public domain, unless specifically stated, there should be the expectation that it will be shared

If we're protecting peoples 1st amendment online, regardless of the message you should have the ability to communicate it in an open and censorship free environment

Illegally sharing commercial content damages the profits of companies, it should be a matter of contract law, not criminal prosecution

Illegally sharing information (whistle blowing, sharing documentaries, citing news shows, sharing old movies that rights-holders do not care about because new movies would be more profitable) is also a democratic act - taking power from huge corporations and giving it to the public. Even if it is illegal now, this can prevent censorship once the copyright is removed. I is different from harming people directly. Corporations are not people, not in the EU. I fear systems that this creates more issues with take-downs of legally posted content

In a society where money is distributed unfairly and unevenly, we should PROMOTE ways to help balance out this inequality

In criminal law harming people is an offense that is sanctioned very differently from harming goods. We should also make this distinction in the web.

in that case i do not agree. abuse and hate speech are criminal offences. this is a direct contradiction of what i was writing before. I do not know if the technology as we know it can do both: liberty of the net and pursue criminal activities.

In the same way that the mind distinguishes, so the internet should: Time Berners Lee said he envisaged the internet to function as freely as the human mind.

Information is not hate and neither is it dangerous. The power to share information is a human right and should be monitored by the owners of the website and not the government, because it's not a governmental issue. It is just a sham and a pitiful excuse to ban us from sharing useful and expansive information

Innocuous content ie pictures, videos and blogs should not be governed by rules designed for criminal activity online

Intellectual property and safety are entirely different areas. It would be entirely inappropriate and impossible to make one law to govern both.

Intellectual property rights should be protected. However, treating an infraction as the same as hate speech or abuse is wrong, and it is an abuse of power

Internet is there to share to all. With restrictions the Internet will die

Internet use promoting hate, abuse, or violent extremist propaganda should be governed separately from all other types of internet use.

Issues of open expression and abusive behaviour are wholly separate from economic and business concerns over copyrighted material. It would be wrong to conflate these issues under the same framework.

It absolutely should NOT. I grew up taping favorite songs from the radio to listen to. No One can honestly liken that to 'extremism, hate speech or abuse.'

It depends on the content and the actual action performed(i.e. publishing a top secret military data is obviously different from posting a screenshot of a movie in a movie review blog). But as a rule of thumb, a day to day content sharing that is causing no harm to the content owner and clearly references the said owner as such should not be a prosecutable an offence by itself

It depends on the content, if the content is going to harm someone undeservedly, then yes, otherwise no.

It depends. Really neutral on the issue,

but there's need to have some balance between removing any abuse, hate preaching and any forms of extremism and respecting people's freedom of speech.

It is absurd to compare the sharing of content with hate speech, etc. These are completely different things. Existing laws are already quite adequate to cover both situations.

It is absurd to place potential copyright infringement on the same level as extremism, hate speech, and abuse online

It is for the EU parliament and national governments to make the internet safer and free from abuse and unsavoury content.

It is not on a par but copyrights should be protected as long as material carries such a warning in a clear and fair manner. If no such warning exists one should not be punished later

it is not the same thing and extremists and hate speeches and abusive speech should be governed by other means

It is unjust to bring in rules to govern hateful behaviour and then extend those rules to apply to sharing content.

It makes no sense to use the same rules to govern sharing content without permission and hate speech etc. The former may have a financial effect, whereas the latter can have much more serious psychological effects.

It must be allowable to share any content that is in the public domain. Powers to control extremist, hat or abuse on-line must be used in exceptional circumstances only and under judicial control

It probably should be though may need caution and discretion as to intent and motive so definitely

needs court examination

It seems absurd that there is consideration of putting what are essentially intellectual property questions unto the same space as assault issues. Extreme and abusive messages are electronic assault and should be dealt with by police and the legal system in much the same ways as serious verbal or physical assault is managed. Questions around the use of copyrighted material rightly belong with specialist lawyers in a civil court

It seems like they are only governed this way when people share these things. But when artists / companies uses creating by the normal citizen they seem to get away with this kind of stealing (as they put it themselves). So if they are not measured by the same rules, why should a citizen be?

It should be a case of using appropriate tools and amounts of legislation. In the same way that different legislation governs bows and arrows, guns and nuclear missiles.

It should be made clear that either it is possible to share content, where the principle of freedom of speech should be applied as widely as possible, or that the content is only available as a commercial product, i.e., for a fee, in which case the sharing stipulations should be specified.

It should not be covered by the same rules: they are different things.

It should not be governed by same law Sharing a picture of a cat for example has nothing to do with hate speech

It should not be governed if it is not offensive.

It should not be treated the same unless specific pieces in question ARE extremism, hate speech, or abuse

It should not be, because they're not the same kind of crimes. Copyright infringement, that sort of thing, would be closer to the mark

It should not be, though it should be punished. Extremism and abuse is worse, though.

It should not. The consequences of existing law is to inhibit abusive behaviour, while not inhibiting free expression of opinion. These are totally different issues

It should not. We already have laws for this. Copyright law

It should not. Why, because hate, extremism and abuse spring mainly from the dysfunctional society based on greed and competition advocated by the very power that now wants to control the net

It shouldn't be governed by the same rules as extremism, unless it itself supports, invites or sympathises

It sounds like a copyright issue, not some kind of violent offense

It's a question of civil vs criminal law, copyright is not covered by criminal law in most cases so its use should be subject to protections intended to allow for flexibility and new models rather than insisting on existing business methods

It's about time these corporates understood that the most successful web based content is mostly free. That's how Google started:-). Kodi is another useful example.

Laws already exist to balance free expression and legal speech. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. Infringement of copyright is a separate issue and should not be conflated with laws on freedom of

expression and curbing online abuse

Laws intended to curb hate speech or online abuse need to be applied. This does not require the creation of a new system that is intended to serve a different purpose and other interests.

Laws shouldn't be created as tools to censure. Laws should protect people, and focus on punishing things that cause real harm. As it is, right holders already have the means to persecute piracy (which cause real financial harm) and they can use them. There's no need to give them more power to control and punish even someone who innocently, and without gaining anything, just shared something that included some piece of copyrighted content (which doesn't cause any real financial harm)

Le bon droit est un droit adapté.
Le droit d'auteur existe aussi.

Leave things the way they are - no censoring!

Legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment. Our existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These existing laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. We do not need more laws, just enforcement of those we already have. When copyrighted material is shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

Legitimate content sharing helps everyone. Hate speech and abuse helps no one. They should not be treated equally.

Looking at other people's content has always been OK, if you borrow a book from a library you are allowed to read it! The problem is who checks content for all the nasty stuff and who pays for that. Probably the people who benefit from the Internet most, i.e. the Internet Service Providers, could pay a volume dependent levy to be wholly used for monitoring the Internet for the nasty (and mostly illegal) stuff.

Loss of revenue is certainly not on the same level as loss of life or getting threats. Especially when the loss of revenue concerns an industry with known abusive and predatory practices

Mere sharing is significantly different from extremism etc. However, I do not consider that extremism or "hate speech" should automatically be taken down without proof of harm in the same way that I think content-sharing need proof of infringement before it is taken down, therefore I consider that the same rules should apply. Nevertheless, I am realistic enough to know that there is no likelihood that the rules regarding free but offensive speech will be changed, so I have to be satisfied with advocating that content-sharing is trivial, and should not be treated in the same way extremism is.

Most definitely. While sharing of copyrighted content should not be encouraged, the penalty for such actions should be reasonable fines. This would lead to easier convictions and less costly trials, leaving more time for the justice system to pursue more serious crimes. Escalating penalties for repeat offenders should provide a deterrent to continued violations

No - copyright infringement is a completely different thing than extremism and abuse and should be governed by different rules.

No - the same laws will and should apply

no matter how any online content is used.
(I think your question phrasing makes answering the question difficult.)

No - there is freedom of speech, but not if certain things go public, and the internet is very public

No as it is entirely different

No because it can be hurtful to the people targeted by the hate speech or extremism;

No because this is in private

no I do not agree -- They should be governed by rules around hate speech etc.

No I do not! Why should the two separate matters, of way different levels of severity, be viewed as similar, when clearly to any sane individual, they are not? How the Hell can sharing a regular piece of music or a blog be viewed as as serious as a hate crime? Any law should be specific to the item it is meant to address - meaning that it should be intelligently worded and refined so that there are no unforeseen, unintended consequences and to guard against abuse by government, or local, agencies who creatively devise 'need' to use a law inappropriately.

No I don't agree.

No i don't believe it should most know the difference between extremism and hate speech to be able to report it themselves.

No it should not be governed the same way. If shared without permission then yes, there must be some form of accountability but to go so far is nothing short of tyranny.

No It should only be governed by applicable copyright and ownership laws

No it shouldn't. And it is too cynical to put it in the same category. The content

is already purchased and sharing it for no profit isn't a crime. Blockbusters are earning more money than ever. Good musicians play in front of crowded stadiums. I doubt it that selling DVDs and CDs is a significant source of income for anyone. And yes - someone worked hard to produce the content that is shared, and it's not the music or movie corporations - the ones that lobby for greater control, punishments and violation of basic human rights. If some product is good, it earns A LOT of money, even if someone shares it somewhere on the Internet. And trying to earn more and more, at the expence of everything should be punishable, not sharing. Internet is part of our society - it is used for communication, learning, sharing information, ideas and sometimes content that some call illegal. Each regulation risks more harmful than useful. In this case, part of our freedom shouldn't be taken away because of someone's greed

No it shpuld not. If a user is stealing material then it needs to be prosecuted in the way that theft is prosecuted.

NO OBVIOUSLY

No person or organization is an oracle. Linking to something is not tacit support for it

No political correctness is hideous enough as it is with its social interference with freedom of expression - it should be kept well away from the internet - anything that causes the thought police to extend their existing socially all-embracing hold on public discourse carries us ever nearer to an Orwellian nightmare. The internet should provide that breath of unadulterated, clear fresh freedom of expression we once enjoyed but is denied to us in social discourse at present.

No sharing content should not

fall into the same category as extremism, hate speech or abuse.

No simple answer. Don't know what those 'rules' are, but I don't see how any universal 'rules' can be applied - perceptions of what is or is not abuse or extremism vary between people, cultures and over time. Any universal 'rules', however sensible and fair-seeming now and to some, will not be so to others, or in the future. We need to be able to discuss anything openly, honestly and without fear of reprisal, regardless of the topic. There is an impossible line to draw between what is honest discussion and what is incitement to abuse or hatred. Don't know the answer, but universal rules cannot be 'it'!

No so long as it can't be used for pornography

no they should be governed individually by there content nothing is just black or wight

No they should not since they are very different issues

No this is not justice, there are different backgrounds required for laws against terrorism that are way too extreme to deal with minor transgressions of copyright law. Trying to conflate the two sounds like a nightmare.Bad legislation can only add to the calls for Brexit.

No way! ;

No Wrong behavior should not be supported

no- they are completely different matters

No, because art is a product of the culture that the artist lives in, their ideas are generated by the world around them, they interpret that world and in turn their art becomes a part of that world for others to interpret. The idea of 'intellectual property'

negates the fact that all 'new' ideas are essentially open source, they derive from all the other ideas and information the person who thinks of the 'new' idea was exposed to that led to the 'new' idea. Being able to expand on other people's ideas and take them in new directions the original thinker never thought of is how new forms of art, new forms of music, new lines and fields of scientific reasoning, new inventions, etc., come into existence.

No, because extremism, hate speech, and abuse are all examples of illegal speech, as well as potentially causing lasting damage to the victims mental health. Such speech has no redeeming value whatsoever, whereas sharing content can often help to advertise the content to potential customers - I can name several video games I have only purchased due to seeing their content shared online.

no, because the intent of the shared content can be different then the original post. it's all about the intent

NO, different issues.

No, hate speech and abuse should not be condoned. Extremism is not necessarily hate speech or abuse

No, I do not agree, The situation is different so the rules need to be different.

No, I don't think sharing of copyrighted material belongs in the same boat as hate speech, bigotry, etc. We're taking Apple's and oranges here. The former is extreme levels of vitriol targeted at individuals or group SPECIFICALLY TO HARM AND/ OR DEHUMANIZE THEM, and the other exists in a legal and moral grey area where the only group that seems to have any consensus is the one making money by making it illegal, which is a little something we in the U.S.A. call a "conflict of interest"

No, it should not. Large companies have enough pull on the Internet already, they don't need to contort our laws to achieve their agenda. We need a legal system that can respond quickly to our changing society, instead of letting the privileged few bastardize all of the language used in out outdated laws.

No, it should't be governed by the same rules, because it doesn't provoke any damage, moral o monetary, it doesn't hurt people and neither the pockets of the firms who own the rights of the content shared

No, it shouldn't, and simply because it's not the same thing

No, it's bad to plagiarise content but should not be punished as harshly as extremism etc

No, it's too extreme, an over reaction.

No, please retain this distinction. We need software that allows content originators to control shares: allowing them or not, ideally on a case-by-case basis. A "fair use" exception should exist

NO, sharing a link shows the original owner

No, the laws should treat all content equally

No, there's no need to place content sharing- particularly non-professional or fan-created content- under any censorship rules. To suggest otherwise is a violation of people's rights to speak and share what they believe

No, they are quite blatantly two very different subjects. That's a really obviously daft idea!

No,, not right

No;

NO! Except for very rare instances 'hate/bigotry/etc' is just that - hate from idiots! The KKK comes to mind and their 'outing' by 'Anonymous' is a great example of self-balancing online. However, "Online Bullying" comes to mind, in particular as this is mainly aimed at teenagers and causal links to suicide etc. are proven facts at this stage. This deserves special/separate legislation. However, the user should have the right to 'read/look/listen' OR NOT! The internet is about information, all information!

No! People put things out to share. If it totally violates the abuse policy then it should be removed

No.

No. Censorship should only occur when actions or words infringe on the human rights of another individual or group. All other actions should have to go through due process within the legal system

No. Copyright is a whole lot less serious than sharing content owned by others

No. Criminal activity or damages should be proved before legal action should be taken

No. Extremism and abuse are a completely different issue from sharing content on the web. The former are anti-social and criminally unacceptable. The latter are pro-social and may have many positive effects. Consider sharing a funny, relevant and caring piece with someone who is depressed or suffering PTSD. Then it's removed or disallowed due to some mostly irrelevant ruling about copyright. Totally bogus and possibly harmful

No. However, rights holders should be able to remove flagrant abuse, such as posting sharing an entire film, music track, etc.

No. If content is owned by others it should

not be shared without their permission.

No. It is necessary to swiftly take down abusive and extremist comments to prevent incitement or harm to individuals. The same concerns do not apply to copyright infringements and thus there is time to consider the merits of any complaint and any counter-arguments before making a decision

No. Natural persons are more important than corporate persons

No. Not everything is the same and appearances can be deceiving.

No. Sharing a picture is very different from hate speech!

No. Sharing content and punishing extremism are not necessarily related.

No. Sharing content owned by others on the internet is no different from sharing information/knowledge learned from books, movies, TV shows.

No. There are already far too many instances of laws being stretched to cover areas they were never intended to cover, often with highly unjust, undemocratic, and downright bizarre results.

No. There is sufficient legal control already

No. There's no connection between simply sharing content and hateful or abusive speech

No. This systematic expansion of what is essentially a civil issue into having more dire consequences than violent criminal behavior must stop. It seems every day I am reading news that some person is being sent to prison for longer than most violent criminals because they possibly caused some giant media company some lost sales. You are

sending the message that human life is less valuable than "lost sales" (which is a false logic by the way). The word "piracy" has been twisted to equate copyright infringement with violent criminals at sea

no. we already have laws governing extremism, hate speech and abuse. we should apply those as necessary, rather than limiting free speech.

No. We need to differentiate between abusive and hateful messages from infringement of copyright. these are two distinct problems and should not be under the same umbrella. They are treated differently by legislators and this should carry over to the internet

No.....same as Facebook

Non-copyright content should be available for sharing freely when not used to promote antisocial/abuse/extremism, etc. There is a difference between sharing ideas (visual, auditory, etc.) for consideration and the onslaught of hate mongering toward a violent or disruptive end which does not serve any societal benefit

Not entirely. Rules to stop one type of thing are being misused to stop others. This manipulation of the rules is wrong.

not same..ex:a potato is not a tree

NOT the same thing. Besides, most of the time the content has been paid for. If I buy a loaf of bread, is it still owned by the baker or can I share it with friends?

not! Because one mans poison is another mans honey! It's all down to interpretation or mis -interpretation.

Obviously sharing content is not hate speech or similar.

Obviously content sharing has to be

regulated differently. First of all because most sharing is done by people who have no idea how to source properly or why they should source the content, what copyright laws are in effect and how they work. Secondly because I don't believe sharing content for information, culture or simple enjoyment should be punished like it is a crime

Obviously I agree. Such measures are only justified where human life is a risk. Corporate profit is certainly not in that category

Obviously it should be governed by the same rules

Of course I agree, it seems to me that entertainment industry are trying to use any law they can

Of course it shouldn't be governed by the same rules! Human beings have been sharing information and collaborating for the betterment of humanity for millenia!

Of course it shouldn't be punished by the same laws- that's like saying if I go into a bookstore and copy a passage with my phone I should be tried as a terror suspect. It's madness.

Of course it shouldn't be, totally different scenarios, one is a civil infringement the other a criminal offense.

Of course it shouldn't, it's a different issue. I agree that content owned by others should not be shared without consent / acknowledgement but, while it might threaten income, it is pretty unlikely to result in a threat to life or liberty

Of course it shouldn't! Sharing info etc is what will defeat extremism, hate speech, and abuse: this works more quickly and effectively than any law

Of course it shouldn't. Extremists WANT organisations like the EU to impose draconian, unpopular and restrictive legislation on the general public, because that encourages fear and resentment. Just think about what you'd be doing with this: causing the very people you're supposed to be protecting and representing to hate you. Is that really sensible? Just because we can't afford expensive lobbyists doesn't mean we wouldn't vote you out of office if you caved in to corporate bullying. Beware EU - your fate is in your hands here!!

Of course it shouldn't. Why? Because one thing is to SHARE and another is to HATE or ABUSE. It's as simple as that.

Of course not - the idea is too ridiculous to comment further. Anyone who supports this is a crackpot!

of course not, because they are clearly worlds apart

Of course not, that is downright ludicrous. Not even remotely similar

Of course not.

Of course not. Copyright is a civil court matter, and the other are criminal court matters, alternatively fully legal under freedom of speech, depending on country

Of course not. I have never heard anything so absurd. The majority of websites are desperate for links to be created to move their content up the ladder and become the trending item. Without links, this wouldn't happen.

of course not. information sharing is a positive. hate speech or abuse is hurtful

Of course not. One of these two acts is victimless.

of course not. sharing content - photos,

videos & blogs - as long as they don't contain hate speech, abuse or extremism, is common & acceptable & harmless. it's illogical that the same laws should apply to innocent sharing of content to extremism, hate speech, & abuse online. complete nonsense! use common sense!

Of course these should be governed;

of course they are different. One is alleged copyright infringement, the other is far more dangerous to society

Of course we should have freedom to use the internet.

Of course. Big brother fascismo is the extremist here.

Of course. Copyright infringement, while illegal, does not have the same consequences as extremism, hate speech or abuse -- unless they actually are intended as such

Offensive or illegal material should be firmly dealt with by criminal law. Civil issues are not the same and putting the two together is a recipe for confusion and manipulation by the industry.

One law can't govern all different areas. You need specific laws for specific areas. ;

One of these things is hurtful to a person, the other is not. It's really not complicated.

One thing is destructive and the other is collaborative in nature. Go figure which is which.

Online abuse is not the same as illegal sharing of copyrighted material. To bring them together will be harmful to both causes.

Only if it involves bullying or other abuse

only sharing information freely allows us to

find out what is happening as opposed to what the corporate media choose to tell us.

Our laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system

Our laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. When copyrighted material is shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society.

Our laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. When copyrighted material is shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

Over a thousand years and more, we have gradually built up laws protecting free speech, with largely effective checks and balances to protect individual and corporate rights whilst allowing a society to discuss, learn, create, and expand. Allowing corporations to have individual control over what they censor, and by negation, what they allow, effectively bypasses all of these existing safeguards, throws out thousands of years of law and philosophy, and institutes a corporate lock-down of the democratic process. Similarly, Corporations push these Copyright and similar control agendas to stifle

competition and increase profit margins, at the expense of society's very fundamental fabric. Their desire to extend Copyright by a lifetime is in direct opposition to the ever increasing speed of communication of ideas across global society. Please reject these cynical attempts to usurp power from the people, and reign in corporations as quickly as possible, for the good of us all -- even, in the long-term, corporations

Ownership in the internet age is a difficult subject. If I want to own something, I copyright it in print on paper. If I put it on the web, I assume anybody can use it. That's a practical fact. Creativity is unlimited, and so is curiosity. And, of course greed is also unlimited---THAT is THE problem, especially when it is institutionalized in corporate law. Just ask the U.S. Supreme Court--who will hand ANYTHING to the richest Americans

Policing copyrights should be quite separate from hate speech etc. Current copyright laws are already abused as a censorship tool, for example by companies seeking to take down unflattering reviews

Provided that you have permission to share it it should be alright. If you don't get permission to share it then you share it anyway then you should be punished. But yes it should not be governed by those same rules

Punishment must fit the crime. Copying digital files is not in the same ballpark as hate speech.

Q5 I agree, current laws are good enough

Q5- YES, pictures videos and blogs should NOT be governed by same rules as trolling, hate speech and abuse etc..

Q5: yes, I agree that they should not be governed by the same rules as extremism, hate speech or abuse online.

Q5....no governing content.
No censorship ever.

Reference my answer to question 2. The rights concerning words and images shared on internet websites need to be re-examined and re-defined

Regardless of reason, no government should be able to store reams of information about our online presence. It's an absolute invasion of our privacy and civil rights. Once a person is proven guilty, or under serious suspicion on a crime, then there is a case to examine data

Rules governing copyrighted material should not be the same as those governing extremism, hate speech, etc. because they are two different things. When copyright is violated, no one is endangered. Damage from copyright violation is financial. On the other hand, hate speech and extremism can result in physical harm, human rights violations, and death. There is absolutely no comparison between the two, and they should not be treated the same.

Rules other than copyright that govern extremism, hate speech and abuse online should not restrict the redistribution of copyrighted content.

rules should be made afresh. laws cover hate speech - should not conflate these with commercial / copyright rules

Seems like different rule would apply here. Sharing links is reasonable. There are enough paywalls to protect usage

Separate these two issues

Sharing another's content does not assume agreement. In the interest of getting a balanced view, freedom of speech and freedom to listen must be upheld.

Sharing content and points of view

is a good thing. Extremism and hate propaganda should be dealt with in a separate manner

Sharing content belonging to others need not be governed by those same rules

Sharing content is a form of art.
It's not a form of thievery.

sharing content is an essential part of a free society, and has nothing to do with extremism or hate crimes.
The later should be treated as they happen. A blanket restrictive law serves nothing except authoritarianism.

Sharing content is harmless and must be left alone. Hate and abuse offences should be banned.

Sharing content is informative and collaborative. Of course there are outliers, but the vast majority of shared content is nowhere near 'extremism'.

Sharing content is not extremism, hate speech or abuse, even though those acts can be carried out by sharing content.
You can use a car to rob a bank but that doesn't mean that car usage should be restricted as if it were committing robbery.

Sharing content is not that different from generating content e.g., speech & videos.
The rules governing free speech appear to be adequate in allowing free speech, and I do not see why sharing content should not be covered by the same rules.

Sharing content is one of the many reasons why the Internet is what it is today. I should be able to send links to the original content or copies of it to anyone I want without being restricted or punished for doing so. My computer/mobile device already has made a copy of this content locally so I can view it so why do I need special permission to send it someone else?

Sharing content is the crux of what the internet is about. Every part of the internet is designed to be used communally, and to punish people for using the absolute most basic function of the internet is an act of futile absurdity. It also does not cause damage in the way that extremism, hate speech and abuse - no one is emotionally or psychologically harmed by it, no one is targeted or marginalised for it. An issue of economic impact cannot be treated the same as one of deep personal and psychological impact

sharing content is usually a desire to let others know about something good. Abuse and hatred are quite different and seek to cause harm. It would be senseless to use the same law for such different things

Sharing content online is free advertising for the content owners and, as such, shouldn't be treated the same way as hate speech etc. The two comparisons are miles apart in similarities

Sharing content owned by another is not the same as abusing that other

sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules ... there is too much room for malicious attacks, in an effort for monetary gain.
Keep the internet free and open.

Sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to examine online abuse. Being able to share content is a fundamental human right, supports free speech and needs to be protected.

Sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online as copyright infringement & freedom of

speech/expression are two different things.

Sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. Copyright material is usually protected for financial gain. Extreme/ abusive material causes more intense damage & hurt

Sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. For one, bad words should never be punished. Behaviors should. Sharing content is a different behavior from anything else and should have its form of punishment specified separately to ensure that the punishment fits the crime.

Sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. While the former is intended to share, the latter is malicious with an intention to do harm

Sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online... Because the intent in sharing such content is not malicious. Its good to share good things. Its not good to share hatred, divisive speech or abuse which are all harmful.

Sharing content owned by others for NON COMMERCIAL use should not be governed by the same rules that apply to extremism, hate speech and abuse online.

Sharing content owned by others has a completely different intent and result compared to extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. These are not the same and should not be governed by the same rules

Sharing content owned by others is anticipated the moment anything is posted If the original post is by the originator or their representative. If such content is used by others then standard copyright laws must apply

Sharing content owned by others is totally different from hate speech, abuse, etc., and of course should not be governed by the same rules.

Sharing content owned by others should not be governed by the same rules that are used to punish extremism, hate speech and abuse online. They are about property, not about violence or public order.

Sharing content owned by others should not be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech and abuse online.

Sharing content owned by others should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech and abuse online. Sharing content is not hate speech or abuse. If the content shared is copyrighted, it should be governed by copyright laws

Sharing content owned by others should not be governed by the same rules used to punish extremism, hate speech and abuse unless it is used for those intents. Otherwise it should be treated according to reasonable copyright laws which allow fair use but which penalize use for profit.

sharing content owned by others should not be governed in the same way that extremism, hate speech or abuse is governed online, copyright infringement does not qualify in the same hateful way as any of those listed.

Sharing content owned by others should not be subject to these rules as, among other reasons, it may have the effect

of denying people access to useful or helpful sites and information

Sharing content owned by others should take place according to rules, but these rules should be far more relaxed than the sort of legislation that is (should be) in place to combat extremism, hate speech and abuse. There are two totally different levels of activity here. One should be harmless, the other is hugely dangerous. If sharing of content is avoiding payment for copyright material, that should be dealt with, in a manner proportional to the damage sustained by the copyright owner. Such fraudulent activity, however, should still be dealt with by rules that are different from those that tackle extremism, hate speech and abuse

Sharing content owned by others such as pictures, videos and blogs, should not be governed by those same rules for extremism, hate speech or abuse.

Sharing content owned by others that does not lead to violence is different from violent extremism of any kind

Sharing content owned by others without their permission should not be allowed but links to that content which is governed by the content owner should be allowed to the extent permitted by the content owner. Rules for hate etc should not be extended to videos etc, it's not the same gravity

Sharing content produced by others bears no relationship to creating hate speech or other forms of extremism and governing them with the same set of rules is itself extreme censorship

Sharing content should be free

Sharing content should not be governed by the rules used against extremism, hate speech and on-line abuse. The two things are completely different, the first is about

encouraging terrorism or at least causing lasting emotional harm, the second is merely about protecting copyright

Sharing content should NOT be governed by the same rules that punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. Economic and emotional issues are not the same at all and require completely different management techniques.

Sharing content should not be governed by the same rules that punish online hate and abuse. The motivations and outcomes of each of these actions are completely different. They deserve separate rules.

Sharing content that does not hurt or is designed to hurt others is obviously not in the same category as extremism, hate speech or abuse.

Sharing content that is hate speech should count as hate speech, when it is clear that this is the intent of the person who shared the content. If I link to a Nazi website and make clear I am a Nazi sympathiser with text in or near my link, then that is arguably hate speech. If I link to a website with content from many users, some of whom engage in hate speech, but I do not specifically link to that speech, then it is the person who generated the content that is responsible, not me. Conversely, if I post hate speech to Twitter, then it should be me that is responsible, not Twitter.

Sharing content that is not considered extreme, hate speech, or abuse should be part of free expression

Sharing content that others (individuals, governments and businesses) is part of our modern, democratic system of information and should not be restricted, punished or suppressed

Sharing content via links on social media with no claim of ownership should

be totally acceptable. Reproducing someone else's content on a website without permission should remain an infringement and subject to removal on the request of the original author without the need for legal proceedings.

Sharing content with proper referencing allows information flow, education and supports free speech. Extremism, hate speech and abuse etc. are obvious special cases and need to be treated differently (with caution) but governments should not allow the over-reaching of laws about national security to be used by media providers looking to protect their assets. The two scenarios are totally different and should not be conflated.

Sharing content, personally owned by others, should be regarded differently than extremism, hate and abuse, as long as it is not of secret content/information. Depending on the background of each and everyone who is sharing content, measures must be enforced. Extremists sharing hate messages should be punished as such. Other type of contents shared by regular persons should be enforced different measures, always by a court of law

Sharing copyrighted information should most definitely NOT be governed by the same rules that apply to extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. They are completely different forms of expression. Copyright infringement can occur innocently when people do not know their legal rights, and is in most instances not done maliciously

Sharing cultural artefacts is PART of culture. It is certainly different to those who want to destroy culture.

Sharing does not automatically entail abuse, hate or extremism, it is freedom of expression and I do not

see why that should be taxed

Sharing does not harm, it only broadens the exposure. What about sharing cat pictures or such is extremism, hate, or abusive? It seems like an overreaching measure to have them governed by the same rules by default, even though the rules might apply in some rare cases

Sharing information is what makes us human and bonds together society. Yes, we need to monitor abuse and hatred but it is idiotic to punish the 99.99% for the sake of the .001%

Sharing information should not be penalised in the same way as we punish extremism, hate speech and abuse online. In the interests of humanity, information should be accessible to all regardless of income

Sharing information/images owned by others is not new. Newspapers, magazines and periodicals have reproduced work for decades. "Reproduced by kind permission of...." is all that is needed along with a proviso to the owner that they will receive acknowledgement anda link(!) to their website. An article about obesity and an unhealthy diet should not be taken down because it contains a link to an article in a newspaper about the benefits of fruit in your diet-plan.

Sharing interesting and innocuous (or even ambiguous) information should not be governed in the same way as hate speech, abuse or extremism. There is a difference in the rest of the law and this should be maintained online. The burden of proof must be maintained and the assumption of innocence preserved, and due legal processes observed. Protection is key and public safety, but where these are clearly not at risk no restriction should be possible. The medium is not

the message- legislate the problematic content (hate speech, abuse, extremist content) and not the method used to communicate it. A pamphlet which contravenes such legislation should be able to be adequately pursued in the same way as a website because it is CONTENT that is the issue. Certainly deliberate proliferation of for example revenge porn should be adequately regulated but it should not be possible to criminalise say climate change activism as a result

Sharing Internet content is a fundamental method of ensuring free speech and allowing the dissemination of information and criticism as well as other content. This right should be absolutely guaranteed and not subject to the unelected opinion or interference by 3rd party interests, corporate or institutional other than under due process after INDEPENDENT judicial review.

sharing is a positive act, punishment for a positive act is ridiculous. there should be rules but they should be transparent and obvious

Sharing is caring

Sharing is caring and sharing content of others should be welcomed and most certainly should not be governed by the same rules used to punish hate speech etc

Sharing is fun, harmless and informative. Hands off our freedom. I recall one guy saying years ago: the Internet is something good created out of the altruism of ordinary people. Sooner or later the corporate world will destroy it and then we'll have to create something else. Even as he said it, I felt how true this could be.

Sharing is not extremism or hate speech so why should it be treated the same? It doesn't physically or mentally hurt

someone so why treat it the same as something that does cause these sort of effects. Treating it this way is its own sort of extremism and is totally out of proportion to the harm (if any) done

Sharing legal and unharmed material with other users should not be criminalised. Bundling innocent material with hate speech, extremism and online abuse is preposterous - it blurs the distinction between right and wrong behaviour, and makes a mockery of a legal system in which the punishment should fit the crime. Punishing people for innocent acts is beyond ridiculous. It is a regressive act and does not belong in a forward-thinking, mature society. Legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment. Our laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. When copyrighted material is shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and on society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework. Trying to make them fit is like trying to mix oil with water. Let's have a grown-up approach to the internet - it is not the possession of the few - but the right of all. The internet should not be abused as a mechanism for control - which is a dangerous form of extremism in itself - and it is that control that should be criminalised - not the victims of that abuse.

Sharing material, except where explicitly banned by the owners, should be OK except extreme hate propaganda and similarly harmful material. Suitable warnings and age restrictions should be carried with appropriate material

Sharing online content with attribution is perfectly fine. Stealing another's multimedia or text is a completely different matter. There should be harsh penalties when caught purposely trying to claim another's info as your own but part of that should involve the discretion of the original owner of the content

Sharing others content should always be done only with the owners permission. If I don't want to share my photos it should be up to me do so or not to do so. If I have something I will share for a fee I should have the right to stipulate that and to have my wish respectd - just the same as printed or otherwise produced materials. If it's a cent or a dollar to view the one who wishes can pay or not view and the fee should go to the owner/creator - not to anyone else. I can create a website to show the works of creators and I can charge them to show their works and have fees paid - and give them the fees. If the creator wants to share his/her work for free it's up to them and if not that should be their choice also. This is not rocket science it's simply common sense. It may be complex to work out the details but that's what needs to be done. If the sharing question is related to abusive or damaging materials there must be a fair screening process and a serious and inescapable consequence for any unfair discrimination that does not conform to fair practices

Sharing pictures, videos and written material that has been displayed publicly must remain free of control, as long as it is not done for financial gain. Where the original material was displayed only for payment, then reasonable samples should be allowed to be redisplayed by others for the purposes of criticism explanation, education and comment. None of this is in any way "piracy" and it is certainly not similar to extremism -- indeed an open society with freedom to

share ideas is the opposite of extremism.

Sharing should be allowed, but for profit

Sharing should not be governed by the same rules as extremism or hate speech. Abuse, extremism and hate speech contain the seeds of real violence and threaten personal physical or emotional injury. The physical analogy here is to actually throw abuse at a person in the street (which is punishable) or make hate speeches (normally seen as a crime along the lines of incitement to riot). In contrast, sharing a link to some copyrighted material (with potentially a teaser of the content) will in general contain at most a small, negative commercial impact and in many cases will be a positive commercial gain as the increased visibility of the teaser will cause more people to visit the original material and potentially purchase it. The physical analogy here is a book review, which may contain small pieces of a copyrighted work and is generally encouraged as it increases visibility of the work and is a commercial gain.

Sharing these things in the private domain without profit and merely to illustrate a point or to illuminate an argument shouldn't fall under the same rules as those to punish extremism, hate speech and online abuse. If one put something on the internet for all to see then it should be allowed to share freely and fairly as long as it's done without gain. If it is done for gain then the gain should be shared with the owner otherwise there should be no penalty. There's too much recourse to commerce, life isn't all about the market and if it is then what has become of our civilisation that everything has to be costed? It cannot be right.

Sharing trademarked content is not a crime in the same league as terrorism, sexual or physical abuse, rape, or the

promotion of this kind of content. If it is addressed at all, it should be seen as akin to shoplifting. Existing laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour

sharing video or pictures might cause a loss of revenue but will never create the harm hate or abuse online causes so cannot possibly be punished in the same way. after all you wouldn't sentence a speeding motorist the same as a stalker

Sharing with families and friends should not be governed by the same rules as for extremism, surely..?

should be governed because if the content is not extreme or hate speech and abuse then no one will be hurt and need not be bothered whether it is governed or not

SHOULD BE.

Should not use the same rules,a lot of complaints are about commercial business, not crimes.

Should still be regulated but in different way.

Shouldn't that be up to the site owners? I'm sorry but this is a rather stupidly framed question.

Simplify & condense your question ass holeStop being a dick, keep links free & online. We shouldn't have to justify ourselves to corporate scum that rule our world.Get them lynched

Simply because probably 99% of what is shared is NOT extremist, hateful, or abusive

Simply, content owned by others need not fall under extremism, hate speech and abuse. People should have the right to avoid others with a grudge putting out things online they don't want if it doesn't fall under those headings.

Since the advertising industry is trying to completely rule our live, the 'small' people get left out by not being able to afford 'ad space'. I recognize this most with musical artists that I like, who don't get the promotion they deserve. Link are THE way for them to get their names out there

Sometimes you share in order to describe why the thing you are sharing to is bad: to educate and oppose.

That depends on content and intention rather than source. If the content is extremist, hate-provoking or abusive/abuse encouraging, or more innocent material, e.g. personal photographs, is shared and/or altered with the intention of bullying, demeaning, abusing etc., then the same rules should apply regardless of source.

That depends on the content and the intent. Spreading hate material and extremist views and content depicting abuse is wrong if the intent is to encourage the depicted behaviour. If the intent is to publicise and bring down the perpetrators of such material and bring them to justice then that's a good thing.

That is a ridiculous question. Those two things are far removed from being equal. Copyright infringement is wrong and can damage our shared knowledge and growth. Extremism, hate, and abuse can result in people dying. So, no, these two should not carry the same legal repercussions

The basis of the democracy that we pay lip service to, is the freedom to express our opinions. Our opinions are formed on the basis of ideas, opinions and snippets of genuine fact that we have been exposed to. The wider the platform and discussion that we base our opinions on, the better the chance that our opinions are at least marginally informed and considered. Sharing and

debating ideas is vitally important in supporting the promotion of innovation. Abuse of individuals, promulgating intolerance and violence is at the extreme end of a spectrum and it seems only appropriate that while such material may be removed temporarily everyone should have recourse to the law to decide if that removal should stay in force.

The content in question is often positive. Why not put the same efforts into better socialisation of people on earth so that negative problems such as hate and abuse can be eased. ;

The current system is sufficient to police abuses of free expression. A new system is not required.

The difference between commercial interests and personal input are vastly different, so two different sets of laws are necessary

The exercise of free expression should be prioritised over protecting us from the opinions of others with whom we disagree

The existing law should be left as it is, as you cannot have one law to cover everything, in my opinion it is totally wrong.

The freedom to share ideas, information and video without restriction, must be maintained as a right of each citizen. Moderation of extremism, hate speech and abuse one line is adequately controlled currently. For Government or Unions to restrict the internet is, in my view, an abuse of power and an abuse of freedom. ;

The general sharing of content is not extremism, hate speech or abuse. To subject it to the same rules is an abuse in itself.

The internet is a web of electrons arranged in specific order to share

information between individuals. It is not physical property for you to claim. Keep your greedy paws off!

The Internet is built around sharing information. Resharing content (with proper attribution) should not be treated at all in the same manner as hate speech or abuse unless the reshared content is, itself, illegally hateful or abusive

The internet is such a powerful thing that there would soon develop an even greater chasm between the rich and the poor. Strife will ensue making everyone's life narrower and more fearful.

The internet operates more as speech than publication, despite being largely print in nature. It is also largely informal. Applying the standards applied to traditional print media misunderstands the medium. People reference pop culture, famous works and topical subjects every day in speech without fear of reprisal, they use the internet in the same way. The informal use of the internet is akin to singing Rigoletto in the bath, no one expects to apply for permission to do so. People take this same sensibility to their informal use of the internet. Unless there is a clear intent to plagiarise or pirate a work for profit, then this everyday use of works, ancient and modern, which have permeated the public consciousness should be accepted as they are in everyday speech.

The INTERNET, itself, was invented, LONG AFTER many countries, established the RIGHT to "Freedom of Speech, therefore, FREEDOM OF SPEECH, should ALWAYS take precedence over Copyright !!!We should ALL accept, WITHOUT EXCEPTION, that if you post ANYTHING to the Internet, you MUST accept, that that post WILL be re-posted, at some time, or another.ALL information posted to the Internet, should be considered to be "Freely Available"

for re-posting, UNLESS, it has a SPECIFIC Copyright Notice Affixed to the Post. We ALREADY have Laws, in individual Countries, that apply to "Obscene", "Illegal", and "Hateful" Posts, IN PLACE --- THEY are the ONLY RULES that should EVER be used to control the content of individual Posts, or Re-Posts, of any available material. No one wants, needs, or will accept, ANY NEW STRUCTURE, to interfere with the Status Quo !!!!! Any attempt to create a new system, based on the proposals you recommend, can ONLY be construed as being PURELY COMMERCIAL BASED, and, as such, UNACCEPTABLE TO USERS !!!!!

The law as it exists is sufficient

The legal basis for the 2 must remain separate, just as it is separate for similar violations offline

The punishment must fit the crime. Anything else would be uncivilized. The act of sharing content that is (or may be) owned by others DOES NOT and CANNOT be considered to be in the same league as other, more serious, rules and laws

The rules governing all media and organs of public information are to do with protecting authorship and preventing plagiarism, passing off, misconduct related to accuracy, privacy etc. It is inappropriate to conflate the various grades of formal infringements, instances of inaccuracy, professional negligence or at worst deliberate dishonesty and intellectual fraud - generally industrial and economic crimes - with crimes of a completely different nature targeting individual human beings or groups in society. Indeed it is dishonest and dangerous to conflate aggressive antisocial acts with other types of misdemeanours, simply because they use a common platform: the link is spurious and the relationship merely superficial. If somebody scrawls hateful swastikas on a

public toilet door, we don't take away all toilet doors. We don't blame toilet doors.

The sharing of content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. Copyright is a commercial consideration and should be dealt with under commercial law, whereas hate crime etc should be dealt with under criminal law: it is dangerous woolly thinking to confuse the two.

The sharing of content is integral to the internet. Ownership of material used is normally acknowledged as a courtesy. Sharing content owned by others should NOT be governed by rules that we use to control extremism, hate speech, and abuse online.

The sharing of content owned by others is very different from promoting extremism or hatred online. I write books, and my content is on the internet, but if someone shares a book of mine illegally, the only person to get hurt is me, financially. This is totally different from someone/ some people being victimized by hatred, extremist propaganda, or abuse online

The sharing of material that is not offensive in general to others should not be regulated in the same way as offensive material.

The sharing of pictures, etc. is pretty innocuous and has become a part of everyday life so should be allowed to continue unhindered. However extremism, online abuse, Etc. are a totally different ball game and should be monitored at least. If there is a sufficient number of complaints or reasonable grounds then there should be a facility for its removal. But again a course of appeal should still apply.

the special conditions we have had to put in place to battle extremism and hate speech should be used sparingly and with careful planning, they should not become the norm.

The terms 'extremism' and 'racism' are ill-defined and often used to shut down dialogue. The Internet does not need or want a 'nanny-class' of prod-noses.

the use of anti hate / extremism laws to regulate commercial situations is inappropriate.

The web is a wonderful way of sharing ideas, your work and skills. As a photographer I put my photos on the net to be shared by as many people as possible. It would be the same if I kept a blog or I share videos. Yes it can be annoying if someone uses your material to make money for themselves or uses my material in an inappropriate way but that's the price I'm prepared to pay for a free web. I believe that the web should be free and not in the hands of governments or global businesses

The World Wide Web was invented by a European working at CERN. Its essence is the transparent use of links. That system and the WWW has revolutionized the world more thoroughly than any sociocultural change since the Industrial Revolution. The proposals to restrict and censor this are a disaster in the making. Europe gave the world a goose laying golden eggs. Now it wants to kill it. This is illiterate, ignorant, short

Theft of intellectual property is hardly in the same class as real or threatened physical violence and should not carry the same punishment.

There are enough laws already to punish extremism, hate and abuse, these apply equally on the internet as

anywhere else. There is no need for more laws. More laws covering the same problems will only confuse things.

There are existing laws which enable the control of extremist views whilst still providing a platform for freedom of expression. We do not need new laws which are more about financial protection than protection from extremist views

There can be NO justification for such draconian action against sovereign people.

There is a clear distinction between financial harm and emotional abuse. Financial harm should be proven and recompensed appropriately rather than punitively. It should be resolved between the complainant and poster where possible. Emotional harm, abuse and hate speech can be very subjective. There are a lot of shades between illegal and undesirable with no clear distinctions. Complaints can also be vexatious rather than of merit. Response should be proportional. A set of official guidelines, with examples of unacceptable content, would set some sort of standards, but policing this type of content will always be difficult as the acceptable boundaries are very indistinct. This is currently policed by the content hoster. Clear guidelines here would help everyone. The authorities should be involved where a law has been broken, but to suggest that everything should be recorded in case a law is broken is inappropriate and unnecessary. Existing laws should be adequate to distinguish between free speech and abuse. This is a fluid boundary and cannot be wholly legislated anyway.

There is a difference between sharing something for financial gain (downloading a movie instead of paying for it), and sharing something out of interest ("Hey, look at this it's cool"), word of mouth is as old as speech

itself and should not be stifled in any way. Any law that tries to curb free speech (even speech we don't agree with), should be very carefully considered before it is proposed. Extremism, hate speech, and abuse online are often precursors to criminal acts in the "real world", whereas someone who shares a link to a video is very unlikely to then go and steal a DVD in real life.

There is a difference between threatening behaviour and criticising politicians and companies. Claiming these 2 are the same is moronic.

There is a great danger that principle such as fair use and parody will be stifled by excessive legislation.

There is a serious 'category error' in this proposal - the same one that sometimes, in legal and political arguments, puts/appears to put property crime in the same bracket as crime against the person (physical, psychological, emotional). While of course there is a spectrum of seriousness and consequence in each field of justice, their overlap needs to be viewed in terms of impact on each other, and not conflated. Equating people and things risks making the legislative/regulatory system no better than those who abuse the freedoms it is designed to protect. It further breeds a culture of contempt and avoidance, driving the very mechanisms of systematic abuse, while penalising those with no intention to do so. The internet does us a service in bringing these distinctions into sharp focus. How we respond makes it very clear where, as a society, our priorities lie, and who is in the driving seat - and whether our institutions (particularly the corporate) serve us or the other way around.

There is difference between copyright and extremism, hate and abuse and should be assessed and judged accordingly. Blanket laws are dangerous in my opinion.

There is no comparison between the harm done to society by copyright infringement to the harm done by extremism, hate speech and abuse, on the web or anywhere. These cannot be governed by the same rules.

There is no equivalence between the two things. In intent and effect they are different from one another. The laws of slander, "hate speech" or inciting violence are not used to resolve copyright disputes. I feel uncomfortable about the "thought crime" category, but understand that persistent abuse or the organising and inspiration of violence must be limited. Sharing other peoples words and images can have a valuable role in this. It would be difficult to draw attention to and deal with a problem if it were illegal to show others the problematic content. There is a real danger that this attempt to add revenue to publishers will help the trolls, fascists and bigots.

There is no need to create a whole new set of rules to try and regulate digital expression, and I caution you against doing so.

There requires to be clear distinction between extremism, hate speech, and abuse issues and ythe sharing of mterials

There should be fair usage parameters. Punishment cannot be disproportionate to other crimes. Rich corporations should not be allowed to buy increased punishment for wrongs against them.

There should be no link what's so ever between the two. One deals with copyright law and the other is some of the most horrible crimes possible to commit by a human. They should never be lumped together, only a complete fool would do so.

There should be three levels of 'sharing' - with- open content, and content shared

for entirely private reasons, or not competing with the original not subject to restriction along the lines of US 'fair use' permissions- owned content shared for commercial gain subject to a scale of civil and criminal penalties, depending on the level of money involved and the degree of persistence- hate crimes and incitement to violence subject to the same criminal penalties as if done face to face

There should be two different rules for the sharing of a music video, for example, and sharing a hate speech. They are not the same thing and should not be regarded as the same. I am all for tighter laws and rules for hate speech, as it is abhorrent. Sharing a video link is not in the same league.

There's a clear difference between sharing content and promoting hate/extremism. Using laws to restrict the latter to police the former is overkill. It would also be a clear sign of a totalitarian state

These are different 'crimes' obviously somebody sharing personal/intimate material could span both scenarios. It is worrying that somebody sharing internet content with friends could potentially be treated the same way as an extremist.

These are two different issues and it is important that we do not try to address one problem by restricting another. There are rules that govern extremism, hate speech and abuse - in any public format, of which online is one. This needs to be addressed separately from other sharing online.

These are two entirely separate issues. Yet again, we're seeing one set of circumstances or concerns (about which people broadly agree there is a need for regulation) being used as a back door to regulate freedom of expression and the day to day use of the internet. This is simply a back door to protect the interests

of the disproportionately powerful and another example of that power and influence being misused or even abused.

These are two separate and distinct categories, and require different kinds of regulation. Extremism has many definitions and can be misused to apply to anything you don't agree with, so I think only its specific content should be monitored. Hate speech and abuse (including sexual abuse!!!) should be eliminated wherever possible

These are two very different issues. Sharing content is normal. It may be a threat to business models, but does not mean that the internet should be censored by a few gate keepers, who are having difficulty adjusting to the new reality. Hate speech can be dealt with by current laws that exist in all countries. These laws have been crafted by legislators, and courts over a long period of time, and reflect a balance that society as a whole expects and respects. Copyright should have a very limited term, and NOT be used as a tool of censorship, and digital slavery.

These items are legally separate in the real world and treated as such. The blurring of these frameworks in the digital world is not only disingenuous, it serves as a platform to retrofit our real world with the same illogic.

These two issues do not fit under the same framework;

these two issues should be treated completely separately. There is a positive value in sharing content (even if its copyrighted) since it allows people who might not have the resources to purchase such content, to enjoy it and learn from it. However there is no benefit to society from "extremism, hate speech, and abuse"

They are 2 different issues so they should

NOT be governed by same rules

They are clearly different issues and their is no blanket response for all these issues. That is what court and law proceedings are for.

They are completely different things and innocent sharing should not be subject to laws covering extremism hate speech and abuse. Those things are being used as an excuse to clamp down on ordinary decent people

They are constitutionally different. They should be subject to different regulations.

They are not connected. If you do not agree with the content, then remove yourself from the source of the content.

They are two completely different things. If I share a link of a cute kitten rolling in cat nip and mention how cute it is, I should be persecuted for fair use and free speech? If anything I'm driving more views to the page which can create more monetization!!! Hate and abuse is uncalled for and shouldn't be a part of the same question. Remove the noggin from the posterior!!!

They are two incredibly different aspects of the Internet, I do not understand how sharing content could be governed in a similar way to online violence (such as hate speech, or abuse). They should be governed separately.

They are very different things. One is a protection of commerce. The other is protection of people from harm. They aren't the same and shouldn't be treated as such,

They require different treatment. The social harms of extremism, hate speech and abuse are far greater than the harms of potential lost revenue due to copyright infringement. Furthermore, the victims of the first category are usually individuals,

whereas the victims of the second category are usually businesses - their interactions with other entities are markedly different.

They should not be classed as EXTREMISTS! No not the same laws at all. Because the powerful lobbyist have to much influence and created these draconian laws!!!!

They should not be governed by the same rules for the same reason that murder is more serious than shoplifting

They should not be governed by the same rules. Gov't should be concentrating on those extremists (etc) under specific laws including fining google, facebook, twitter etc for allowing extremists and others to post anything at all

They should not be governed by the same set of rules - they are quite different categories and therefore need quite different regulations, if and where regulations are needed.

They should not. It should always be possible to make fair use of music, art, videos, etc, for instance in articles, etc. Extremism, hate speech etc should not

This goes to the heart of the whole argument about how we treat crimes against property and crimes against the person. In my opinion the latter should always be seen as the more important although that is not to say that some protection for intellectual property should not be provided. However, corporations have huge resources to protect their property whereas individuals only have their own resources and those which the state chooses to apply to protect them.

This is a strangely worded question but yes I agree that sharing content should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech and abuse online. Aren't there enough laws already

existing to govern what is right and what is wrong? Why do we need new and improved laws when the old laws are far from busted.

This is a straw man question, ignored it

This is all about protecting commercial interests, and nothing about concern for the people. Extremism, hate speech, etc (movable targets in themselves) simply cannot be equated as the same thing as copyrighted pop videos.

This is difficult, as it can be hard to trace the originator of material, but I can readily see that they may want to be credited for their work. I would very much like to see a permanent, indelible credit applied to each work as it is first posted, so that not only can creativity be acknowledged, but so that it is possible to see if you are unwittingly reposting from a site you would prefer not to support (eg Britain First)

This is two different matters and should be treated as such.

This move will turn Europe into the kind of state as Russia under Stalin.:

This needs care. Sharing such material in a way that indicates approval is equivalent to creating it, whereas using to illustrate how unacceptable it is is just the opposite. The current rules on this sort of material are much too strict anyway. Such censorship should be confined to publication of material advocating or teaching criminal activity. Tolerance of offensiveness (including abuse) is the price which has to be paid for freedom of speech.

This should not be the business of the State;

Those should be separate rules since they are much different issues. First should be allowed, 2nd should never be allowed

To be brutally honest, ALL speech,

regardless of tone or color, should be subjected to the same rules across the board. If there are exceptions, then there will be loop holes that will be exploited for the benefit of a few, and to the detriment of the majority.

Too many laws that are not founded on fact and truth destroy our creative expression - and sovereign rights to explore the Earth.

Two words - FREE SPEECH.

Under some circumstances, sharing such material can promote sales (for example, there is some recent evidence of distribution companies publishing their material on torrent sites), so yes.

Unless there is evidence of a hate crime, I don't understand how property claims could fall under the same rules. We already have laws governing hate crimes and laws governing property claims

Use current laws to limit/stop abusive speech online and keep the internet a safe place to spend time. Do not create new laws for it.

Using archaic real world punishments for what is essentially free speech and content sharing, should not be tolerated and should not be encouraged

Wait, so we're treating cyberbullying, in which children have been known to be targeted so appallingly they take their own lives, with some technical breach of the law in which a large corporation is barely affected other than to have a bunch of their lawyers pretend to be outraged? Nope. Wrong.

We are free to speak, and free to ignore ideas we find repugnant. This being so, anyone in their right mind can reject hateful ideas when presented with truth. Abuse needs to be curbed, however freedom of speech must be preserved

We don't need a new system/laws for tackling abusive behaviour online. Our current legal system has already been established to ensure that free expression is possible within the laws of what is acceptable legal speech.

We have enough laws to prevent abuse

We have rights not to be misled and micro

We mostly share content online the same way we share stories at dinner parties or during conversation. It's not done to make money. If it was, it's an economic harm and should be treated accordingly but not with the same rules that we use to punish extremism for example. These are totally different topics.

We need rules, but one should not go to court martial for not buying bus ticket

we should at least have the right to be able to report such. What do you want? Throw us back to dark ages where only men ruled and women were mere means of a machine?

WE SHOULD BE ABLE TO EXPRESS ALL CONTENT FREELY UNLESS IT IS EXPRESSLY USED TO INTIMIDATE, HATE AND CAUSE CRIME

We should invest much more to moderation and deliberation than to building fences and road-blocks, everywhere, not only on internet

we should not be governed by the same rules as extremists, but, permissions for publishing 'owned' copyrights should be protected as they now are.;

We would be drawing attention to it, not promoting these ideas. Sometimes the ones who are the most extreme are the censors who block legitimate discussion, legitimate free speech and legitimate understanding which is not hate. Although I used to think

that human rights applied to all even if they were homosexuals, I now find that those who do not agree with the pushing of boundaries by the LGBT political agendas are being persecuted and subjected to hate speech. They are being denied human rights by the LGBT politicised agendas. The political fundamentalism we have seen over 4 decades has been just as frightening as the terrorists. ;

When copyrighted material is illegally shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework

Who decides? Under what pretext are those decisions made? I don't like the colour of your hair, your eyes, where is this going to stop? Extremism is always used as an example of reasons to restrict our rights! As if some bloody extremist is going to sit online and happily chat about their extremist views and decide to go and do some bloody awful thing to others! These despicable human beings have been doing this stuff since we threw rocks at each other, they found ways to contact each other then just as I'm sure they do now! Restricting everyone else to get at an extremely small minority is an atom bomb to crack a nut! Freedom of Expression is and should always remain a basic human right! I can't stand the present Government but they have every right to put their views out, so why can't the rest of us?

wholeheartedly agree

Why would the two even be conflated? They are two separate, albeit overlapping, concepts. Although the medium of racism or incitement could be pictures, videos, and blogs they wouldn't have to be. One is a partly question of financial or intellectual

interests in the content, the other a threat to social order and freedom. One is a question of economic resource, the other of potentially criminal behaviour

Why would you conflate the sharing of content illegally with hate speech or abusing another person online? The two things have NOTHING to do with one another except in some cases the location of the criminal. This suggestion is ridiculous

Yeah. Why on earth would you want to treat sharing content as a hate crime? They're totally different things and cannot be put in the same box. Why is this even a question?

Yes - a false comparison.

Yes - because not proportionate

YES - for the reasons set out in Q1 Q2 Q3 Q4 Legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment. Our laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. When copyrighted material is shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework.

Yes - sharing content should NOT be governed in any way. It is the heart and soul of the internet - SHARING. Extremism, hate and abuse should be monitored and removed, but that is not sharing. COMPLETELY different.

Yes - simply sharing content is a far cry from extremism, hate speech and / or abuse

yes - it is basically simple conversation

and information sharing though some rules should apply

Yes agreed. Today extremism and hate speech are loosely defined and targeted predominantly against one group. The authorities could decide to include anything in it, such as criticism of government, politicians or other ideologies in the future. The internet has been revolutionary in giving us access to alternative views that the MSM and governments would rather that we did not hear. In fact, I am certain that if governments can have their way they will use new laws to simply "ban truth telling".

Yes because for freedom of expression they need to be protected. It is dangerous if governments and multinationals can influence what we see and share, that is a loss of our democratic rights;

Yes Because it is none of those things

Yes because quite simply it is not the same thing and the temptation to misuse the rules will be significant.

Yes because the first is just a sharing of information the second is a promotion of Hate, the two are entirely different and should be treated differently

yes Because the sharing content could be simply an affirmation to the content, not specifically for or against the owner

Yes because there is no way to perfectly control content that has been made and when you release it you should know that. Hate speech and online abuse are far more damaging to a person than having their personal property stolen or looked at.

Yes because they are often not intended maliciously like extremism, hate speech, and online abuse are, so such punishment does not fit that 'crime'

Yes because they're 2 totally different categories. Sharing harmless (even if it is controversial) content is an expression of free speech and supports the ideology of democracy. Extremism, hate speech, and abuse is immoral, inhumane and degrades the good of civilization, goes against freedom and should be the only thing regulated on the Internet

Yes democracy depends on freedom of information

Yes Hate speech and abuse should not be tolerated if we are to have civilized debate and progress

Yes I agree that sharing content owned by others (pictures, videos, and blogs) should NOT be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online. They are obviously different issues that require different solutions.

yes I agree that they should be governed differently. what's the big deal to tell someone "Hey, check this out...<http://.....>" The big deal is that is our free speech that they are trying to take away! We need to take people who want all of this away!

Yes I agree that this kind of positive informative sharing should not be subject to the same legislation as that used to penalise the use of links for negative purposes. Positive link sharing has become a vital ways of sharing useful and informative information.

Yes I agree there should be different rules for that content. And The extremism, hate speech and abuse is intended to harm someone, the other isn't

Yes I agree, and because it's a total and utter false equivalence.

Yes I agree, for instance should those sharing a video of a new film trailer

for example be under watch the same as those getting people to go out and murder innocent people.

Yes I agree, it should not be because it is not of the same serious felony

Yes i agree, sharing get the original artist more exposure to prevent this would be at the cost of them

yes i agree. for reasons already stated, honest, thoughtful, opinions should be allowed as long as they are not threatening others or bullying others

Yes I agree. If those owners don't want to share their stuff, no-one is forcing them to do it in the first place

Yes I agree. It's completely different. When done properly (acknowledging the original author) sharing content usually helps everyone. There's no excuse for hate speech in any form.

Yes I do agree. Anything published to the internet in whole or in part should be classified as public domain material for anyone to use, particularly since it's readily available to billions of people in seconds and also in perpetuity. This was the original concept in the first place. Information Access. If people want to make money on their property, then they must provide a sample for free publically in order to encourage commercial sales.

Yes it is clearly not the same issue

Yes it should not be governed by the same rules that we use to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse online.because it is different from it

Yes it should not. The offence is with the original poster. extremism is a matter for careful judgement otherwise we will get more of the nonsense that Cameron

showed with his classification of anyone against bombing Syria as 'terrorist sympathisers'. we are purportedly living in democratic states with free speech held in high regard. we allow arbiters of this at our own peril.

yes it's called "free expression"

Yes Not that damaging to society

Yes of courses not, because the rules are not suitable for such application

Yes of course, given that such content is legal and that the sharer does not use the content in such a way as to be characterized as being extremist.

Yes sharing of knowledge, information and learning is paramount to an open and engaged society. Impeding access to this for the sake of a few under the guise of perceived lost financial opportunity is damaging to the rights of a just and open society wanting to better the general interest

Yes should NOT be governed by same rules as extremism, hate speech, and abuse online as these are disharmonious & divisive to mixed communities, let alone against the law.

Yes they definitely should, provided you are dealing with infants. But really, Elon Musk did not need to be very old before he was able to demonstrate the difference between reality and gaming. He will not be the only one. We must grow up in a world where we have a chance to become adults able to discern the difference between what has an impact and what will not help anyone. This can only happen if we learn of ideas strange to us and think them out. What we should have laws for is to ensure that a person owns their own data. If someone wants to store my date of birth, for example, I should

have the facility to rent it out to them.

Yes they should NOT be governed by the same rules

Yes, agree. Keep the Web free from snooping government and their agencies. Look out for 1984.

yes, all artists borrow from one another to a certain extent, so hate speech and hurtful speech is NOT that category of speech.... It's like putting innocent marijuana users in prison with the worst of the worst and mandatory minimum crap....We have way too much litigation in this country already for stupid stuff, and DA's wanting \$\$\$\$\$\$ and making names and advancement for themselves at all our expense....You only need to watch the doc on Aaron Schwartz to see the extent of that nonsense, the judicial system is truly berserk, one need only look at SCOTUS to see that

Yes, because alleged copyright infringement is of a completely different order. I'd crime--much less destructive--than hate speech and abuse.

Yes, because it's ridiculous.

Yes, because legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment. Existing laws have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. These laws should be used to curb abusive behaviour online, rather than creating a new system. When copyrighted material is illegally shared the harm is usually an economic and business one. However, extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, on individuals and society. These two issues do not fit under the same framework.;

Yes, because sharing content is a copyright issue and only subject to copyright laws

yes, because sharing is not abuse

Yes, because that is ridiculous

Yes, because they are not the same thing

Yes, because they are two very different things

Yes, but credit must always be given.

yes, copyrights are one thing but using rules to protect people's sovereignty to address civil matters is manipulating the system.

yes, for the same reason that we don't hang jaywalkers

Yes, for they are two separate issues and do not fit under the same framework. -The illegal sharing of copyrighted material results, usually, in an economic or financial harm. -While the extreme and abusive messages have a lifelong emotional and mental impact, both on individuals and society. There are currently existing laws that have been crafted with the delicate balance between free expression and legal speech in mind. They should be used to curb abusive behavior online, rather than creating a new system

yes, free speech is a sign of a developed civilisation

yes, freedom of expression is a democratic right.

Yes, hate speech and online abuse can lead to psychological problems or disorders

Yes, how can any right minded person mention the two things in the same sentence?

Yes, I agree because these are completely different crimes. Extremism, hate-speech and abuse are a direct attempt to stir up bad feeling in the community and bring harm to others. Sharing content owned

by others can be done for very good reasons, or at least for harmless ones

Yes, I agree that applying rules for anti-terrorism etc. to all content is ridiculous. Moreover, companies will probably find it loses them money in the end, because people will simply find it too difficult to recommend something they like to friends as they do currently by sharing a link. If it incurs a charge they won't do it - period.

Yes, I agree that it should not be governed by the same rules. Extremism, hate speech and abuse online have a lifelong emotional and mental impact on individuals and society while sharing copyrighted material illegally just has an economic and business harm which is not severe

Yes, I agree that these two issues should not be governed by the exact same rule. They are after all, completely different issues

Yes, I agree that we need separate rules for this. It should stay in the realm of corporate law and copyright management

Yes, I agree. As long as it does not intend to harm anyone, sharing content should be under different rules. How else can we find out about the rest of the world and keep updated?

Yes, I agree. Because sharing information is what freedom is all about

Yes, I agree. Innocently sharing photos is not the same as extremism, hatred or abuse.

Yes, I agree. It should be perfectly obvious why not, it's not the same level of seriousness at all.

Yes, I agree. This is fair use of content to further the culture

Yes, I agree. We are comparing apples and

oranges here. Extremism, hate speech and abuse can cause real damage to an individual/individuals, whereas the other is on the public domain where someone chose to put it on the public domain. We all have a choice. You don't want your pictures, video, blog to be shared, don't publish it on the public domain in the first place

Yes, I believe in that, because you are not making any direct harm to other people

Yes, I completely agree, freedom of expression is a main staple of democracy. Privacy is another but that's already gone.

Yes, I do believe it should be treated differently. This is because the content may not be being used for the original purpose or for a different reason and to shame rather than agree with the content creator if it is offensive. Furthermore, existing laws attempt to resolve this issue and balance between free speech and legal speech and should be used as opposed to creating an entirely different system. Any form of widespread censorship only gives credence to those who portray nasty and potentially offensive posts in the first place. In exceptional circumstances I do believe that posts should be removed or reported but this could be done through existing website infrastructure as opposed to a blunker system.

Yes, I mostly agree. But if it's someone's original work that the creator sells, it doesn't seem ok to pass it around for nothing. But that isn't usually the case - the sharing extends the audience for the works. It certainly isn't the same as hate speech or cyberbullying, etc.

Yes, I think the rules used to punish hate speech are becoming misuesd

Yes, I wholeheartedly agree that content sharing should not and CANNOT be

regulated by governments for ANY reason in ANY way. You cannot stop a grand mother from singing a Celine Dion song to her hand child at home

yes, it's an totally different level

Yes, it's called "fair use" and as long as it is not hate speech, abusive or some form of extremism it should be allowed to exist and roam freely in the online world

yes, its a free world;

Yes, not hate speech etc, just should say the source and author of content

Yes, sharing content by just linking to it is never a crime!

Yes, sharing content generally has nothing to do with the negative aspects of the internet mentioned above, why use the same rules? It is utterly perverse to equate hate speech etc to sharing content. Just greedy people trying to get more and more for themselves as usual, commodification and the ruining of the internet

Yes, sharing content is not the same thing as extremism, hate speech and abuse. Many content owners will not mind their content being shared. In fact most of them will welcome this free advertising and many depend on this type of publicity. Plus anything can be seen as content so this does not address any clear problem, but would harm many innocent internet users.

Yes, sharing content owned by others results primarily in economic/business related harm. The harm caused by extreme and abusive messages are more personal in nature, with mental/emotional repercussions which can last for years. Thus, the two issues should be considered separately-some rules might be the same for both, but each would also have its own rules

Yes, the question compares two entirely different things. The rules used to punish extremism, hate speech, and abuse are already too close to thought-crime as they are.

Yes, the same rules should be used, but recognising that there are two different areas here and the effects of any content has to be considered in the framework and the humour level of where it appeared

Yes, The spirit of sharing freely and generously is what makes the internet useful and strong. Courts can be used to take down extreme or abusive content. Everything else should be available for debate and wonder and information freely provided.

Yes, the systems should be separate. It should be possible to think of effective systems to monitor both types

Yes, there is no need to govern sharing of content of others unless it is obviously copyrighted. Separate rules are needed for hate and extremism

Yes, there should be different rules and a different process

Yes, this is an entirely different issue for society

Yes, we should have the right to express ourselves in any way we feel.

Yes, absolutely

Yes: we are not all out to destroy the world. Most of us want to spread the message of peace, love and all our cat pics, as well as keep in touch with family and friends. Maybe even make them laugh or think about things

Yes! Simply put, it's not a crime to share other peoples content as long

as the owner gets the credit

Yes. A separate set of rules needs to be created for content sharing.

Yes. Again, this would be seriously impede the freedom of sharing and accessing information, could be easily misused and would result in unfair and disproportional punishment

Yes. Are we stupid?

Yes. As children we're taught that sharing is a virtue, so this must be reflected in adult life.;

Yes. Because it's ridiculous to conflate the two

Yes. Because it's not the same thing

Yes. Because unless they are making from it, then it is free advertising for the content owner

Yes. Content sharing usually doesn't cause harm to people in general

Yes. Creative expression, ideas and information should flow as easily as possible while destructive extremism, hate speech and abuse should be fought at every turn.

Yes. Different issues

Yes. I don't want to lose freedom of expression in order to 'protect' myself/society from extremism, hate speech and abuse.

Yes. If it's fair use (or the local equivalent), then no permission is needed and no punishment is appropriate. Everyone must chill. If it's not fair use, it's merely copyright infringement, which is an entirely different category from hate speech and abuse. The boundary between what's protected by fair use and what exceeds fair use is fuzzy and

contestable. We cannot protect freedom of speech and punish speakers who can't find the line defining copyright infringement in the haze of legal uncertainty. Copyright infringement can be inadvertent, and reasonable people can disagree about it even after courts have ruled, and certainly before courts have ruled. None of this is like hate speech or abuse

yes. Internet is a free place. It should not be governed.

Yes. It's a completely different mattar. Producers have the right to receive their money for their work

Yes. It's people just sharing info

Yes. It's ridiculously out of order.

Yes. Legislators have a key role in making our digital sphere a safe space where individuals can be free from abuse and harassment.

YES. NOT THE SAME THING

Yes. open sharing advances the wellbeing of society. incitement to harm others, hate speech and abuse are detrimental to society. Extremism is a loaded word that should only be used in context

Yes. People say and do whatever they think is right or perceived to be inherently right. Copyright laws are arbitrary (as is freedom too) and limit creative expression for people to use. People should care for people not big business. Thank you.

Yes. Restrictions on freedoms of speech have never been a step forward.

Yes. Sharing content is at most an economic harm unlike abuse etc.

Yes. Sharing copyrighted content is unlikely to cause physical harm to others

and may be done without any intent to cause harm or achieve financial gain. It may be important to suspend abusive or threatening content quickly to reduce the risk of physical/emotional harm, while it would be more appropriate to wait for proof before removing copyrighted content. The threat of being treated the same way as an extremist or abuser could also stifle fair use of copyrighted content.

YES. Sharing information is what freedom is all about , and is not the same as Hate speech and abuse , and we must differentiate between the two.

Yes. The harm caused by sharing copyrighted content is not in the same category as the harm caused by sharing hate speech, abuse or extremism. These are two completely separate issues for which a very different balance needs to be struck by laws. It would be incompetent and/or immoral to require that the same laws be used.

Yes. The intention behind them is different

Yes. The Internet on post and sharing should be a RIGHT, not a privilege.

Yes. The motivations and impacts of these actions are extremely different and should therefore be governed by different laws

yes. there is a clear distinction between criminal and non-criminal activity and they shouldn't be governed by the same laws

Yes. These are entirely different matters and should be dealt with as such

Yes. These are separate issues, and should be treated as such

Yes. They are different. It would be like trying to apply road traffic laws to tax fraud cases. Those who thought of these potential laws are imbeciles.

Yes. They are not causing harm as hate speech etc do

Yes. This is certainly doing away with free speech, and should not be harmful to anyone--who should have known that anything they put on social media was open to anyone

Yes. We can share in person without being punished so why not online?

Yes. Why, because they are not necessarily one and the same

Yes.... "apples & oranges"

Yes.Because otherwise it would be to limiting

Yes.If they were published they were intended to be shared

Yes.The majority of us are regular folk.

Yes. The two issues are different. Existing laws should be applied in relation to abusive content. The ownership issue is primarily commercial and must not be linked with moral/legal issues which are more serious.

YesSharing information online keeps us closer to the principles of democracy that we have strived for over the years.

YesThe two are completely different. Infringing copyright is often a matter of ignorance, rather than intent. It is an economic issue, not an issue of an individual's or public safety. And it needs careful consideration of the different rights involved in each case - including fair use.

You're could be sharing the content with others for their opinion, or commenting on it. You are not necessarily promoting the material