

SUBJECT: DoH comments

FROM: John Carr <[REDACTED]>

TO: "[REDACTED]" <[REDACTED]>

DATE: 20/01/2021 01:34

Dear Mozilla,

I daresay if you had sat down to write your consultation document after 6th January 2021 you would have written rather differently in a number of places. You would certainly finesse the language, particularly in passages

“At the same time, we do not consider broad filtering and blocking through the DNS to be an appropriate means of ensuring online safety.....”

The Regal “we” fits entirely with the overall, sanctimonious tone of the remainder.

The aftermath of 6th January 2021 saw private entities silencing the President of the United States and shutting down a speech app (Parler) altogether or very substantially. In so doing Silicon Valley added in

The amount of sympathy I have for either Trump or Parler can be measured only in large minus quantities. The point is the egregious presumption of private bodies deciding to make public policies of fundamental importance to our whole way of life. De haute en bas they, and in this context that includes above us mere mortals and tell us when we meet their exacting standards.

A self-appointed, self-selecting techno priesthood has no right to set conditions on how the rest of us should keep our children safe when they go online.

I say that because how else should one interpret this?

*“Numerous ISPs today provide opt-in filtering control services, and our deployment of DoH is designed to respect those controls **where users have opted into them.**” (emphasis added).*

To put that slightly differently, you intend not to “respect” those controls where users have *not* “opted in” to a decree that one approach to child protection is acceptable and another is not.

Inertia is at the root of many evils in the internet space, particularly among the less literate and less knowledgeable people who are often also among the most vulnerable.

You seem willing to expose children to the risk of harm unless and until their parents get their act together and opt in to protective filters. Wrong answer.

Education and media literacy programmes are good and necessary, both for parents and children, but they are oblique and can be very slow acting. They are not a substitute for direct interventions of the kind provided by protection filters. And where is the evidence that there is any kind of significant scale of circumventing protection filters? Only anecdotal tittle tattle generally put about by highly tech savvy- people who don't like filters anyway. It is self-serving, deceptive nonsense.

Your attitude seems to be “not my problem”. Someone else needs to deal with that. Well they have, or they will.

Such attitudes illustrate very well the barbarism of laissez faire. It has no place in civilized society. The internet experiment that began with the development of TCP/IP has run its course. 6th January and everything

bots or similar? - discuss) but choosing to modify or abandon child protection filters is what should require, the act that overthrows inertia.

If a nation's laws permit ISPs or whoever to have default-on filtering solutions it is no business of yours conditions. I gather you intend to allow arrangements presently in place in the UK to continue, but please accept my gratitude from me.

UK-based ISPs and other online businesses domiciled here should not have to beg you to make an exception proving the UK is indeed a democratic country that honours the rule of law and habitually honours human rights.

Regards

John Carr