

**Public Comments on Internet Filtering  
from SJLibrary.org Online Feedback Form**

*Received from January 8, 2008 through March 13, 2008*

NAME: Eric

CITY\_ZIP: San Jose

COMMENTS: I think filters is a good idea for library computers, especially those that are accessible to children.

NAME: Seth

CITY\_ZIP: 94568

COMMENTS: There should be ZERO filtering on computers. If parents are worried about what their children may be viewing then they need to accompany them to the library and keep watch over their actions.

NAME: Tobias

CITY\_ZIP: San Jose

COMMENTS: Filters do nothing but make a big mess. It would just complicate things and there is always a way around them... People need to watch their kids a little closer and teach them things... LOTS of things...

NAME: Lionel

CITY\_ZIP: San Jose

COMMENTS: I oppose filters on library computers, not because of a desire not to protect minors, but that I don't believe any filter is good enough to work perfectly, yet still guarantee that legitimate material is not being excluded.

I believe the use of computers by minors should require parental or other adult supervision.

NAME: lorna

CITY\_ZIP: San Jose

COMMENTS: Information is power.

"If a nation expects to be ignorant and free, in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be. The functionaries of every government have propensities to command at will the liberty and property of their constituents. There is no safe deposit for these but with the people themselves; nor can they be safe with them without information. Where the press is free, and every man able to read, all is safe." - Thomas Jefferson ( and every woman able to read, of course!)

Education is the key, not censorship! No filters on adult material.

NAME: Kevin

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: While child safety is important, this responsibility should not be removed from the parents of those children. Not all citizens of San Jose and Santa Clara County have children in their families, and they deserve the completely open use of research tools like the Internet at Libraries that their tax dollars fund. A balanced solution would provide filtered Internet access on computers in children's areas only, or configuring computers to recognize a non-adult member login and activate a filter for these users only. More strict "system wide" restrictions are detrimental to tax-paying researchers, and serve only the purpose of parents unconcerned with informing their own children about responsible internet use; or too busy to prioritize their own children as important enough for parental supervision. Don't make other tax-payers pick up the slack for other lazy parents. A simple adult and non-adult login should solve this issue with little difference in cost than the proposed

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 2

measure, without restricting the research ability of all library patrons. As to concerns of children viewing unfiltered content over the shoulder of adult researchers; demand that parents take responsibility to educate or supervise their own children. Don't place this burden and restriction on all library patrons. Thank you for your consideration of the importance of parental responsibility and freedom of information.

NAME: Kathleen

CITY\_ZIP: 95128

COMMENTS: Please keep internet access open and free from censorship.

Refrain from using any type of filters or privacy screens in your public library.

Suggestion: Children can use the internet terminals in the children's library section with their parent(s) right sitting next to them. Finally, just by chance, I was at the MLK library the day that Pete Constant gave his press conference about the evils of pornography in the library. He was flanked by a woman and a cadre of children standing against the background of the American flag. Funny thing is that when I was doing research earlier on one of the upper floors, I observed the same children (3 or 4 elementary school boys) playing in the stacks and then chasing each other, running full bore, down the steps of the marble stairs.

My point in recounting this is that all parents need to monitor their children when they are in the library so it can be a (censorship) free library.

Sincerely,

/s/

NAME: Bob

CITY\_ZIP: 95125

COMMENTS: No filters. Filters are the same as censorship. If people are concerned about what their children are doing, they need to be there to supervise them, or teach them what is appropriate and then trust them.

NAME: Nancy

CITY\_ZIP: 95120

COMMENTS: I feel strongly that there should be internet filters on all library computers. I do not want my children or other's children to be exposed to pornography. I work very hard to shield my children from that on our home computers and at their friends' homes. I feel the library should be a safe place where my children will not be at risk of seeing inappropriate material.

NAME: Quentin

CITY\_ZIP: 95148

COMMENTS: It is not the Library's business to put barriers between people and the information they seek. Period, end of discussion. You say you want to 'protect' children from being exposed to pornography? Fine -- \*do it YOURSELF\*, rather than force uninvolved third parties (i.e., anybody other than you and your child) to do it \*for\* you. And don't use the force of law to impose \*your\* particular moral standards on \*everybody\*.

NAME: Michele

CITY\_ZIP: San José

COMMENTS: i think if you want to voluntarily filter something, fine. but don't put filters on everything. everyone has their own discretion on what they don't want to see. filters are faulty anyway. parts of the bible would be censored if we had them, as well as some people's names, like Ho, Hooker, Wang, etc. No mandatory filters. but please give us privacy screens we can use. that's all we need.

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 3

NAME: Bob

CITY\_ZIP: San Jose

COMMENTS: The SJPL should not be in the business of censoring content. The library may request parents either submit a letter specifying which sites they desire their offspring not view. The library can code this onto the minors' library card. When the minor logs on, those sites can be blocked. In the alternative minors can be restricted to the childrens' terminals in the kid room.

Also, you may want to review your restrictions on copying materials to CD/DVD from the Web. A lot of companies are putting training/product info online for their employees and contractors to download. Often times, I have been unable to download to this format from your system. This defeats the purpose of companies posting this material so folks can study at times convenient for them. Folks who have only dial-up access to their office/home units have to wait forever to download a file in PDF, flashplayer and/or podcast formats.

thank you

NAME: John

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: I am a resident of San Jose and a student of SJSU. I am writing this feedback not only as a concerned citizen but also as a student of the joint SJSU/MLK library. I am so concerned and disturbed about the fact that the main library lost its direction from becoming a SAFE place for everyone to go. To me this does not mean allowing visitors to view adult materials via the internet freely. And by providing the specialized screens does not stop the behavior but only attempts to hide it. I do not condemn the viewing of pornographic material on the internet but I do believe that there is a proper place and time for it...and the public space of the library is not the appropriate place for it. I am always scared when school is in session when I see young kids running through the library stacks feverishly looking for books or even being entertained by their favorite website but next to them is someone jerking off to porn. We have turned a blind eye to this for far too long! and I feel that we need to take action for the betterment of our kids.

Can you imagine this slogan to the young kids that tour the library during school trips: Come read our millions and millions of books and sit down next to pervert watching the new version of Bambi does Dallas! As much as I like free speech but when that speech begins to harm the kids that's where I draw the line. YES place the filters on those computers to not access pornographic materials. I did not vote to fund library measures so that kids can be corrupted while using the facilities.

NAME: Thomas

CITY\_ZIP: 95118

COMMENTS: I think that the internet should and needs to remain unfiltered. The city of San Jose is infringing upon our rights as adults to view certain material. If parents have objections to the material being viewed, they should and need to do their job to raise their kids in a better environment.

NAME: Kristin

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: Although in principle I would disagree with any filtering of the internet, in this case I believe a filtering (or some other method of limiting access) to pornographic material is appropriate. An alternative solution would be to allow "Adult" content to be available only on computers on floors unlikely to have young members (floors 6 and 7 for example). Although it doesn't exclude the possibility of younger members, these floors are primarily used by older library patrons so access to the adult material (and inappropriate behavior of users) would be limited to other adults primarily. I would support a site filtering policy for this material if other solutions are not feasible.

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 4

NAME: Angela

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: I have felt for a long time that filters should be placed on the library computers.

NAME: Joy

CITY\_ZIP: San Jose

COMMENTS: Our children need to participate in the discussion of evaluating the content of websites. The library personnel should be able to initiate this kind of discussion with unsupervised children because these are the kids who will have to evaluate web content for the rest of their lives, in school and out, for themselves. Library personnel are in positions of authority to teach patrons how to find and evaluate information in the new “self-service” age. Parents whose minor children attend the library are demonstrating trust in librarians, library technicians, and library assistants to facilitate information acquisition. Perhaps a “knowledgeable use” agreement could be reached with unsupervised minors accessing the Internet.

Computer users need to be taught how to use the computers and Internet users need to be taught how to use the Internet. Guidelines to evaluate content on the web include knowing how to find certain key information on a website, such as the author of the site, who the web page was intended for, and how to tell if the content is accurate and objective or a matter of opinion, as well as where to look for the date when the page was last updated and the different purposes of sites ending in edu, gov, mil, org, and com.

While I respect the opinion of those who wonder if the library can function as a Safe Place for unsupervised children and, at the same time, offer free access to web content, I think that the use of filters is a mistake. Filtering technology consists of software created by people to limit the parameters of what other people should see. Who are these people who hold themselves above the rest of our free society by setting parameters for our children? All the members of a democratic society should decide what we should see – not have it decided for us. Children need the guidance of their parents, their teachers, and their librarians to learn a transparent process to access the information that can be used to evaluate for themselves the value or truth of text and images.

It is public knowledge that the Communications Decency Act of 1996 was found to be unconstitutional on June 27, 1997 when the U.S. Supreme Court stated, “The interest in encouraging freedom of expression in a democratic society outweighs any theoretical but unproven, benefit of censorship.” I agree with the library policy that is stated on the web page from which I accessed this form, “Responsibility for safe use of the San José Public Library and its resources is a cooperative effort among users, parents and library staff.” It is my judgment that this cooperative effort is a worthwhile effort that leads to American citizens who grow up learning to evaluate information in the world around us.

NAME: Jody

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: I think this is a very good idea and I strongly support filters on library computers. As a mom of young kids, I am in favor of public institutions taking responsibility to implement security on technology they offer to the public. I know tons of teens who use the libraries after school, and I think filters would be helpful for all parties involved.

NAME: me

CITY\_ZIP:

COMMENTS: i think we should see as many bad words as we can

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 5

NAME: Max

CITY\_ZIP: San Jose

COMMENTS: Filters should be an optional feature on a per user account basis. By default, no filters are active. A user can activate filters for his/her account.

NAME: Rick

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: I teach at a public middle school and we wouldn't think if NOT having filtering. I strongly believe the public library should have filtering on hate, violence, and sexual material. This is not a freedom issue, it's a common sense issue.

NAME: Daniel

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: Pornographic material is harmful to young minds and definately needs to be filtered.

NAME: Allen

CITY\_ZIP: 95131

COMMENTS: Dear Sir/Madam,

Librarians are requiring library cards on computers which violates the Open Access Policy at the Berryessa Library. Please fix this problem or else I will file a complaint

NAME: Melissa

CITY\_ZIP: 95122

COMMENTS: I think that filtering is an extremely bad idea, however, it may be a necessity on the 12 and under only computers. I believe that filtering undermines the belief in intellectual freedom and I strongly believe that all adult computers should remain unfiltered. If children 12 and under need to use these computers to do research without being limited by the use of filtering software then they should have a parent present to okay their usage of these computers. Sadly, it is not reasonable to ask parents to take part in watching over their children's internet use. While I think it is a parents responsibility to do so and to be aware of what their children are doing online at the library, it's just not going to happen. Not enough parents care or maybe just don't think to pay attention to what their kids are doing on the computer in a public library. Half the time children playing on the computers in the library don't even have a parent with them in the library at the same time. Sadly, this is just reality, and therefore the library may need to, in this instance, step in to protect children using the computers set aside for them. I commend the library employees in their diligence in keeping adults off and away from the children only computers and areas but I think more steps may need to be taken in the future to protect younger children from inappropriate websites.

NAME: yasir

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: Any1 is allowed to access ALL kinds of information on Internet,the PROBLEM is NOT internet it is its usage. The only concern is with the children,that I agree can be best dealt with Specialized Monitor screens and thats it! Moreover, we need to have much open debate in the society about the adult contents and its "CONSEQUENCES" with our children,they are gone a do any way somewhere it doent have to be your library,You cant stop this new generation acquisition. The best way is to 'deal' with it rather steal away from it!

NAME: Tim

CITY\_ZIP: 95126

COMMENTS: The SJPL rules and policies in place right now are entirely adequate. Parents who do not trust their children to stick to appropriate sites when using the internet should not get them a library card. And parents who DO get them a library card should have "the talk". In short , this is a

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 6

parental responsibility issue. Sure, library staff should take reasonable action to prevent or deal with overt inappropriate behavior in the library; and library staff is doing so. Filtering, restricting access, over library computers would be unreasonable, and in my opinion violates the supreme law of the land, meaning the Constitution and the First Amendment (granted I'm not a Supreme Court Justice). This is a "sexy" issue, literally and figuratively, and governmental leaders naturally want to protect children. But in this case children are adequately protected with the rules already in place.

NAME: Allen

CITY\_ZIP: 95126

COMMENTS: Dear Folks,

I grew up in Mill Valley. As a late teenager I remember taking the bus up to San Rafael for a visit to the County Library. I was concerned that my sexuality did not seem to be the norm and wanted to find information on male sexual identity and homosexuality. After digging through the card catalog and searching the stacks (no way could I ask a librarian for help with this topic) I came up with two books that seemed wholly lacking but were the only thing they had. I remember how trapped and alone I felt; there was no one I could talk to, least of all my parents! At the time (and may well still be) suicide over sexual identity issues was the main cause of death for teenagers in my age group. I was such a protected Christian teen that I almost did commit suicide on two occasions.

If I were that same teenager making my pilgrimage to the San Jose Library today and did a little google I would quickly find out information on local counseling resources at the Billy De Frank Community Center and be still my hart their, youth group. I would also have access to the worldwide youth movement that has a substantial LGBT content and contact possibilities. In under half an hour I could find out that I was a perfectly normal gay youth.

The above was the first thing that went through my mind when I heard about this filter idea. We all know that there are hundreds of possibilities, medical and emotional that the right information may sooth. And, of course there are all those things folks worry about. It is a fact that sex and related topics are the number one requests to the search engines. As the library had not turned into a brothel since the advent of the Internet and freedom of speech is a cornerstone of our constitution I strongly urge keeping the net connections the way they are.

Sincerely,

/s/ [Note: library card # removed]

NAME: Robert

CITY\_ZIP: San Jose

COMMENTS: Heck no! This would block the majority of the art sites I go to, not to mention the fact that patrons should be allowed to search for anything and everything at their public library.

NAME: Crystal

CITY\_ZIP:

COMMENTS: I believe bona fide pornography should always be blocked from being viewed in the public library system.

NAME: Susan

CITY\_ZIP: 95127

COMMENTS: The internet should not be filtered at any public libraries. The library is a place where you can go to find information without any restrictions. If we allow filters on porn, soon it will escalate to filters on this or that; whatever people decide they don't like at the moment.

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 7

NAME: Viet

CITY\_ZIP: 95123

COMMENTS: Remove internet access from all sjlibrary computers. Don't waste money on the filtering software. It won't block everything. Web email attachments with porn would be able to get through. Or just disable display of images in the web browsers.

NAME: Sherry

CITY\_ZIP: 95126

COMMENTS: Filters should not be required!!!!

NAME: Thomas

CITY\_ZIP: 95014

COMMENTS: I am appalled by the idea of filtering content at the San Jose Public Library. Users should be treated as responsible adults with the freedom to browse the internet as necessary without having to worry about arcane filters and restrictions. It would be completely appropriate to revoke internet usage privileges for those users who abuse the internet at the library. It would not- and is not- however, appropriate to put content filters in place.

Thank you for your time,

/s/

Cupertino, CA

NAME: Kevin

CITY\_ZIP: 95111

COMMENTS: I think I does not make anything different with the filter on or off. Once someone turn on porn pix or video, the people around still can see it too.

NAME: Ramon

CITY\_ZIP: 95135

COMMENTS: I am in favor of the proposed Internet Access Policy. I am actually surprised that the current policy leaves it to the student and their parents/guradian to filter themselves. We all know that this will not work.

NAME: Quynh

CITY\_ZIP: 95122

COMMENTS: I oppose the proposal of placing internet filters in computers of libraries. The reason is people should be able to have the freedom to access whatever they choose. People who can't access at home are likely to use computer in the libraries. And this proposal takes away their chances to be able to connect. I also know that not every computers in libraries can access to the Internet. I think that's restriction should work just fine. There is no need to add filtering system to all computers.

NAME: Mike

CITY\_ZIP: 95123

COMMENTS: I do NOT want to see filters on library computers. Better to DISCONTINUE the practice of providing internet access at Libraries. Let some other forum practice the censorship being proposed. Libraries maintain collections of printed matter that many people thought should be censored in the past - thankfully not every copy of Tom Sawyer was burned by such well-meaning people! I have used computers at work that have been filtered by various different software over the past 10 years - NONE of them work well. I've seen co-workers accessing the worst kind of trash - while sometimes the filters won't allow me access to my own Email because the word "Juno"

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 8

triggers their idiot response to block it - I have no idea why. We are currently unfiltered but I'm sure someone will keep looking for new ways to tell others what to see and hear.

NAME: Donald

CITY\_ZIP: 95136

COMMENTS: Filters are a reasonable step to keep viewing areas in proper decorum. Since there is little or no shame in the people that view such sites in public, it is incumbent on the library to take this step for the public good.

NAME: Sarah

CITY\_ZIP: 95117

COMMENTS: I think filtering the library computers is appropriate. People of all ages and maturity levels are exposed to the information on the internet in these public places, but this information is not necessarily age or maturity level appropriate.

NAME: Glenn

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: As a SJSU student, I believe it is very important that the internet in the library remain unfiltered so that the place where students go to learn remains unencumbered by systems that will always be flawed. Judging what is appropriate is always a very gray area, and is a slippery slope into further restrictions on what should be a totally free source of information. Looking to outside sources shows that there are many problems with internet filtering, China being a great example with their massive firewalling of banned sites. People will always be restricted from legitimate content, and those with less than perfect intent will find ways to circumvent these filters.

NAME: robert

CITY\_ZIP: 95122

COMMENTS: i agree the Policy should be amended.

NAME: rachel

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: I believe that the internet policy for the San Jose Public Library should remain the same. Unlimited access for the internet allows the intellectual freedom for all users.

NAME: Barbara

CITY\_ZIP: 95124

COMMENTS: The public library system is just that - a publicly used system with a vast variety of books and reading materials. To limit internet access with filters violates the rights of our citizens and assumes that children are freely accessing inappropriate sites. Filtering systems are not the answer. First of all most either filter too much or not enough and who is to decide what is the right filter. Are we then going to form another committee to decide what is best for the public? And spend taxpayer's money doing a study of the kinds of filter systems? Let's let the public choose what they want to research on the internet and expect parents/teachers to supervise their own children as they do at home and in the classroom.

NAME: Jack

CITY\_ZIP: 95126

COMMENTS: I am a frequent (weekly) user of both the King Library and the Rosegarden Branch. I have never encountered anyone viewing porn on the computer screens. It strikes me as a waste of money to spend \$200K on internet filtering software to "solve" a non-issue. I would rather see the money spent on collections. It is up to parents to accompany their children to the library and control

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 9

the behavior. It should NOT be the role of the library and its staff to act as parents. Please keep open access to the internet available at the San Jose libraries.

NAME: Melinda

CITY\_ZIP: 95110

COMMENTS: I would like to see SJ not censor the use of our public computers in our libraries and support freedom of speech. I think the burden should be put on the user for adhering to existing library policies and the library for upholding these policies. Especially in a research environment at a university, internet filters can interfere with valid research. Speaking as a former SJ library commissioner, a student and a mother, I do not support a system-wide internet filter.

NAME: Stuart

CITY\_ZIP: 94061

COMMENTS: Dear Sir/Madam -

As a software developer who has implemented internet filtering systems for educational institutions in the Bay Area, I am confident that the use of filtering technologies in research institutions such as libraries raises concern. Filtering technology is far from perfect. Universally, the technology typically applies statistical analysis against the content (web page) along with comparison against a blacklist (disallowed sites) and a whitelist (allowed sites). Statistical analysis is not 100% accurate. Typically, 5% to 10% of user requests will be falsely blocked by the software, hindering access to relevant and lawful information (a false positive). Conversely, a percentage of content that the filter is targeted to address will be allowed to pass due to the unreliability of statistical analysis (a false negative).

Whitelists (web sites explicitly allowed) and blacklists (web sites specifically disallowed) are also of significant concern. Typically maintained by a third party, these lists are known to be inaccurate and are used to censor information which is deemed unpalatable to the political leanings of the controlling organization.

Web sites which have been blocked by various companies include, but are not limited to:

- \* The website of the Vatican
- \* Sites involving Gay and Lesbian issues, such as the National Journal of Sexual Orientation Law
- \* The Heritage Foundation
- \* The National Organization for Women
- \* Websites of competing organizations
- \* Websites of organizations which criticize the use of filtering software

Furthermore, the use of content filtering software is of questionable constitutionality within a library. *Reno v. ACLU* cites that the use of such a system in a public library represents a hinderance to the First Amendment. In addition, case law in *US v. American Library Association* states that an adult user must be able to request the disablement of the filtering software without having to explain cause. This was upheld in *Sarah Bradburn et al v. North Central Regional Library District*.

The cold reality of the matter is that the use of filtering technologies in libraries is akin to broad censorship. San Jose's Public Library System - particularly, the King Library represents a crown jewel of the public libraries in our Nation. Implementation of filtering is a slippery slope, which would erode the fundamental values of unfettered access to information and learning that represent the foundation of your institution.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/

NAME: James

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: I am completely opposed to internet filters. My reasoning for this is twofold, I do not believe they are effective and they end up preventing legitimate use. Filters are typically setup based on keywords and broad topics. The companies running the filters have no contact with the people who are trying to do research, often very personal research.

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 10

I do not want the government telling me what I can and cannot look at in the library.

Who will determine what is to be filtered? I think this is the most important point for me. Who determines what is to be restricted, and what is the process to get something unrestricted? I do not doubt that if filtering becomes the norm it will be influenced by political motivations.

There is no fair way to censor the internet, so don't do it.

NAME: Brian

CITY\_ZIP: 95133

COMMENTS: I am against internet filtering in general because the technology is not advanced enough to distinguish between legitimate research and pornography. Someone could be doing research on breast cancer only to be blocked because of the word "breast." A possible compromise would be to a) install privacy screens on all computers, and b) have separate computers designated for children only, which would have these internet filters. But adults and college students having to contact library staff everytime they need to do research, is quite frankly stupid and a waste of librarian's time.

NAME: Christopher

CITY\_ZIP: 95126

COMMENTS: I understand the emotions behind the proposals - no parent wants their children exposed to material that is too mature to them. However, I urge the City to resist the temptation to solve this problem through preemptive censorship. Libraries should not be gatekeepers responsible for enforcing what material can and cannot be viewed by its patrons. By creating a "big brother" type of atmosphere, users attempting to access legitimate information may be discouraged from their research. If there is a problem, it is best to solve by working with the child, not preventing free access by all users.

NAME: Daniel

CITY\_ZIP: 95002

COMMENTS: I want to keep the internet policy as is. No filters. As a gay man, I feel that if I want to do research, into the gay culture, that the filter would limit me. I'm aware that pornography at the library is a problem, but limiting a tool as the internet, is not the way to go.

NAME: Roy

CITY\_ZIP: 95136

COMMENTS: Since you already block all FTP traffic at my Edenvale branch, seems like you might as well filter out a subset of potentially offensive websites as well. Just get it down to a handful of websites people can access, to minimize bandwidth usage as well as cut down on your monthly Internet costs.

NAME: DM

CITY\_ZIP: 95118

COMMENTS: Whatever happens, never get yourself into a position where you are committed to maintaining flawless filters to prevent inappropriate content from being available on Library computers. Someone will find a way through the filters, and you are on the hook for software that you didn't write.

Say that you will "Make a reasonable effort, but we will still rely on parents and adult guardians..." or something similar.

Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 11

NAME: Sudha

CITY\_ZIP: 95127

COMMENTS: There should be no restrictions / filters / monitoring on the PCs used by adults or for general access. This is a 1st amendment issue and amounts to invasion of liberty otherwise. Perhaps filters could be used in children's and Teen areas but this fact should be posted on the PCs. Ideally no policing by the City council or library is best.

NAME: Jean

CITY\_ZIP: 95125

COMMENTS: I do not believe there should be filters. Children are the responsibility of their parents; they should not use the library as a babysitting facility. I do not believe it is acceptable to have different filtering standards in the branches vs. main. It is an unfair burden on users to require those with searches that are affected by the filters to have to go to San Jose Main. A filtering system may allow parents to think their child is "safe" on line, when in fact, their greatest risk is among users of sites such as facebook and various chat rooms. Children should be supervised by their parents. No technology can replace that.

NAME: Jon

CITY\_ZIP: SANTA CLARA

COMMENTS: filters would be a bad idea. It would limit freedom of exploration.

NAME: Linda

CITY\_ZIP: 95126

COMMENTS: I do not cede my parental rights to the San Jose Library or the City of San Jose. The existing policy is fine. Leave it alone. The responsibility for what my children experience when we are out in society is mine, and mine alone. I will not support any trend toward "nanny government".

NAME: THERESE

CITY\_ZIP: 95148

COMMENTS: THERE ABSOLUTELY NEEDS TO BE FILTERS IN THE LIBRARY. I HAVE 2 TEENAGE SONS, AND I CERTAINLY WOULD NOT WANT THEM OR ANYONE ELSE HAVING ACCESS TO PORNOGRAPHY. THE LIBRARY IS NO PLACE FOR THIS!!!

NAME: Jerry

CITY\_ZIP: 95136

COMMENTS: It is critically important to prevent access by anyone to pornography in the Library System. My tax dollars should not be used to fuel the derogation of our society by permitting this so called "freedom." Freedom to inflict harm on our citizenry is not a freedom contemplated by our founding fathers. There are sufficient ways for these poor people to access this mind drug elsewhere.

NAME: Ken

CITY\_ZIP: 95125

COMMENTS: I do not support any sort of filtering for library computers. It appears to me to be a solution in search of a problem, and not finding one; a solution that is doomed to fall seriously short of its stated goal; a solution which will create its own concatenating slew of problems.

NAME: Laurie

CITY\_ZIP: 95124

COMMENTS: While there are valid reasons to allow free and non-restrictive access to library users, I do not believe that this applies to children and potential access to pornographic or other harmful information on the internet and so would be very much in favor of a change in policy.

Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 12

NAME: Kimberly

CITY\_ZIP: 95131

COMMENTS: The internet is really good and helpful with my own laptop. I can even work in the Berryessa Library in the quiet study room.

I didn't have any problem with the internet.

NAME: Suzanne

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: Even though I am a journalism student and an advocate of the First Amendment and free access of information, I do believe that things like porn sites should be monitored and filtered in public areas. Perhaps that makes me prudish, but I would not want children to look over the shoulder of a stranger and see something they are not ready to see. Images are more powerful than words and they will stick with a child for a long time. I also would guess that about 98% of people who look at porn in public libraries were not doing it for legitimate research.

You have to find the right filters that will set an appropriate amount of blockage -- someone looking up a chicken breast recipe shouldn't be denied access because of the "breast" keyword. That's my main concern. How will you reassure the public that the software you use will be appropriate and will block only what you say will block?

That burden falls on the library's shoulders, just like other libraries across the nation. San Jose is a unique location in that we revel excessively in our civil liberties, so perhaps your job will be more uphill than other libraries who already had to go through this process. But I am sure the staff of the city, SJSU and the library will come to a logical solution that works best.

Thank you for providing this feedback forum.

NAME: dan

CITY\_ZIP: 95120

COMMENTS: I believe it makes sense to limit access. I find it ludicrous that some claim "free speech" as why it shouldn't be limited. I've asked people in public places to stop their "potty mouth" if my children are with me. I see limiting computer access as the same thing. Do that stuff in your own place and time.

As an aside, I limit my children's access to our computer by not only what sites they can go to, but also by the time they can be logged on. The computer is in a public place (family room) so that we can monitor their activities during the limited time that they do have.

NAME: Nina

CITY\_ZIP: 95132

COMMENTS: Keep internet access available without filters. freedom of access is important

NAME: melanie

CITY\_ZIP: 95037

COMMENTS: I think that all computers should have internet access in libraries because the internet is a great research tool. ALong with the internet access, all computers should have e-mail capabilities as e-mail is a valuable source to back up your work so that you can send your word files to yourself and save it that way.

NAME: Michael

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: This is censorship - period. It is the parents responsibility to supervisor their children's internet usage, not the San Jose Public Library System. Thank you.

Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 13

NAME: beth

CITY\_ZIP: 95123

COMMENTS: i wouldn't mind if they made some modifacations, as long as I can still get on youtube.

NAME: Claire

CITY\_ZIP: 95119

COMMENTS: I beleive that there should be filters on the Library computers. I see no reason that anyone should be looking at Porn, etc on Public computers. The FAQ mentioned screens around the computers, but that might not prevent someone else from seeing the content. Thanks, /s/

NAME: Eric

CITY\_ZIP: 95125

COMMENTS: I am extremely opposed to the idea of requiring filters on library computers. A library should be a place where patrons have access to information; policies limiting that access are, in my opinion, dangerous. I recognize that the Internet contains material and images that some (even many) people would find offensive. I do not, however, believe that brief exposure to this material can somehow "damage" a person. The library already has policies to deal with people creating a disturbance, so why impose further restrictions? I consider this proposal little more than a thinly-veiled attempt to dictate what people "ought" to be able to see. This is not something that a library should do.

NAME: Joi

CITY\_ZIP: 95127

COMMENTS: Please keep access unfiltered. Parents should be responsible for minor's access, not the City of San Jose. City and State limits on access seems more like an action taken in China, not the US.

NAME: K N

CITY\_ZIP: 95125

COMMENTS: Broad filters on those computers in the Teen/Youth section would be beneficial. But no filters on those computers in the Adult section

NAME: Krista

CITY\_ZIP: 95120

COMMENTS: I agree with the proposal. I visit the library frequently with my children, and want to protect them from distrurbing images and content.

NAME: Donna

CITY\_ZIP: 94709

COMMENTS: I am only an advocate for filters on the library's computers if access to certain things such as my space, etc.. is not blocked. Filters often block a variety of sites that are not pornographic or inappropriate for minors. If we restrict access to certain websites that people who have no computers at home need access to, what are they to do. THE library is directly cutting off access to certain things and in essence not serving the entire community, but just a part if filters are filtering out more than inappropriatte materials. A library is meant to serve it's local community, users and non users alike. I am a supporter of intellectual freedom and feel that the SJlibrary really needs to be careful in the steps it takes to decide whether to place filters on computers. This may also be an issue for librarians who work at SJlibrary, who assumingly are supporters of intellectual freedom, may struggle with censorship within the walls of the institution where they work.

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 14

NAME: Matt

CITY\_ZIP: 95128

COMMENTS: Unfamiliar with the restrictions in place that would be implemented, however if we are talking restrictions to various sites such as Myspace and Facebook like other libraries in this state then I am against it. Sometimes a quiet afternoon watching YouTube videos or checking messages or updating profiles is a relaxing way to go about your day. As far as other sites such as sites like pornography and the like should be viewed in the privacy of the user's own home and not in a public area where a minor may unwillingly or unintentionally view or see graphic acts or descriptions that may cause legal trouble. I wish the SJ Public Library the best in finding the most suitable solution in this matter.

/s/

NAME: Ehong

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: The public library should be a welcome place for people of all ages. By taking away one part of the public library system, unrestricted internet access, you are paving the road for future censorship. People visit libraries to research, read, and learn. If age is the problem concerning the filters, then the problem should be tackled in that manner. Children age 13 and higher should be allowed Internet access and be accompanied by an adult. I do not know why young children would be at the library alone unless they're doing research. If second-hand porn is the problem, then adjust the height of the computers. Raise the terminals so young children will have problems accessing them, unless they sit on an adult's lap. Do not take away our Internet, there are chairs designed for children in the children's section. Why not have chairs designed for adults in the adult section as well.

NAME: Kate

CITY\_ZIP: 94536

COMMENTS: I think that all library computers shouldn't be filtered. There are many legitimate reasons for people to be viewing things that could be blocked by a filter, such as students (I am one) doing research for various classes. Libraries should not practice censorship! Information should not be withheld from consenting adults. However, I know that little children need to be protected, so maybe the computers in the children's section could have a filter. If filtering occurs in other areas, users should know they are being blocked from accessing sites, and they should have the option to request an override from a librarian, after they show that they are over 18 (with a driver's license), or if they are an SJSU student. Or, if filtering is going to occur, there should also be an area that people can use to access the unfiltered internet somewhere in the library. Maybe that area wouldn't be on the first few floors, but it should exist. SJSU students need unfettered internet access in order to learn to the fullest extent!

NAME: Kendra

CITY\_ZIP: 95138

COMMENTS: I don't think the library or city should waste its money on something that is not needed.

NAME: nathan

CITY\_ZIP: 95136

COMMENTS: Just as the Supreme Court cannot come up with a competent definition of pornography, so too will you be unable to come up with an unambiguous definition of what to censor. Actually implementing filters that would prevent anyone who wanted to view pornography from viewing it, all for the sake of protecting children, would be starting down a slippery slope where banning any content could be justified if one believed it harmed the children. The fact such events rarely happen should have tipped off the city on the unimportance of the problem, but considering

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 15

motions have already been put in place to debate such a thing, I offer a solution. I have used a computer with a privacy screen before. I had no idea such devices even existed. In an age of obtrusive and pervasive surveillance, I was surprised how secure I felt using that public computer. Those screens will be your best solution.

NAME: sophia

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: I think the screen filters are really a waste and stupid because people can see everything even with the screens on. Those filters dim the lights, and they are not good for people with poor vision. The filter screens hurt my eyes.

NAME: brian

CITY\_ZIP: 95125

COMMENTS: First Amendment for everybody to get information at public library. Filter screens are useless-- they are not blocking anything

NAME: C J

CITY\_ZIP: San Jose, CA

COMMENTS: I am all for library filters.

NAME: Phil

CITY\_ZIP: 95120

COMMENTS: I am a firm believer in the First Amendment AND I would like the SJPL institute an Internet policy in keeping with CIPA. Other towns and cities, even Santa Cruz, haave done so. If folks wish to view porn, they may do so in the privacy of their own homes.

NAME: James

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: I strongly feel that anyone of any age should have the same amount of access. The policy should be towards "openness" and that the responsibility for it's use or abuse lays with the client. Anything else smacks of censorship.

NAME: Robert

CITY\_ZIP: 95111

COMMENTS: I am opposed to the idea of having filters on all Internet terminals in the library. I believe it is opposed to the spirit, if not the letter, of the Supreme Court's decision on this matter. Adults should have unfettered access to the Internet, and if they have to ask to have a filter removed, that puts a chilling effect on their free exercise of their rights.

NAME: Mike

CITY\_ZIP: 95129

COMMENTS: I am a firm believer that parents should have the ability to control their children's access to material to whatever extent they deem necessary. I believe filters should be put on all public library access to limit the access of all people under the age of 21.

In addition I don't believe those over the age of 21 should be viewing adult material (sexual, violent, vulgar or pornographic) at the library. If they want to find that type of material they can pay for it privately. There is no reason anyone should expect my tax money to be used to provide them access to that type of material. I am adamantly opposed to our library resources being used for access to sexual, violent or vulgar web sites by anybody, regardless of age, and I am especially opposed to allowing children to have this type of access. There are horrible things on the internet, the viewing of

Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 16

which I would not wish on my worst enemy. I do not want one cent of my tax money contributing to children or adults seeing these disturbing images, words or movies.

Sincerely,

Mike /last name/

SJ Resident since 1993

Thanks, /s/

NAME: Roger

CITY\_ZIP: 95008

COMMENTS: The accessibility to the internet as a library service would be compromised by installation of any filtering systems strictly imposed as a method of controlling content. Please keep our access unfettered as any freedom-loving society would intend. This would be only the first step toward continual revision of our access as more and more "objectionable" content would be targeted. (Censorship can creep in on little cat's feet as well as being announced with a trumpet's blast.)

NAME: Michael

CITY\_ZIP: 94085

COMMENTS: The Library should absolutely, positively put filters on the workstations' internet access. Not only to protect our children from stumbling over pornography, but also to limit the access of pornographic material from individuals who might harm others or themselves after viewing this material, commit lewd acts, sexual assault, etc. Additionally, in the event there is a false positive id for pornographic material, there should be an override functionality provided to library staff to enable access when a patron alerts them to the false positive.

NAME: Mara

CITY\_ZIP: 95122

COMMENTS: No one should be able to access pornographic material on Library computers.

NAME: Elaine

CITY\_ZIP: 95128

COMMENTS: No filtering - this is a proposal similar to making a mountain out of a molehill. If anything, when kids see unsavory things on others' computer screens in a public place like the library (or an airport or anywhere people mill around and inadvertently look at other people's stuff), it would be a good opportunity for parents to have a "teachable moment" as in: tell the kids that pornography is bad or whatever you want the kids' morals to be, and say that grownups sometimes make bad choices, but in your family you don't agree with that, and therefore the kids should not go to those sites. This is not an issue for government to be the teacher. This is a personal issue, and filtering is a bad suggestion by a councilmember who seems to like to get media attention for being the "leader" when, in fact, he doesn't think before he speaks. Pretty dumb idea....and I don't want him or his cronies making decisions about what I can and cannot see. He's not my father, and I'm glad about that!

NAME: Holly

CITY\_ZIP: 95032

COMMENTS: The filters are ABSOLUTELY NECESSARY. Thank you for adding them.

NAME: Steve

CITY\_ZIP: 95128

COMMENTS: I am an IT specialist and a 20 year internet user. I agree with the PDF I read regarding the impossibility of providing a sanitized internet, just as the books on the shelves are not

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 17

censored. Particularly with the agreement established with SJSU, you can not provide an academic resource that includes censorship, without crippling the academic benefit provided by that resource. Access to sites regarding health, biology, sexuality and relationships would be so severely curtailed as to be worthless. The children's computers have only local games and no net access; teens must be responsible as taught by their parents & guardians and are defacto young adults to be dealt with if acting out of line in the library environment. As the librarian's report states, there are no useful censorship solutions that permit reasonable academic research. Even though I do not use the branch library's internet access, I would not wish it upon any patrons (or the library staff) to try to navigate around the burden caused by any known censorship solution.

NAME: Mary

CITY\_ZIP: 95124

COMMENTS: I oppose the use of filters in the adult areas of the library. It is my understanding that filters are text based and do not filter out graphics. The chances of legitimate research being blocked is increased with filter use and not in the public interest. Freedom of information and inquiry are essential to maintaining healthy social discourse. As a parent I understand worries over children's internet use and support filter use on computers in children's areas. Director Light is correct that lewd incidents have occurred long before the internet came along. With a proactive staff and history of few problems, I see no reason for the added expense of requiring filters on adult computers.

NAME: Leslee

CITY\_ZIP: San Jose 95126

COMMENTS: I oppose the proposed use of library filters.

NAME: Ernesto

CITY\_ZIP: 95135

COMMENTS: I think the less filters the better. Our society is based on the free flow of information. Although I too am concerned about children, my solution is more low tech. Parents need to take greater responsibility for their children, both in using the internet and being aware about their children's whereabouts. I firmly believe that greater parental supervision is the key.

NAME: Sstoz

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: TWIMC: It is a danger to any republic for self-appointed arbiters of public morality to put limits on access to information, regardless of their reasoning or political background. Even for those who are willing to sacrifice the public's free access to information, internet filters will not fulfill this task. As the Library's own research has shown, the filters are simply not accurate enough: not only do they over-block, they also under-block (presumably this is undesirable to would-be censors). Over-blocking is a travesty for those wishing to do unfettered research, and the facility with which filters can be fooled makes a mockery of the proposal. This is particularly troublesome given the expense of a product that does not work as it is purported to. Not only do filters not block accurately, the proposed system would put an unreasonable burden on both the patron and the staff. All this when there is an extant, functioning protocol for dealing with illegal activity. Please do not fritter away our hard-won Constitutional rights, and please do not waste public resources for a product that does not even fulfill the functions that its proponents say that it will.

Best regards

/s/

This Machine Kills Fascists

NAME: michele  
CITY\_ZIP: 95112  
COMMENTS: Filter-free libraries!

I am disturbed by the direction of the current debate about the implementation of filters in the San Jose Public Library. Any secular and public institution, particularly a nationally recognized library, has a responsibility to keep every avenue of intellectual inquiry unfettered by political opportunism and religious extremism. This is true because such institutions set precedent for others and because every public institution has the responsibility to uphold democratic values. I believe that the mission and vision of the San Jose Public Library would be jeopardized by the installment of filters on Library computer workstations. The San Jose Public Library vision is grounded in the idea of providing access to a wide variety of ideas and information for educational and personal growth. By installing filters, the San Jose Public Library would be limiting access to information.

NAME: Dan  
CITY\_ZIP: 07928  
COMMENTS: Dear Councilman Pete Constant,

An influential (in my opinion) library-related blog has written about your community's library concerns. See <http://blog.librarylaw.com/librarylaw/2008/02/report-by-san-j.html> Thanks to Mary Minow, I learned I can submit comments online to the library. I'll copy and paste this and send it to them (if it bypasses their filters, if any, ironically).

I replied online, and, pending technical issues and approval of my response (which I think is likely), the below will appear online as well. I wanted you to see it and consider it. There is no need to respond to me about this.

I am cc'ing the blog author, among others, involved in my references cited.

Thank you.

Dan [last name removed]

-----  
<http://www.SafeLibraries.org/>

Mary,

What a well-written article, and I would have like to have attended that meeting as well. I have some points I'd like to raise to see what you think.

First, the city councilman has written online exactly why he is taking the stand he is. It adds to this discussion so I'll add it here and ask you to read it, if you haven't already:

<http://www.sjdistrict1.com/newsletter/NewsletterArticles/2008-February-LibraryFiltering2.pdf>

Second, you say, "In practice, however, there are no filters that can do this. [T]he bigger problem is ... filters invariably overblock legitimate sites, especially health sites, gay and lesbian sites, etc." Now this has two problems, I believe. First, it makes an implicit assumption that filters must be near perfect before they should be used. The US Supreme Court in *US v. ALA* acknowledged they would never be perfect, being as they are just some software, so anyone can ask for the site to be unblocked or for the filter to be disabled. So to imply filters must be near perfect to be used when the US Supreme Court has already asked and answered that question seems misleading to me.

The second problem with that statement is factual. The ACLU was a party with the ALA in *US v. ALA*. But now, even the ACLU admits that filters are over 95% effective and no longer block health-related web sites. So I think it is misleading to say what you said when the

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

### Page 19

ACLU and the courts say the opposite. See *ACLU v. Gonzales*, E.D. Pa., March 2007 [ACLU expert and court agrees Internet filters are about 95% effective and no longer block out breast cancer and other health-related information—so effective that another law, COPA [Children's Online Protection Act], was found unconstitutional] here:

<http://www.paed.uscourts.gov/documents/opinions/07D0346P.pdf>

Third, you provided data from a report dated February 4, 2007. Well the ACLU case discussed is more recent than your suggested report, and it has been found trustworthy in a court of law. Indeed the court was swayed by the ACLU's argument. I think the ACLU case is a better ruler to use to discuss these issues. At a minimum, both could be discussed, but the ACLU case should not be excluded, as it was here (likely for innocent reasons such as no one can know everything in the world).

Fourth, you say, "Privacy screens generally block images from passersby." Do you really believe this? This is false. Even Judith Krug of the ALA's OIF said privacy screens do not work as well as recessed desktops. But even with that, news reporters have shown that privacy screens are a total failure by showing that everything can be seen clearly, only a little darker, but it's still all there. Privacy screens are effective only in providing a feel-good approach that will fool the public into accepting them. Here's that news report, and watch the video. ABC7's Dan Noyes: 'I've seen the [privacy] screens and I see how they work and the stuff is visible from behind. You can see everything.' Jane Light...: 'So you can avert your eyes.' Watch for yourself the head librarian's attitude when she is caught in the lie:

[http://abclocal.go.com/kgof/story?section=i\\_team&id=4808374](http://abclocal.go.com/kgof/story?section=i_team&id=4808374)

Fifth, you say, "Be sure to notice in the library's response that in fact there have been very few porn incidents in San Jose." But you do not point out that this is false, neither do you point out that some libraries regularly mislead the public as to the true nature of the problems caused by unfiltered computers. As to this being false, I reference the above news story just linked, and I provide this summary:

San Francisco Bay Area, CA: "Porn, Sex Crimes At Libraries; I-Team Investigation," KGO, 29 Nov 2006, "[T]he Martin Luther King Library has a problem with pornography. They have no rule against viewing photographs or full-screen sex videos from Internet sites, even with children nearby. Chief librarian Jane Light says it's a matter of free speech. .... ABC7's Dan Noyes: 'I've seen the [privacy] screens and I see how they work and the stuff is visible from behind. You can see everything.' Jane Light...: 'So you can avert your eyes.' .... San Jose's police blotter over the past year lists several arrests for child porn at the library, at least ten cases of child molestation or other sex crimes involving kids and several cases of men viewing porn and performing a lewd act, right at the terminal. .... Sgt. John Laws, San Jose library police: 'It showed him sitting at the computer terminal and ... masturbating.' .... Marcia Stacke, Child Quest International: 'You know, sometimes I wonder if we're just too afraid to be, I don't know, sued in this country. We've got to step out and protect our kids. Enough is enough.'"

Mary, that police blotter proves the library's claim of "very few porn incidents" is false. Mary, it's just plain false. I know you are very hard working, honest person dedicated to her work. I am certain you will admit at least that the police blotter does appear to contradict the library's report.

As to libraries and even the ALA's OIF, misleading the public, I would count this San Jose case as one instance. Additional examples include the Illinois library that would not report crimes against children to the police:

Naperville, IL: "Library Confidential: Crimes Kept Secret; Indecent Acts, Violent Attacks And Sex Crimes Not Reported To Police," WBBM-TV, 2 Nov 2006 [ [http://cbs2chicago.com/westsuburbanbureau/local\\_story\\_306153622.html](http://cbs2chicago.com/westsuburbanbureau/local_story_306153622.html) ] ("He visibly had his hand down his pants," McNichols said. And for a second time they say library officials did nothing. .... "It is atrocious what is going on in some of these libraries throughout the metropolitan area," said Naperville Police Chief David Dial.); and "Your Library May Be A Safe Haven For Criminals; Library Confidential: Police Say Library Law Hinders Their Ability To Nab Offenders," WBBM-TV, 3 Nov 2006 [ [http://cbs2chicago.com/westsuburbanbureau/local\\_story\\_307173446.html](http://cbs2chicago.com/westsuburbanbureau/local_story_307173446.html) ] (The current law prohibits library staff from revealing the identity of a patron to police once they have left the library. .... "We have helped these laws be created and passed because they balance the right of the users of the libraries with the rights of law enforcement officer," said Judith Krug of the American Library Association.).

And another really egregious example. Here a library is invaded by criminals for about three years with almost daily incidents of criminal activity [ <http://www.safelibraries.org/adamson/> ], 47 librarians and coworkers speak out publicly about this, and Judith Krug of the ALA's OIF scoffs because, she claims, falsely, that only one of the 47 is an actual librarian. Who cares about the nonlibrarians, right? Look:

"Dangerous Access 2000: Media Coverage, ALA's Reaction," by David Burt, FilteringFacts.org, 17 Mar 2000. [ <http://lists.webjunction.org/wjlists/publib/2000-March/048232.html> ] "ALA Office of Intellectual Freedom Director Judith Krug was caught spreading false information as she tried to discredit 47 employees at the Minneapolis Public Library protesting being subjected to pornography on a daily basis at their workplace." .... "Krug also told the Times that, 'We have almost no evidence of any influx or even a small number of concerns about accessing pornography on the Internet by anyone.'"

So leading people to think that librarians can be trusted for accurate information in such matters is not a wise idea, in my opinion. Especially in San Jose where the head librarian is seen on the news report openly lying. What kind of example does it set when even the ALA's de facto leader for over 40 years "was caught spreading false information as she tried to discredit 47 employees at the Minneapolis Public Library protesting being subjected to pornography on a daily basis at their workplace."

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 20

What do you and your blog readers think of what I provided here? I know you are a professional but sometimes other people really launch on me for presenting this information and its sources, though it has never happened to my knowledge on your blog. So let me head some of them off ahead of time by saying I am not the issue -- ad hominem argument is not effective. I have simply provided alternate views and information and, more importantly, cited to the sources that allow me to make the statements I do.

I applaud Pete Constant for taking the stand he has. It is very hard to stand up to political correctness, especially when one needs votes and the PC crowd is allowed to wield great weight by the majority.

I hope Pete Constant's constituency learns the truth of the issues involved, not just the library's misinformation that is often echoed by the media, then makes the right decision based on that accurate information. I feel they would then choose to use the filters that are nowadays very effective and no longer block out health-related information. The hoped for result, of course, is that we no longer have to report "San Jose's police blotter over the past year lists several arrests for child porn at the library, at least ten cases of child molestation or other sex crimes involving kids and several cases of men viewing porn and performing a lewd act, right at the terminal."

NAME: Norma

CITY\_ZIP: 95126

COMMENTS: The free flow of information and citizens' ability to read and learn without restriction is essential to the American way of life. It's time that the small minority of religious fanatics stop imposing their ill-conceived and ignorant views on the rest of us. It's up to the government (the City of San Jose, in this case) to put an end to their influence of public policy.

NAME: Danelle

CITY\_ZIP: 95008

COMMENTS: I object to any attempt to filter or censor library resources, whether in digital or print formats.

NAME: Chris

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: As a student at SJSU I often find myself using the library computers for research and school work. While I disagree with people searching for porn on the library computers, I believe that internet filters will do more harm than good. Internet filters are far from perfect and can often accidentally block websites that may contain no or limited objectionable content. Even worse, once it blocks these websites it can usually take weeks to appeal a website's blockage. This is terrible if the site you needed happened to be the one that got blocked. I admit this is unlikely, but my experience with internet blockers on my highschool's computers tells me it's still a significant problem. The cost of having the occasional (and rare) incidence of someone looking at objectionable content is worth the benefit of unrestricted access.

NAME: Bill

CITY\_ZIP: 95126

COMMENTS: The idea of censoring public computers is ridiculous. This isn't China. We have the right to not have our tax dollars and other financial support for public institutions not support censoring for either political reasons or for religious reasons. This idea is ridiculous.

NAME: mari

CITY\_ZIP: 95461

COMMENTS: I think that it's a great idea

NAME: Tami

CITY\_ZIP: 95120

COMMENTS: Please don't put filters on the computers. Proper education and continual vigilance by parents are really what is needed to protect our children on the Internet. Parents want to think of the library as a safe place children can be on their own, but it is still a public place. We teach our kids stranger and strange place safety--that education just needs to be expanded to the online world.

Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 21

NAME: Judy

CITY\_ZIP: 95111

COMMENTS: I am opposed to filtering the library computers. I believe there is insignificant problem will adults or children. Further, parental supervision should eliminate any perceived problem. And, as far as adults, I believe there has been very little problem, and librarians will call the police when necessary.

NAME: Joyce

CITY\_ZIP: 95135

COMMENTS: Traditionally, the Library has not censored books which go into the collection. Why should the internet be handled in a different way? It makes the Library into a "big brother" deciding what should be seen and not seen. The users and users parents are the ones to make that decision.

NAME: ketty

CITY\_ZIP: 95111

COMMENTS: (I lost the message I was working on before I'd finished composing it. If It somehow got sent, please ignore this e-mail.)

I think, after weighing the pros and cons, that it would be a big mistake for the San Jose Public Library System to require filters on all its computers. It won't make us, or our children, safer. It will create more problems than it will solve.

NAME: Wilma

CITY\_ZIP: 95123

COMMENTS: With all of the problems confronting the city, why are we spending so much time and money on a problem that isn't really a problem. Parents can be the filters and save the city time and money. I don't believe there are any more problems now than before we had the computers in the library.

NAME: Donna

CITY\_ZIP: 95128

COMMENTS: I do not believe there should be filtering.

It is a COSTLY and imperfect solution, and doesn't address at all the impact on many health and science related searches that people make. It takes away the right to privacy of all because of a negative usage by a small minority.

NAME: Bruce

CITY\_ZIP: 95119

COMMENTS: I am a former California State University Professor of Computer Science. I strongly support the position taken by the SJSU Academic Senate on November 19, 2007.

NAME: William

CITY\_ZIP: 95126

COMMENTS: No filters needed.

NAME: Kathy

CITY\_ZIP: San Jose

COMMENTS: I believe this new proposal is a highly needed piece of legislation. When I visit the library, I sometimes see people viewing inappropriate content. There are usually many children at the library so I praise this long overdue proposal.

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 22

NAME: Priyanka

CITY\_ZIP: 95125

COMMENTS: I am in 100% support of having filters to restrict internet usage so its appropriate for all who use the public library, including but not limited to pornographic content. Not only is viewing pornographic content disturbing to children but also to adults. The fact that the system is free for all to use and the unrestricted access only makes it attractive to individuals interested in viewing such content. The library is a place that should foster learning in a safe and healthy environment. I whole heartedly support this policy.

NAME: Jim and Fran

CITY\_ZIP: 95126

COMMENTS: In our opinion filters on library computers would hinder valid searches in return for perhaps reducing the incidence of a very small problem. NO on filters.

NAME: Christine

CITY\_ZIP: 95110

COMMENTS: I would like to see the city's (taxpayers) monies being used for other city services. The costs involved in terms of labor, resources, and budget do not serve the community. The actual details in implementing the councilman's proposal would be a nightmare. Internet filtering software does more harm than good. I believe the SJPL system has enough safeguards already in place. In fact, as far as I can tell, nothing is broken so what is there to fix? If necessary or in terms of a compromise, perhaps privacy screens would be an appropriate alternative.

NAME: James

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: Filters are needed in at least the minor children areas. Even some adult areas should have filters. An unfiltered section should also be available with signs and notices posted warning about possible content.

NAME: Leanne

CITY\_ZIP: 95148

COMMENTS: No restrictions should be put in place to block anything! Adults should be able to access anything available on the world wide web.

NAME: Kenneh

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: I think that the city should install a "black list" filter, i.e. a filter that blocks out only known "bad" websites. If a site is on the list, it's not loaded. If it's not on the list, it is loaded. This way, staff can block known porn sites, as well as other undesierable pages, while still allowing unknown pages to be loaded. I think that this kind of black listing, along with public education about appropriate things to access on public computers, we can cut down on the amount of undesierable content that can be downloaded and potetially viewed by children at the library.

NAME: Kathleen

CITY\_ZIP: 95130

COMMENTS: I believe it is appropriate to require filters on library computers.

NAME: Nicole

CITY\_ZIP: 95110

COMMENTS: While I am aware of the issues concerning inappropriate web browsing in the library, I feel that filtering will be more detrimental than helpfu. Because King library is a joint city and

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 23

university library, it is critical that university students have full access on the web and are not limited due to filtering. Many research topics may include terminology identified as inappropriate by the filter; and my knowledge on current filtering systems is that they will block many things you don't want blocked, and still miss some of the things you do want blocked. As a public facility, and especially as a university one, restrictions on information should not be enforced. Internet filters are for home and personal use for families who so choose.

NAME: Renee

CITY\_ZIP: 95136

COMMENTS: I think that the SJ library system should not require filters on all library computers. Blocking software blocks access to sites the software company thinks offensive. It is well established that filtering software does not work properly. It overblocks (blocks sites no one would think objectionable) and underblocks (fails to block sites that some might think objectionable). The companies that sell filtering software also won't tell anyone what they have blocked.

Adults deserve to be able to access the Internet without a software company deciding what they should be allowed to read and see. At the very least, adults should have the option to turn off the filter or unblock specific sites, and the procedures for doing these things (or getting a librarian to do them) should be posted publicly.

Thank you for your time.

NAME: Lelouch

CITY\_ZIP: 95123

COMMENTS: I feel that the need of Internet Filtering shouldn't really be needed... all the hassle and angered customers might cut down the Library's income by 1/2-1/4, depending on how severe it is. Also, it would affect the whole booking/CPU system adversely, making it more difficult to browse the web when in need. In addition, this problem is nothing

NAME: David

CITY\_ZIP: 95124

COMMENTS: I do not believe that using filters is appropriate at the library. They are not accurate and prevent others from access to legitimate information. I believe that other methods can be used to safeguard children and still support the free access to all information.

NAME: Gary

CITY\_ZIP: 95133

COMMENTS: I believe that internet filters are inappropriate. Libraries are fonts of knowledge and filters are susceptible to both false positives and false negatives, impeding research in some areas while allowing unfettered access in other areas. It is enough that display screens be in public areas and library staff walk through the areas occasionally, monitoring what the patrons are doing.

Of most concern to me is not pornography, the great American bugaboo, but various hate sites and chat rooms luring children. I would filter these sites for the under 18 crowd until they are educated and sophisticated enough to make informed decisions, but just don't see how that can be done effectively as the sites change daily.

Best alternative, teach our children at home about morality and the ways of the world and leave the filters off.

NAME: Owen

CITY\_ZIP: 95110

COMMENTS: I am in favor of filters on library computers. Especially as a parent, I am disconcerted when I turn a corner (especially on the more lonely upper floors of the King Library), and inadvertently run across someone accessing pornography. If the library feels it must provide access to "everything" as part of its mission, I encourage it to implement policies that can achieve this while protecting children and others. Perhaps a designated area can be identified where patrons can request filters to be turned off, and that area clearly signed so that children and others who don't wish to run across inflammatory material can avoid that area.

NAME: Texie

CITY\_ZIP: 95123

COMMENTS: I believe there definitely should be filters on the library computers so as not to allow viewing of inappropriate material for children.

NAME: Anne

CITY\_ZIP: 95124

COMMENTS: Have you used filters? I'm a parent who has used Internet filters and they are imperfect. They block a lot of sites that are safe, legitimate, and instructive. As unwieldy as filters are, though---ADD THEM NOW! The procedures for unblocking needed sites, as detailed in the proposal, are time-consuming, but acceptable. Once again--ADD THE FILTERS.

NAME: Kimberly

CITY\_ZIP: 95136

COMMENTS: I absolutely agree with the new policy proposal. It is shocking to know that 10 counts of lewd acts involving minors were documented at San Jose's main library - and those are the ones that were caught and prosecuted, only a percentage of the total I am sure. If you want to state that San Jose's libraries are a "safe place," internet filtering and the new use policy need to be implemented at once. This makes the libraries a safe place not only for our community's children, but adults and library employees as well. Thank you.

NAME: Anna

CITY\_ZIP: 95133

COMMENTS: Regarding to this internet filtering, i dont think its that good of an idea. What if there are sites that are not pornography, but still blocked? It limits sites that teens would like to go to.

NAME: steven

CITY\_ZIP: sandpoint, idaho

COMMENTS: to many hoops to be able to do simple work on a computer. no instructions of how to reserve a computer, unnecessary issuance of library cards for visitors to use the computers in the library. however, assistance when needed is good. please make it easier and cut through all the red tape.

NAME: Carrie

CITY\_ZIP: 95118

COMMENTS: I am a mother of two children, ages 4 and 1.

I think internet filters are ineffective and will unintentionally filter out "legitimate" research material as well. Also, I have heard of internet filters in the past that have filtered human rights group sites

## Internet Feedback – Public Comments

Page 25

and political candidate sites, either unintentionally or intentionally. See [www.peacefire.org](http://www.peacefire.org). I think that the current policy of library personnel monitoring and handling issues on a case-by-case basis is preferable to internet filters.

NAME: Emy

CITY\_ZIP: 95112

COMMENTS: Not sure what kind of comments you want? Do I think the library should put filters (what kind of filters) on all computers on all systems throughout the library? Sounds kind of draconian.

Does it make me very uncomfortable and do I find it insulting and intimidating when I'm working in the reading area on the Lower Level, and there are a lot of men looking at porn sites? Yes. It makes the library, the place where I do my graduate work, creepy, sleazy, not a safe place to be. Does the library carry issues of Playboy, Hustler and other hardcore magazines too? I understand that the library is a public institution, but the policy of not limiting access at all ends up creating an environment that is not a kid-friendly, family-friendly, or person-friendly.

NAME: Jason

CITY\_ZIP: 95134

COMMENTS: Please do not filter internet content. Doing so would set a precedent for further filtering in the future and is a slipper slope we don't want to go down.

NAME: cydney

CITY\_ZIP: 95065

COMMENTS: I feel that, overall, the internet access is great. One thing that I would change, however, is the log out procedure. Instead of it booting you off after the allotted time, it would be nice if it asked you if you would like to renew your time, so one doesn't have to start everything all over again.

NAME: Ben

CITY\_ZIP: 95138

COMMENTS: making WI-FI available to personal laptop user is great. This allows me to do research beyond what's available in the library without going through all the logging in using library's computers (providing that the computers are not occupied).